

Sentiment Analysis of Users' Reviews on COVID-19 Contact Tracing Apps with a Benchmark Dataset

Kashif Ahmad*, Firoj Alam[†], Junaid Qadir[‡], Basheer Qolomany[§], Imran Khan[¶], Talhat Khan[¶], Muhammad Suleman[¶], Naina Said[¶], Syed Zohaib Hassan^{||}, Asma Gul**, Ala Al-Fuqaha*

*College of Science and Engineering, HBKU, Doha, Qatar

[†]Qatar Computing Research Institute, HBKU, Qatar

[‡]Dept. of EE, Information Technology University, Lahore, Pakistan

[§]Dept. of Cyber Systems, University of Nebraska, Kearney, US

[¶]DCSE, University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan

^{||}University of Trento, Italy

** Dept. of Stat., Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar, Pakistan

*{kahmad,aalfuqaha}@hbku.edu.qa [†]fialam@hbku.edu.qa, [‡]junaid.qadir@itu.edu.pk, [§]qolomanyb@unk.edu,

[¶]imrancaan@outlook.com, [¶]talhatkhan95@gmail.com, [¶]nainasaid@uetpeshawar.edu.pk,

^{||}zohaib.tirmazi@gmail.com, **asmagul@sbbwu.edu.pk

Abstract—Contact tracing has been globally adopted in the fight to control the infection rate of COVID-19. Thanks to digital technologies, such as smartphones and wearable devices, contacts of COVID-19 patients can be easily traced and informed about their potential exposure to the virus. To this aim, several interesting mobile applications have been developed. However, there are ever-growing concerns over the working mechanism and performance of these applications. The literature already provides some interesting exploratory studies on the community's response to the applications by analyzing information from different sources, such as news and users' reviews of the applications. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no existing solution that automatically analyzes users' reviews and extracts the evoked sentiments. In this work, we propose a pipeline starting from manual annotation via a crowd-sourcing study and concluding on the development and training of AI models for automatic sentiment analysis of users' reviews. In total, we employ eight different methods achieving up to an average F1-Scores 94.8% indicating the feasibility of automatic sentiment analysis of users' reviews on the COVID-19 contact tracing applications. We also highlight the key advantages, drawbacks, and users' concerns over the applications. Moreover, we also collect and annotate a large-scale dataset composed of 34,534 reviews manually annotated from the contract tracing applications of 46 distinct countries. The presented analysis and the dataset are expected to provide a baseline/benchmark for future research in the domain.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the emerge of COVID-19, public authorities are trying their best to slow down the infection rate of the virus, globally. As part of their efforts, several solutions, such as closing public places, imposing full or partial lock-downs, and limiting people's contacts, have been implemented. Contact tracing has been globally recognized as one of the effective methods to slow down the infection rate of the virus [1]. To this aim,

most of the initial efforts were based on manually tracing the contacts of infected persons. Manual contact tracing works only when the infected person knows who has been in physical contact with him/her, which reduces the effectiveness of the method. Moreover, manual contact tracing is a very time- and resource-consuming process [2], [3].

The potential of contact-tracing could be fully utilized if, ideally, the contact tracing mechanism can track the contact of an infected person on a very large scale. For instance, it would be ideally beneficial if the authorities are able to track where the infected person has been and identify and notify the potential contacts of the patient. The technology, such as proximity sensors in smartphones and wearable devices, can help in such situations allowing the authorities to automatically notify the potential cases more quickly and accurately [1], [4]. To this aim, several mobile applications with a diversified set of features have been developed world-wide each aligned with COVID-19 related policies, social values, and local infrastructure. However, the success of such applications is largely constrained by the number of users. According to Hinch et al. [5], the potential of these mobile applications could be fully utilized if used by at least 80% of the mobile users—which is 56% of the total population in the case of UK as reported by the authors but generally depends on the mobile penetration in the country.

In order to increase the number of these applications' users, different strategies and policies have been devised [6]. For instance, public authorities in several countries have made it mandatory for the residents to install the contact tracing application to be able to access shopping malls, transportation, hospital, and other public places.

However, there are several concerns over these applications in terms of both effectiveness and privacy. For instance, since

the applications require tracking individuals' movement with GPS and other sensors to track their interactions, privacy concerns may arise [7], [8]. Moreover, the literature also identifies lack of understanding and unavailability of the technology (e.g., smartphones) with a large portion of the population in third world countries, as one of the main reasons for less effectiveness of such contact tracing applications [9].

We believe an analysis of users' reviews on these applications will facilitate a better understanding of the concerns over these applications. There are already some efforts in this regard [3], [9], [10]. However, the majority of the methods rely on exploratory and manual analysis of the users' reviews, which is a resource and time-consuming process. Moreover, some of the works also rely on existing general sentiment analysis platforms/tools without training or fine-tuning the tools on COVID-19 application reviews. For instance, in [10], a commercial tool namely *AppBot*¹ has been used for sentiment analysis of users' reviews on only nine mobile applications used in Europe. However, the tool relies on AI models trained for generic sentiment analysis, and returns four types of sentiments namely *positive*, *negative*, *neutral*, and *mixed*. As a result, the outcome is not reliable as the models are not trained on the task-specific data (i.e., App reviews). For instance, a vast majority of the reviews are highlighting some technical issues, such as difficulties with registration, etc., which also need to be analyzed. To address those limitations, we believe a task-specific model trained on a large-scale manually annotated users' reviews dataset will help to make better and context-specific classification of the reviews. Moreover, the existing literature relies on the users' reviews of fewer applications used in a specific region, which cover only a portion of the population of the world.

In this paper, we analyze *how AI models can help in automatically extract and classify the polarity of users' sentiments*, and propose a sentiment analysis framework to automatically analyze users' reviews on COVID-19 contact tracing mobile applications. In detail, we collected and annotated a large-scale dataset of Android and iOS mobile applications users' reviews for COVID-19 contact tracing. After manually analyzing and annotating users' reviews, we employed both classical (i.e., MNB, SVM, Random Forest) and deep learning (i.e., Convolution Neural Network [11], fastText [12], and different transformers [13]) methods for classification experiments. This resulted in eight different classification models. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to develop a large-scale benchmark dataset for sentiment analysis of users' reviews on COVID-19 contact tracing applications, which are from 46 distinct countries from *Google Play* and *App Store* are covered.

The main contributions of the work can be summarized as follows:

- We provide 34,534 manually labeled reviews based on the analysis of 40,000 reviews from 46 different COVID-19 contact tracing applications. The labels consist of sentiment polarities (i.e., positive, neutral, and negative) and a label (technical issue).

- We provide an in-depth analysis of the dataset that demonstrates different characteristics and insights.
- We share the dataset and data splits² with the research community for both reproducibility and further enhancements.
- We report benchmark results using eight different classification experiments, which can serve as a baseline for future studies.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II provides an overview of the related work. Section IV discusses the development of the dataset. Section V details the classification experiments. The detailed observations of our study are discussed in Section VII. Section VIII concludes this study and provides directions for future research.

II. RELATED WORK

To fight against the COVID-19 pandemic, almost all research communities, such as health, NLP, and Computer Vision have been playing a significant role. As a result, several interesting solutions, aiming at different aspects of the pandemic, have been proposed over the last year [14]. For instance, there have been efforts for an early COVID-19 outbreak detection to help in an emergency response preparedness [15]. Similarly, a large portion of the efforts aimed at an automatic diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment [15], [16]. Fake news detection, risk assessment, logistic planning, and understanding of social interventions, such as monitoring social distancing, are the other key aspects of the pandemic that received the attention of the community [14], [17], [18].

Contact tracing is also one of the aspects of the pandemic that has been widely explored in the literature. For instance, the study by Lash et al. [19] analyzed the mechanism and results of contact tracing in two different countries. The authors report that an accurate and efficient mechanism of contact tracing can significantly reduce the infection rate of the virus. However, several challenges are associated with a timely and accurate contact tracing of a COVID-19 patient. In this regard, a joint effort from the community, and the use of more advanced methods relying on different technologies, such as global positioning system (GPS), Wireless Fidelity (Wi-Fi), Bluetooth, Social graph, network-based APIs, and mobile tracking data will help to a great extent [20], [21]. Handheld devices, such as mobile phones, which are already embedded with such technologies, are ideal platforms for deploying contact tracing solutions. Being a feasible solution, several mobile applications have been already developed in different parts of the world. In addition to basic contact tracing capabilities different features are also implemented based on the domestic COVID-19 policies [22]. For instance, in different countries, such as Qatar, Australia, the applications are used to access different facilities. Similarly, in Saudi Arabia, the application is used to seek permission for going out during lockdown. In Table I, we provide a list of some of the prominent contact tracing applications used in different parts of the world.

Despite being a feasible solution for slowing down the infection rate, these applications are subject to criticism due

¹<https://appbot.co>

²Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/1RDRCM>

to risks associated with them. In the literature, several issues, such as privacy, power consumption, and annoying alerts, have been reported. For instance, Bengio et al. [23] analyze and reported the privacy issues associated with COVID-19 contact tracing applications. Besides, some recommendations on how to ensure users' privacy, the authors also proposed a decentralized design for contact tracing by optimizing the privacy and utility trade-offs. Reichert et al. [24] also analyzed the privacy concerns over the applications, and proposed a privacy-preserving contact tracing mechanism relying on a privacy-preserving protocol namely secure multi-party computation (MPC) [25] to ensure individuals' privacy. Power consumption is another key challenge to contact tracing applications.

The literature also provides several interesting works, where the feasibility of such mobile applications is carried out by analyzing people's response/feedback on these applications [22], [26], [27]. For instance, in [28] an online survey was conducted to analyze citizens' response to HSE³, a contact tracing application used in Ireland. During the survey, a reasonable percentage of the participants showed their intention of using the application. However, the survey mainly aimed to analyze and identify different barriers in the use of such an application without analyzing the experience of the users with the application. In order to better analyze, understand, and evaluate users' experience and feedback on the COVID-19 contact tracing applications, a detailed analysis of the public reviews is required, which are available of Apple⁴ and Google Play⁵ Store. There are already some efforts in this direction. For instance, Rekanar et al. [3] provide a detailed analysis of users' feedback on HSE in terms of usability, functional effectiveness, and performance. However, the authors rely on manual analysis only, which is a time-consuming process. Another relevant work is reported in [10], where an exploratory analysis of users' feedback on nine COVID-19 contact tracing applications, used in Europe, is provided. To this aim, the authors rely on a commercial app-review analytics tool, namely Appbot⁶, to extract and mine the users' reviews on the applications. To the best of our knowledge, the literature still lacking a benchmark dataset to train and evaluate ML models for automatic analysis of users' feedback on COVID-19 contact tracing applications. Moreover, the existing literature relies on the users' reviews of fewer applications used in a specific region, which cover only a portion of the population of the world. Hence, our work differs in a number of ways (i) we analyze reviews of a large number of applications used in different parts of the world, (ii) manually annotated dataset and provide them for the community, and (iii) provide detail experimental results.

III. PROPOSED PIPELINE

In this section, we will provide an overview of the methodology adopted in this paper. The complete pipeline of the proposed work is depicted in Figure 1. The work is mainly

carried out in two different phases including (i) dataset development phase, and (ii) experimental phase. In the development phase, as a first step, we scraped Google Play and App Store to obtain users' reviews on the COVID-19 contact tracing application used in different parts of the world. After obtaining users' reviews, a crowd-sourcing study has been conducted to annotate the reviews for the training and evaluation of ML models for automatic sentiment analysis of the reviews. The annotation and other details obtained during the crowd-sourcing study are then analyzed as detailed later. In the experimental phase, before conducting experiments, data is pre-processed to make it more meaningful for the AI models deployed in the experiments. During the experiments, we employed several AI models as detailed later. In the remainder of this section, we provide details of our dataset development process in which we describe our methodology for collecting, annotating, and analyzing the dataset.

IV. DATASET DEVELOPMENT

A. Data Collection

In order to obtain real-world users' reviews for our analysis, we crawled reviews from 46 COVID-19 contact tracing applications used in the different parts of the world and hosted on Google Play and Apple's App Store. These applications are listed in Table I. We note that in this work we consider reviews in the English language only where we made sure to analyze and annotate at least 50% of reviews. However, to make sure the dataset is balanced in terms of reviews from different applications, for some applications, such as Aarogya Setu, a lesser portion of the available reviews is analyzed. Besides users' reviews, we also obtained replies to the reviews, if any are available, as well as the ratings. However, for this study, we only used the reviews for the analysis and experiments. We note that the reviews were obtained from December 20th to December 25th, 2020.

B. Data Annotation

For the annotation of sentiment, typically three sentiment polarities are used such as *positive*, *negative*, and *neutral*. From our initial analysis we realized that applications can have technical problems, hence, we used another label, *technical issues*, for the annotation. Hence, our annotation consists of four labels: (i) *positive*, (ii) *negative*, (iii) *neutral*, and (iv) *technical issues*.

To facilitate the annotation process, we developed a web application where the users' reviews on the applications were presented to the annotators to be manually label them. In Figure 2 we present a screen-shot of the annotation platform, which demonstrates the review and labels to be annotated (Q.1). In addition, we asked the annotators to briefly provide the reason behind their decision provided in response to Q.1. The question (Q.2) is used to evaluate the quality of the annotation (i.e., whether the annotator carefully read the review or not). Moreover, we believe this question will provide useful information for the manual analysis of the users' feedback.

In total, 40,000 reviews were analyzed. To assure the quality of the annotations, each review is analyzed by at least two

³<https://www.hse.ie/eng/>

⁴<https://www.apple.com/qa/app-store/>

⁵<https://play.google.com/store>

⁶<https://appbot.co>




Fig. 1: Block diagram of the proposed pipeline for sentiment analysis of users’ feedback on COVID-19 contact tracing mobile applications. The proposed pipeline can be roughly divided into two components, namely (i) dataset development, and (ii) experiments.

S. No.	Country	App	Tech.
1	Australia	COVIDSafe	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
2	Austria	Stopp Corona	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
3	Bahrain	BeAware	Bluetooth, Location
4	Bangladesh	Corona Tracer BD	Bluetooth, Google
5	Belgium	Coronalert	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
6	Bulgaria	VirusSafe	Location, Bluetooth, Google/Apple
7	Canada	COVID Alert	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
8	Cyprus	CovTracer	Location, GPS
9	Czech Republic	eRouska	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
10	Denmark	Smitstopp	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
11	Estonia	HOIA	Bluetooth, DP-3T, Google/Apple
12	Fiji	CareFiji	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
13	Finland	Koronavilkku	Bluetooth, DP-3T
14	France	TousAntiCovid	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
15	Germany	Corona-Warn-App	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
16	Ghana	GH COVID-19 Tracker	Location, Google/Apple
17	Gibraltar	Beat Covid Gibraltar	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
18	Hungary	VirusRadar	Bluetooth, Google
19	Iceland	Rakning C-19	Location, Google/Apple
20	India	Aarogya Setu	Bluetooth, Location, Google/Apple
21	Indonesia	PeduliLindungi	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
22	Ireland	Covid Tracker	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
23	Israel	HaMagen	Location, Google/Apple
24	Italy	Immuni	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
25	Japan	COCOA	Google/Apple
26	KSA	Tawakkalna	Bluetooth, Google
27	KSA	Tabaud	Google
28	Kuwait	Shlonik	Location, Google/Apple
29	Malaysia	MyTrace	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
30	Mexico	CovidRadar	Bluetooth
31	New Zealand	NZ COVID Tracer	QR codes, Google/Apple
32	North Macedonia	StopKorona	Bluetooth
33	Northern Ireland	StopCOVID NI	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
34	Norway	Smitstopp	Bluetooth, Location, Google
35	Pakistan	COVID-Gov-PK	Bluetooth, GPS, Google/Apple
36	Philippines	StaySafe	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
37	Poland	ProteGO Safe	Bluetooth, Google
38	Qatar	Ehteraz	Bluetooth, Location, Google/Apple
39	Singapore	TraceTogether	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
40	South Africa	COVID Alert SA	Bluetooth, Google/Apple
41	Switzerland	SwissCovid	Bluetooth, DP-3T, Google/Apple
42	Thailand	MorChana	Location, Bluetooth
43	Tunisia	E7mi	Google/Apple
44	Turkey	Hayat Eve Siğar	Bluetooth, Location, Google/Apple
45	UAE	TraceCovid	Bluetooth
46	UK	NHS COVID-19 App	Bluetooth, Google/Apple

TABLE I: COVID-19 contact tracing mobile applications used in this study.

participants (graduate students from different age groups). During the annotation process, we removed some reviews due to reasons such as (i) not being in English, (ii) having a large number of emoticons/signs, and (iii) they are irrelevant. This process resulted in having a total of **34,534** annotated reviews.

C. Analysis

Overall, the dataset provides sufficient number of samples per class. However, fewer samples are obtained in the *Neutral* category, which contains reviews that are not directly linked to the usage of the applications. In total, we have 15,587 samples in the *positive* class while the *negative*, *neutral*, and *technical issues* classes are composed of 8,178, 1,271, and 9,496, respectively.

From the analysis of the second question (Q.2), we identified the reasons/information that influenced the participants’ decision. In this section, we provide the statistics of the second question (Q.2) In Figure 3a, 3b, and 3c, we provide the distribution of the most common reasons/causes associated with the *positive*, *negative* and *technical issues*, respectively.

As can be seen in Figure 3a, in the majority of the positive reviews, users’ found the applications useful, informative, and helpful in the battle against COVID-19. Some sample positive reviews are “*Thank you very much. it’s very helpful and informative. it helps keep people away from suspicious areas.*”; “*A very good app for tracing and stopping coronavirus*”; “*Always getting updated information about the virus*”; “*Very useful and informative app.*” A significant portion of positive reviews is also based on ease in the installation while some reviews mentioned that the application they are using is working fine without further details. However, the most encouraging aspect is the fact that a significant percentage of users have appreciated the idea, concept, and efforts made by the authorities for contact tracing to slow down the infection rate. Some sample reviews include “*A good initiative by the government*”; “*Good initiative to prevent the spread of corona virus, I appreciate who work behind this effort.*” There were also a large number of short reviews where the users simply showed their positive response without mentioning any particular reason. Besides these, other common reasons for their positive reviews highlighted by the users include some specific features of different applications in different parts of the world. For example, *Takkawalna* from Saudi Government was used to seek permission for going out during lockdown was praised for being a source of seeking permissions.

Figure 3b reflects power consumption, uselessness, and privacy as the most common issues with these applications. A significant amount of reviews also highlight that majority of the applications are not user-friendly. There were also reviews depicting other issues, such as annoying notifications, unnecessary access to the gallery, slow response from the helpline, and unavailability of some key features, which could further improve the effectiveness of the applications. Some sample negative reviews include “*Too much personal information collected. Privacy risk. Non compliant to international standards.*”; “*Allow too many permission please ban this application. A total waste.*”; “*I have concerns with their data privacy.*”; and “*This app is a battery hog.*”

The Data Annotation Task for COVID-19 Contact Tracing Applications

Given Review

Sadly, this app does not solve any problem. The government thought that the privacy is far more important than people's lives. Even in the app You see that the government is trying to protect your privacy, but they don't have any announcement about how to protect people's lives in this app. It's a shame.

Questions

Q.1: Please select an appropriate label from the following list

Positive
 Negative
 Neutral
 Technical Issues

Q. 2: Please give the reason for choosing a particular tag in Q. 1

Reason for choosing a tag

Fig. 2: Block diagram of the annotation platform.

On the other hand, as can be noticed in Figure 3c, the key technical issues with these applications include registration and update issues. Moreover, a large number of reviews also highlight that majority of the applications crashes or frequently stops working. Besides these common issues, the reviews also hint about certain technical issues, such as device compatibility and connectivity issues, lack of support for some languages, such as English, and not correcting QR codes by different applications. Some sample reviews highlighting technical issues in the applications include “*The app continually crashes.*”; “*I have business visa i am unable to register please give a solution on this.*”; “*I installed..but i cant register yet.*”; “*I cant update?*”; and “*Install the apps, but keep showing connection error. Even restart the phone, also the same.*”

We also provide country-wise statistics in Figure 4, where we summarize the number/percentage of samples/reviews on the applications used in different countries belonging to each category. An important observation from the figure is the variation in the distribution of number of *negative*, *positive*, *neutral*, and reviews highlighting *technical issues* in different parts of the world. The variations in the number of reviews in each class depict how different response to the use of the applications has been observed in different parts of the world. As can be seen, in certain countries, such as Japan, Israel, Canada, and Ireland, the ratio of *negative* reviews is high. The ratio of the *positive* reviews is sufficient in most of the countries, which shows the trust of users in the applications. On the other hand, as expected, fewer *neutral* reviews from the majority of the countries are obtained for the dataset. The dataset also covers a significant ratio for the *technical issues* class in the majority of the countries. For instance, the ratio of

the reviews highlighting technical problems in the applications is significantly high in *Denmark*, *Tunisia* and *Cyprus*.

In order to analyze the changes in the polarity of users’ sentiments over time, in Figure 5, we provide some preliminary temporal analysis to analyze the variation in the distribution of *negative*, *positive*, *neutral*, and reviews highlighting the *technical issues* over time. We note that in the current work we provide some preliminary temporal analysis, which will be explored in the future, and to this aim, we manually analyzed the 200 most recent reviews and the initial 200 reviews on applications having a reasonable time duration in the initial and more recent reviews. As can be seen in the figure, overall higher variation has been observed in the *positive*, *negative*, and *neutral* categories. As far as the individual applications are concerned, higher variation in the polarity of sentiments is observed for the applications used in *Australia*, *Singapore*, *UAE*, and *Canada*.

During the data analysis, though there were some doubts about privacy, we observed that at the beginning the initiative/idea of contact tracing was largely appreciated by the users in different parts of the world. Moreover, we also observed that the users of these applications faced device compatibility and registration issues with the application with time. Interestingly, in the case of most of the applications, the number of *negative* reviews increased with time. One of the possible reasons for the increase is the applications’ failure in achieving what they promised.

D. Lexical Analysis

To understand the lexical content, we have conducted an analysis of the number of tokens for each review. It can help




Fig. 3: Analysis of common reasons provided in the reviews.

to understand the characteristics of the dataset. For example, for CNN and LSTM based architectures, it is necessary to define max sequence length. The minimum, maximum and average number of tokens in the dataset are 3, 198, and ~ 18 , respectively. Figure 6 provides the statistics of the length of the reviews in the dataset.

We also analyzed the lexical content in each category to understand whether they are distinctive in terms of the lexical content – top n-grams. This analysis also demonstrates the quality of the labeled data. We compared the vocabularies of all categories using the valence score [29], [30], ϑ for every token, x , using the following the Equation 1:

$$\vartheta(x, L_i) = 2 * \frac{C(x|L_i)}{\sum_l^L C(x|L_l)} - 1 \quad (1)$$

where $C(\cdot)$ is the frequency of the token x for a given class L_i . T_{L_i} is the total number of tokens present in the class. In $\vartheta(x) \in [-1, +1]$, the value $+1$ indicates the use of the token is significantly higher in the target class than the other classes.

In Table II, we present top frequent bi- and tri-grams with $\vartheta = 1.0$ for each category. From the table, we observe these n-grams clearly represent the class-wise information of the data.

Negative	Positive	Technical issues
Battery went down	Best app	Error requesting
to delete this	Excellent app,	Cannot register.
overheating and battery	and helpfull	what's wrong
Not happy	Very nice and	fix this,
battery drainer	feel safer	I can't seem
uninstall due to	very good apps	Unable to proceed
Drains battery and	Good information	error while
massive drain	save lives and	have error
too much battery,	very useful for	phone number. Tried
Massive battery drain	Easy to register	I force stop

TABLE II: Class-wise n-grams based on valance scores.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Task Description

As discussed earlier, we obtained a large number of samples for *positive*, *negative*, and *technical issues* while fewer samples are obtained in *neutral* class. Moreover, the reviews highlighting technical problems in the applications could also be treated as negative reviews. Thus, in order to cover different aspects of the problem, we divide it into three different tasks.

Task 1: Ternary classification (PNT)—we treat the problem as ternary classification problem, where *positive*, *negative*, and *technical issues* are considered. The models trained for this task are expected to help in identifying the reviews highlighting technical problems in the applications along with the positive and negative reviews.

Task 2: Binary classification (PN)—the *negative* and *technical issues* classes are merged into a single *negative* class to form two classes for a binary classification problem along with *positive* reviews. One of the main reasons for treating the task as a binary classification is the availability of fewer samples in the *neutral* class.

Task 3: Ternary classification (PNN)—we have three classes namely *positive*, *negative*, and *neutral*. We note that in this task, the *negative* class is the combination of original negative and technical issues classes.

All these tasks will help in analyzing how the performances of the proposed sentiment analyzer vary with different sets of annotations.

B. Data Splits

For the classification experiments, we divided the dataset into training, validation, and test sets with a proportion of 60.3%, 6.7%, and 30%, respectively. While dividing the dataset we used stratified sampling to maintain class distribution across different sets. The data split/distribution is performed for each task separately, which results in a different number of samples for training, validation, and test set for each task. The data split for each task will be made publicly available, separately, to ensure a fair comparison in future work. Table III summarizes the distribution of the data into training, validation, and test sets used in each task, respectively.




Fig. 4: Country-wise statistics of the dataset in terms of the distribution of *negative*, *positive*, *neutral*, and *technical* issues in the applications covered in this work.




Fig. 5: Preliminary temporal analysis reflecting the changes in the distribution of the sentiment classes over time. The statistics are compiled by analyzing the top 200 more recent (i.e., December 25th, 2020) and the initial 200 reviews from some applications having sufficient number of reviews.

C. Data Preprocessing

Before proceeding with the experiments, the data is also cleaned by removing unnecessary tokens, such as non-ASCII characters, punctuations (replaced with whitespace), and other signs.

D. Models

For this study, our classification experiments consist of multiclass classification using both classical and deep learning algorithms as detailed below.

1) *Classical Algorithms*: For this study, we used several classical algorithms such as Multinomial Naive Bayes (MNB) [31], SVM [32] and Random Forest (RF) [33]. As a feature representation with these algorithms, we used the bag-of-grams, which is one of the most commonly used methods for text classification and retrieval applications, applied with classical algorithms. Earlier this has been widely used as a simple, yet effective and computationally efficient method. Motivated by its better performance in similar types of text classification applications, such as fake news and floods detection in Twitter




Fig. 6: Number of reviews with different lengths in the overall dataset. On 60 reviews we have more than 120 tokens, which has not shown in the figure.

Class labels	Train	Dev	Test	Total
Task 1: Ternary classification (PNT)				
Positive	9370	1041	5176	15587
Negative	5000	556	2622	8178
Technical Issues	5686	632	3178	9496
Total	20056	2229	10976	33261
Task 2: Binary classification (PN)				
Positive	9342	1038	5207	15587
Negative	10715	1191	5770	17676
Total	20057	2229	10977	33263
Task 3: Ternary classification (PNN)				
Positive	9364	1040	5183	15587
Negative	10690	1188	5798	17676
Neutral	770	85	416	1271
Total	20824	2314	11398	34534

TABLE III: Data split and distribution of class labels for different tasks.

text [17], [34], [35], we experimented with this representation using the mentioned classical algorithms.

2) *fastText*: *fastText* is an NLP library aiming at efficient word embedding and text classification with a higher speed compared to traditional deep learning solutions [36]. For word embedding, the model relies on Continuous Bag of Words (CBOW), which is based on a shallow Neural Network (NN), strategy by predicting a word via its neighbors. To ensure training at a higher speed, the model relies on a hierarchical classification mechanism by replacing the traditional soft-max function with a hierarchical one resulting in a reduced number of parameters.

3) *Transformers*: BERT [13] is a state-of-the-art pre-trained model, which has shown its success in many downstream NLP tasks. It is typically used for downstream classification problems either by using embedding representations as features or fine-tuning the model. The main strength of the model comes from pre-training on a very large text dataset that allows the model to understand and interpret text easily in different NLP

applications. Moreover, the model also possesses the ability to learn from context. For this study, we use different transformer models, which include BERT [13], RoBERTa [37], XLM-RoBERTa [38] and DistilBERT [39].

E. Evaluation Measure

To measure the performance of each classifier, we use weighted average precision (P), recall (R), F1-measure (F1). We used weighted metric as it has the capability to take into account the class imbalance distribution.

F. Classification Experiments

To train the classifiers using the MNB, SVM, and RF we converted the text into bag-of- n -gram vectors weighted with logarithmic term frequencies (tf) multiplied with inverse document frequencies (idf). To utilize contextual information, such as n -grams which are useful for classification, we extracted unigram, bigram, and tri-gram features.

We used grid-search to optimize the parameters for MNB, SVM, and RF. For the MNB, we optimize laplace smoothing α parameter with 20 values between 0 and 1. For the SVM, we optimize linear kernel with C parameters with 30 values ranges from 0.00001 to 10, and radial-basis-function kernel with C and γ parameters (for γ we use 10 values from 1e-5 to 1e-1). For RF we optimize the number of trees (10 values from 200 to 2000), and the depth of the tree (11 values from 10 to 110). Choosing such ranges of values depends on the available computational resources as they are computationally expensive.

For *fastText*, we use pre-trained embeddings trained on Common Crawl⁷ and default hyperparameter settings available with *fastText* toolkit.⁸

For transformer-based models, we use the Transformer Toolkit [40]. We fine-tune each model using the below hyperparameter settings with a task-specific layer on top of the model. As reported in [13] the training with the pre-trained transformer models shows instability, hence, we do 10 runs of each experiment using different random seeds and choose the model that performs the best on the development set. For training the transformer-based models for each task we fine-tune the model 10 epochs with the ‘categorical cross-entropy’ as the loss function and used the following hyper-parameter settings.

- Batch size: 8
- Learning rate (Adam): 2e-5
- Number of epochs: 10
- Max seq length: 128

Below we provide the detail of the number of parameters⁹ for each model, which demonstrates the size of the models.

- **BERT** (bert-base-uncased): This model is trained on lower-cased English text. It consists of 12-layer, 768-hidden, 12-heads, 110M parameters.

⁷<https://fasttext.cc/docs/en/crawl-vectors.html>

⁸<https://fasttext.cc/>

⁹https://huggingface.co/transformers/pretrained_models.html

- **DistilBERT** (distilbert-base-uncased): This is a distilled version of the BERT model consists of 6-layer, 768-hidden, 12-heads, 66M parameters.
- **RoBERTa** (roberta-large): RoBERTa using the BERT-large architecture consists of 24-layer, 1024-hidden, 16-heads, 355M parameters.
- **XML-RoBERTa** (xlm-roberta-large): It consists of ~ 355 M parameters with 24-layers, 1027-hidden-state, 4096 feed-forward hidden-state, and 16-heads.

VI. RESULTS

A. Task 1: Ternary classification (PNT)

Table IV provides the experimental results on task 1 in terms of weighted accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-Score. Overall better results are obtained with transformers compared to the classical and deep learning based methods. One of the main reasons for the better performance of the transformers is their text interpretation capabilities. Though no significant differences have been observed in the performances of the different transformers, a slight improvement is observed for RoBERTa over the rest of transformers.

To better analyze the performance of the proposed methods, we also provide class-wise performance. Overall reasonable results are obtained on all three classes, however, the performance of all the methods is higher on the *positive* class. One of the possible reasons for the comparatively lower performance on the other two classes is the lower inter-class variation. As detailed earlier, reviews in the *negative* and *technical issues* classes contain similar types of words, and there are higher chances of confusion in the classes. The experimental results of task 1 provide bases for task 2, where the *negative* and *technical issues* classes are merged.

B. Task 2: Binary classification (PN)

Table V provides experimental results on task 2, where the models have to differentiate between positive and *negative* reviews. As expected, the performance has been improved significantly on task 2, which proves our hypothesis that *negative* and *technical issues* classes have similarity in contents. Moreover, similar to task 1, transformers have outperformed the rest of the methods.

As can be seen in the table, in contrast to task 1, no significant differences can be observed in the performance of the methods on different classes, which indicates that reviews highlighting technical problems in the applications evoke negative emotions/sentiments. Moreover, no significant variation in the performance of the methods on a particular class has been observed.

C. Task 3: Ternary classification (PNN)

Table VI provides the experimental results on task 3, where the models have to differentiate among *positive*, *negative*, and *neutral* reviews. Similar to previous two tasks, transformers produced better results compared to the classical and deep learning based methods.

As can be seen in the table, better results are reported for all the methods on *positive* and *negative* classes. However, the performance of the proposed methods is significantly lower especially for the bag of words and ngram with the Naive Bayes classifier. One of the main reasons for the lower performance on *neutral* class is due to the fewer samples in the class as described in Section IV. We note that task 2 and task 3 are performed separately to analyze the impact of the fewer samples in the *neutral* class.

VII. DISCUSSION

Contact tracing of COVID-19 patients has been globally recognized as one of the most effective ways of controlling the infection rate. However, there are several limitations of the existing mechanisms. Manual contact tracing is a tedious and time-consuming process. Moreover, it is difficult to keep track of all potential contacts of a patient. Digital solutions, such as the use of mobile applications, has been considered as a promising solution where a patient's contacts can be traced and informed quickly. However, there are several concerns over the working mechanism and performance of the applications. This work has revealed different facets of the COVID-19 contact tracing applications, advantages, drawbacks, and users' concerns over these applications. We have summarized the main points hereafter.

- The idea/initiative of contact tracing via a mobile application is highly appreciated by people worldwide. Besides contact tracing, the applications are also proved useful in implementing and ensuring public policies on COVID-19. However, there are also some concerns over the working mechanism and the effectiveness of the applications.
- Analysis of users' reviews on these applications helps to better understand and rectify the concerns over the applications.
- Majority of the reviews lie in three categories, namely *positive*, *negative*, and *technical issue*. On the other hand, very few neutral reviews are observed.
- Privacy in terms of tracking via GPS and access to the gallery and other information by the applications have been the main concerns. Moreover, a vast majority of the users of these applications in different parts of the world are not with the high power consumption of the applications.
- Majority of the users also faced some technical problems while using the applications. Some key technical issues include device compatibility, registration, slow updates, connectivity issues, and lack of support of some languages e.g., English.
- The distribution of *negative*, *positive*, *neutral*, and *technical issues* may vary over time.
- Overall better performance has been observed for the AI models in sentiment analysis of users' reviews allowing an efficient analysis of users' response to the application more quickly.
- The transformers have been proved more effective among the models deployed for sentiment analysis in this work.

Method	Positive			Negative			Technical Issues			Overall (Weighted Average)			
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	Acc	P	R	F1
MNB	0.910	0.892	0.901	0.679	0.664	0.671	0.751	0.789	0.769	0.808	0.809	0.808	0.808
RF	0.854	0.923	0.887	0.809	0.538	0.646	0.729	0.833	0.777	0.805	0.806	0.805	0.797
SVM	0.946	0.867	0.905	0.660	0.707	0.683	0.745	0.803	0.773	0.810	0.820	0.810	0.814
fastText	0.930	0.904	0.917	0.713	0.691	0.702	0.752	0.806	0.778	0.825	0.827	0.825	0.825
DistilBERT	0.943	0.934	0.939	0.753	0.714	0.733	0.778	0.824	0.800	0.849	0.850	0.849	0.849
BERT	0.938	0.936	0.937	0.750	0.718	0.734	0.786	0.817	0.801	0.850	0.849	0.850	0.849
RoBERTa	0.943	0.946	0.945	0.754	0.716	0.734	0.788	0.817	0.802	0.854	0.853	0.854	0.853
XML-RoBERTa	0.941	0.946	0.943	0.744	0.705	0.724	0.783	0.811	0.797	0.849	0.848	0.849	0.848

TABLE IV: Experimental results on **Task 1: Ternary classification (PNT)**.

Method	Positive			Negative			Overall (Weighted Average)						
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	Acc	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
MNB	0.925	0.873	0.898	0.891	0.936	0.913	0.906	0.907	0.906	0.906	0.906	0.906	0.906
RF	0.902	0.879	0.891	0.894	0.914	0.904	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898	0.898
SVM	0.944	0.876	0.909	0.895	0.953	0.923	0.916	0.918	0.916	0.916	0.916	0.916	0.916
fastText	0.947	0.890	0.917	0.905	0.955	0.929	0.924	0.925	0.924	0.924	0.924	0.924	0.924
DistilBERT	0.947	0.932	0.939	0.939	0.953	0.946	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943
BERT	0.947	0.936	0.941	0.943	0.953	0.948	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945
RoBERTa	0.948	0.942	0.945	0.948	0.953	0.951	0.948	0.948	0.948	0.948	0.948	0.948	0.948
XML-RoBERTa	0.953	0.930	0.942	0.939	0.959	0.949	0.945	0.946	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945	0.945

TABLE V: Experimental results on **Task 2: Binary classification (PN)**.

Method	Positive			Negative			Neutral			Overall (Weighted Average)			
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	Acc	P	R	F1
MNB	0.902	0.873	0.888	0.854	0.935	0.892	0.379	0.027	0.050	0.874	0.859	0.874	0.860
RF	0.875	0.881	0.878	0.862	0.916	0.888	0.333	0.005	0.010	0.866	0.844	0.866	0.851
SVM	0.926	0.844	0.883	0.881	0.914	0.897	0.211	0.330	0.257	0.861	0.877	0.861	0.868
fastText	0.947	0.890	0.917	0.905	0.955	0.929	0.463	0.177	0.256	0.891	0.883	0.891	0.883
DistilBERT	0.932	0.918	0.925	0.913	0.934	0.923	0.364	0.312	0.336	0.904	0.901	0.904	0.902
BERT	0.933	0.927	0.930	0.913	0.940	0.926	0.387	0.261	0.312	0.909	0.903	0.909	0.905
RoBERTa	0.933	0.931	0.932	0.919	0.941	0.930	0.386	0.269	0.317	0.912	0.906	0.912	0.909
XML-RoBERTa	0.929	0.930	0.930	0.922	0.935	0.928	0.359	0.288	0.320	0.909	0.905	0.909	0.907

TABLE VI: Experimental results on **Task 3: Ternary classification (PNN)**.

- The experimental results indicate that reviews highlighting technical problems in the applications evoke negative emotions/sentiments.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we focused on the sentiment analysis of users' reviews on the COVID-19 contact tracing mobile applications and analyzed how users react to these applications. To this aim, a pipeline is composed of multiple phases, such as data collection, annotation via a crowd-sourcing activity, and development, training, and evaluation of AI models for the sentiment analysis. The existing literature mostly relies on the manual/exploratory analysis of users' reviews on the application, which is a tedious and time-consuming process. Moreover, in the existing studies, generally, data from fewer applications are analyzed. In this work, we showed how the automatic sentiment analysis can help in analyzing users' responses to the application more quickly. Moreover, we also provided a large-scale benchmark dataset composed of 34,534 reviews from 47 different applications. We believe the presented analysis and the dataset will support future research on the topic.

We believe, many interesting applications and analysis can be conducted keeping the dataset as a baseline. Temporal and topical analysis are the key aspects to be analyzed in the future.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adam J Kucharski, Petra Klepac, Andrew JK Conlan, Stephen M Kissler, Maria L Tang, Hannah Fry, Julia R Gog, W John Edmunds, Jon C Emery, Graham Medley, et al. Effectiveness of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(10):1151–1160, 2020.
- [2] Contact tracing apps promised big and didn't deliver. <https://tinyurl.com/y3a83l65>. Accessed: 2021-01-27.
- [3] Kaavya Rekanar, Jim Buckley, Sarah Buckley, Manzar Abbas, Sarah Beechum, Muslim Chochlov, Brian Fitzgerald, Liam Glynn, Kevin Johnson, John Laffey, et al. Sentiment analysis of user feedback on the HSE contact tracing app. 2020.
- [4] Pratik Sinha and Alastair E Paterson. Contact tracing: Can 'big tech' come to the rescue, and if so, at what cost? *EClinicalMedicine*, 24, 2020.
- [5] Robert Hinch, Will Probert, Anel Nurtay, Michelle Kendall, Chris Wymant, Matthew Hall, Katrina Lythgoe, Ana Bulas Cruz, Lele Zhao, Andrea Stewart, et al. Effective configurations of a digital contact tracing app: A report to NHSX. *Retrieved July*, 23:2020, 2020.
- [6] Muhammad Shahroz, Farooq Ahmad, Muhammad Shahzad Younis, Nadeem Ahmad, Maged N. Kamel Boulos, Ricardo Vinuesa, and Junaid Qadir. COVID-19 digital contact tracing applications and techniques: A review post initial deployments. *arXiv preprint*, 2021.

- [7] Johannes Abeler, Matthias Bäcker, Ulf Buermeyer, and Hannah Zillesen. COVID-19 contact tracing and data protection can go together. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8(4):e19359, 2020.
- [8] Alessandro De Carli, M Franco, A Gassmann, Christian Killer, Bruno Rodrigues, E Scheid, D Schoenbaechler, and Burkhard Stiller. Wetrace—a privacy-preserving mobile COVID-19 tracing approach and application. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08812*, 2020.
- [9] Samuel Altmann, Luke Milsom, Hannah Zillesen, Raffaele Blasone, Frederic Gerdon, Ruben Bach, Frauke Kreuter, Daniele Nosenzo, Séverine Toussaert, and Johannes Abeler. Acceptability of app-based contact tracing for COVID-19: Cross-country survey study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*, 8(8):e19857, 2020.
- [10] Vahid Garousi, David Cutting, and Michael Felderer. Mining user reviews of COVID contact-tracing apps: An exploratory analysis of nine European apps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13589*, 2020.
- [11] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.
- [12] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. In *Proc. of EACL*, pages 427–431. Association for Computational Linguistics, April 2017.
- [13] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [14] Siddique Latif, Muhammad Usman, Sanaullah Manzoor, Waleed Iqbal, Junaid Qadir, Gareth Tyson, Ignacio Castro, Adeel Razi, Maged N Kamel Boulos, Adrian Weller, et al. Leveraging data science to combat COVID-19: A comprehensive review. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [15] Erfaneh Gharavi, Neda Nazemi, and Faraz Dadgostari. Early outbreak detection for proactive crisis management using twitter data: COVID-19 a case study in the US. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00475*, 2020.
- [16] Adnan Qayyum, Kashif Ahmad, Muhammad Ahtazaz Ahsan, Ala Al-Fuqaha, and Junaid Qadir. Collaborative federated learning for health-care: Multi-modal COVID-19 diagnosis at the edge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.07511*, 2021.
- [17] Abdullah Hamid, Nasrullah Shiekh, Naina Said, Kashif Ahmad, Asma Gul, Laiq Hassan, and Ala Al-Fuqaha. Fake news detection in social media using graph neural networks and NLP Techniques: A COVID-19 use-case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.07517*, 2020.
- [18] Yejin Bang, Etsuko Ishii, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Ziwei Ji, and Pascale Fung. Model generalization on COVID-19 fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03841*, 2021.
- [19] R Ryan Lash, Catherine V Donovan, Aaron T Fleischauer, Zack S Moore, Gibbie Harris, Susan Hayes, Meg Sullivan, April Wilburn, Jonathan Ong, Dana Wright, et al. COVID-19 contact tracing in two counties—North Carolina, June–July 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 69(38):1360, 2020.
- [20] Elliot Mbunge. Integrating emerging technologies into COVID-19 contact tracing: Opportunities, challenges and pitfalls. *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*, 14(6):1631–1636, 2020.
- [21] Samuel Lalmuanawma, Jamal Hussain, and Lalrinfela Chhakchhuak. Applications of machine learning and artificial intelligence for COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic: A review. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, page 110059, 2020.
- [22] Nadeem Ahmed, Regio A Michelin, Wanli Xue, Sushmita Ruj, Robert Malaney, Salil S Kanhere, Aruna Seneviratne, Wen Hu, Helge Janicke, and Sanjay K Jha. A survey of COVID-19 contact tracing apps. *IEEE Access*, 8:134577–134601, 2020.
- [23] Yoshua Bengio, Daphne Ippolito, Richard Janda, Max Jarvie, Benjamin Prud’homme, Jean-François Rousseau, Abhinav Sharma, and Yun William Yu. Inherent privacy limitations of decentralized contact tracing apps. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 28(1):193–195, 2021.
- [24] Leonie Reichert, Samuel Brack, and Björn Scheuermann. Privacy-preserving contact tracing of COVID-19 patients. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2020:375, 2020.
- [25] Nigel P Smart and Nigel P Smart. *Cryptography made simple*. Springer, 2016.
- [26] Jinfeng Li and Xinyi Guo. COVID-19 contact-tracing apps: A survey on the global deployment and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03599*, 2020.
- [27] Hyunghoon Cho, Daphne Ippolito, and Yun William Yu. Contact tracing mobile apps for COVID-19: Privacy considerations and related trade-offs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.11511*, 2020.
- [28] Michael Edmund O’Callaghan, Jim Buckley, Brian Fitzgerald, Kevin Johnson, John Laffey, Bairbre McNicholas, Bashar Nuseibeh, Derek O’Keeffe, Ian O’Keeffe, Abdul Razzaq, et al. A national survey of attitudes to COVID-19 digital contact tracing in the Republic of Ireland. *Irish Journal of Medical Science (1971-)*, pages 1–25, 2020.
- [29] Michael D Conover, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Matthew Francisco, Bruno Gonçalves, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. Political polarization on twitter. In *Proc. of 5th ICWSM*, 2011.
- [30] Shammur Absar Chowdhury, Hamdy Mubarak, Ahmed Abdelali, Soonyo Jung, Bernard J Jansen, and Joni Salminen. A multi-platform Arabic news comment dataset for offensive language detection. In *Proc. of 12th LREC*, pages 6203–6212, 2020.
- [31] H. Zhang. The optimality of naive bayes. In *FLAIRS Conference*, 2004.
- [32] Marti A. Hearst, Susan T Dumais, Edgar Osuna, John Platt, and Bernhard Scholkopf. Support vector machines. *IEEE Intelligent Systems and their applications*, 13(4):18–28, 1998.
- [33] Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32, 2001.
- [34] Naina Said, Kashif Ahmad, Michael Riegler, Konstantin Pogorelov, Laiq Hassan, Nasir Ahmad, and Nicola Conci. Natural disasters detection in social media and satellite imagery: a survey. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 78(22):31267–31302, 2019.
- [35] Pedro Henrique Arruda Faustini and Thiago Ferreira Covões. Fake news detection in multiple platforms and languages. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 158:113503, 2020.
- [36] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.01759*, 2016.
- [37] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. RoBERTa: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *ArXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [38] Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale. *arXiv:1911.02116*, 2019.
- [39] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. DistilBERT, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019.
- [40] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, R’emi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.03771, 2019.