IEEE Intelligent Systems

PUTTING AI INTO PRACTICE

VOLUME 36, NUMBER 6 NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2021



Argumentation Systems

IEEE

75 YEARS IEEE COMPUTER SOCIETY

www.computer.org/intelligent

IEEE Intelligent Systems



NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2021

Feature Articles

Feature Articles Continued

Columns and Departments

Also in this Issue

Credit:
Image licensed by
Ingram Publishing

www.computer.org/intelligent

ISSN 1541-1672

IEEE Intelligent Systems

www.computer.org/intelligent

Editorial: : Unless otherwise stated, bylined articles, as well as product and service descriptions, reflect the author's or firm's opinion. Inclusion *in IEEE Intelligent Systems* does not necessarily constitute endorsement by IEEE or the IEEE Computer Society. All submissions are subject to editing for style, clarity, and length. IEEE prohibits discrimination, harassment, and bullying. For more information, visit www.ieee.org/web/aboutus/whatis/policies/ p9-26.html. **Circulation:** *IEEE Intelligent Systems* (ISSN 1541-1672 is published bimonthly by the IEEE Computer Society. IEEE Headquarters, Three Park Ave., 17th Floor, New York, NY 10016; IEEE Computer Society Publications Office, 10662 Los Vaqueros Cir., Los Alamitos, CA 90720, phone +1 714 821 8380; IEEE Computer Society Headquarters, 2001 L St., Ste. 700, Washington, D.C., 20036. Subscribe to *IEEE Intelligent Systems* by visiting www.computer.org/intelligent-sytems. Postmaster: Send undelivered copies and address changes to *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 445 Hoes Ln., Piscataway, NJ 08855. Periodicals postage paid at New York, NY, and at additional mailing offices. Canadian GST #125634188. Canada Post Corporation (Canadian distribution) publications mail agreement number 40013885. Return undeliverable Canadian addresses to PO Box 122, Niagara Falls, ON L2E 6S8 Canada. Printed in the USA.

IEEE Intelligent Systems

COUNTRY

United States

Universities and research institutions in United States

Media Ranking in United States

SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY

Computer Science
Artificial Intelligence
Computer Networks and Communications

PUBLISHER

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc.

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, USA in Scimago Institutions Rankings

SJR 2024

1.326 Q1

H-INDEX

145

PUBLICATION TYPE

Journals

ISSN

15411672

COVERAGE

2001-2025

INFORMATION

Homepage

How to publish in this journal

vs@dartmouth.edu

SCOPE

IEEE Intelligent Systems serves users, managers, developers, researchers, and purchasers who are interested in intelligent systems and artificial intelligence, with particular emphasis on applications. Typically they are degreed professionals, with backgrounds in engineering, hard science, or business. The publication emphasizes current practice and experience, together with promising new ideas that are likely to be used in the near future. Sample topic areas for feature articles include knowledge-based systems, intelligent software agents, natural-language processing, technologies for knowledge management, machine learning, data mining, adaptive and intelligent robotics, knowledge-intensive processing on the Web, and social issues relevant to intelligent systems. Also encouraged are application features, covering practice at one or more companies or laboratories; full-length product stories (which require refereeing by at least three reviewers); tutorials; surveys; and case studies. Often issues are theme-based and collect articles around a contemporary topic under the auspices of a Guest Editor working with the EIC.

Quartiles

FIND SIMILAR JOURNALS

1	2	3	4	5
ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and USA 57% similarity	Jisuanji Xuebao/Chinese Journal of Computers CHN 51% similarity	Journal of Frontiers of Computer Science and CHN 50% similarity	Knowledge and Information Systems GBR 49% similarity	ACM C USA





























← Show this widget in your own website

Just copy the code below and paste within your html code:

<a href="https://www.scimag

Source details

IEEE Intelligent Systems

Formerly known as: IEEE Intelligent Systems and Their Applications

Years currently covered by Scopus: from 2001 to 2025

Publisher: IEEE

ISSN: 1541-1672

Subject area: Computer Science: Computer Networks and Communications | Computer Science: Artificial Intelligence

Source type: Journal

CiteScore 2024
13.6

SJR 2024
1.326

SNIP 2024
2.009

View all documents > | Set document alert | Save to source list

CiteScore | CiteScore rank & trend | Scopus content coverage

CiteScore 2024

13.6 = 3,278 Citations 2021 - 2024 / 241 Documents 2021 - 2024

Calculated on 05 May, 2025

CiteScoreTracker 2025

10.7 = 2,189 Citations to date / 205 Documents to date

Last updated on 05 October, 2025 • Updated monthly

CiteScore rank 2024

Category	Rank	Percentile
Computer Science — Computer Networks and Communications	#27/507	94th
Computer Science — Artificial Intelligence	#46/450	89th

View CiteScore methodology > | CiteScore FAQ > | Add CiteScore to your site

EDITOR: Erik Cambria, Nanyang Technological University, 639798, Singapore

DEPARTMENT: AFFECTIVE COMPUTING AND SENTIMENT ANALYSIS

Combining Sentiment Lexicons and Content-Based Features for Depression Detection

Raymond Chiong, Gregorious Satia Budhi, and Sandeep Dhakal, *The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW, 2308, Australia*

Numerous studies on mental depression have found that tweets posted by users with major depressive disorder could be utilized for depression detection. The potential of sentiment analysis for detecting depression through an analysis of social media messages has brought increasing attention to this field. In this article, we propose 90 unique features as input to a machine learning classifier framework for detecting depression using social media texts. Derived from a combination of feature extraction approaches using sentiment lexicons and textual contents, these features are able to provide impressive results in terms of depression detection. While the performance of different feature groups varied, the combination of all features resulted in accuracies greater than 96% for all standard single classifiers, and the best accuracy of over 98% with Gradient Boosting, an ensemble classifier.

There is a general agreement in the relevant literature that social media platforms, by allowing people to express their feelings or share their ideas and thoughts more freely, have become a vital source for monitoring health issues and trends.[1,2] Posts on platforms, such as Twitter and Facebook, enable researchers to investigate multiple patterns of human behavior and their psychology.[3]

Several studies on mental depression—a medical illness with symptoms such as persistent sadness, loss of interest, and an inability to carry out normal activities[4]—have found that tweets posted by users with major depressive disorder could be utilized to predict the possibility of future episodes of depression in those users.[5–9] Sentiment analysis, which is an automatic and systematic process of detecting the sentiment or emotional tone of a given text, has been identified by various studies as a potential mechanism for detecting signs of depressive disorder.[10–12] Sentiment analysis has previously been successfully applied to predict the sentiment or emotional tone behind social media messages, online reviews or any other types of text messages.[13–16] In addition to the detection algorithm applied, the performance of sentiment analysis is also significantly influenced by the features selected.[17–19]

Therefore, in this study, we propose 90 unique features, through a combination of feature extraction using sentiment lexicons and content-based features from the social media messages themselves. Two sentiment lexicons, namely SentiWordNet[20] and SenticNet,[21] are used for feature extraction. Similarly, the content-based features utilized for depression detection are formulated from the characteristics of the Twitter message content (e.g., the number of words, sentences, questions, exclamations), part-of-speech (POS) tags, linguistic traits, and readability scores. The combined features are then used as input for several machine learning models trained using publicly labeled depression/nondepression datasets comprising of tweets.[6] Results of our extensive experiments confirm the effectiveness of these features for depression detection.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. The following two sections discuss the datasets used and the design of the input features; next, we provide details about our framework and the measurements used; then, experimental results and discussions are presented; finally, we conclude the article and highlight future research directions.

1541-1672 © 2021 IEEE
Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/MIS.2021.3093660
Date of current version 17 December 2021.

TABLE 1. Datasets used in this study.

Dataset	Records		
	Total	Depression	Nondepression
Shen *et al.*	11,877	54.67%	45.33%
Eye	10,314	22.44%	77.56%

Both are labeled and comprised of Twitter posts.

DATASETS

Two depression datasets, comprising of Twitter posts that have been labeled as either "Depression" or "Nondepression," were used for all the experiments in this study (see Table 1). These datasets were used to train and test the proposed featuring approach for several machine learning models using tenfold cross-validation. The first dataset, by Shen *et al.*,[6] was constructed with the restriction that a record would be labeled as "Depression" only if its anchor tweets satisfied the strict pattern "(I'm/I was/I am/I've been) diagnosed with depression"; the record would be labeled as "Nondepression" if the user had never posted any tweet containing the character string "depress." Eye's dataset,[a] on the other hand, is less restrictive and was built by seeking the word "depression" in the tweets. Any tweet containing the word "depression" was labeled as "Depression," and "Nondepression" otherwise. Eye's dataset is highly imbalanced; depression class records account for only 22% of the total records.

DESIGN OF INPUT FEATURES

The input features in this study have been defined based on two sentiment lexicons: SentiWordNet[20] and SenticNet.[21] These input features are categorized into three groups, namely Groups A, B, and C (see Table 2). Group A consists of nine features created using SentiWordNet, whereas Group B consists of the same features extracted using SenticNet. Group C includes four features that were directly extracted using some sentiment values in SenticNet and represent the total introspection, temper, attitude, and sensitivity values of the terms in the text. The features from SenticNet have been split into Groups B and C to facilitate a fairer comparison of the effectiveness of the two lexicons for depression detection. Since SenticNet has four additional features, the initial comparison is first conducted using Groups A and B (same nine features), following which the effect of the additional features in SenticNet (Group C) is investigated.

To improve detection, another 68 features have been defined based on our previous study[22] (see Table 2). These features were extracted based on the characteristics of the tweets and are categorized into four groups (D, E, F, and G) as follows. The features in Group D are related to basic information that can be extracted from the text; Group E consists of 36 POS tags based on Penn POS;[23] Group F captures the linguistic traits of the text; and Group G is related to the readability of the text. Groups D–F were extracted using the Natural Language Toolkit[24] and additional custom functions and formulas written in Python, whereas the features in Group G, representing the readability scores, were extracted using functions from the TextStat project.[b]

FRAMEWORK

Our framework, as depicted in Figure 1, is straightforward. Once the dataset(s) and settings have been loaded, the input features are extracted based on the group settings. All input features are subsequently normalized to a scale of 0 to 1 using min–max normalization. Since all attributes have differing ranges, normalization ensures that all features have equal contribution toward the detection. Following the creation of training targets, the *n*-fold cross-validation process is run according to the assigned classifiers. Finally, the best classifier for detecting depression is determined, and all information and the detailed results are written to a file.

In this study, we implemented and tested four standard single classifiers—Logistic Regression (LR), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Decision Tree (DT), and Multilayer Perceptron (MLP)—and four ensemble models—Bagging Predictors (BP), Random Forest (RF), Adaptive Boosting (AB), and Gradient Boosting (GB)—for detecting depression from Twitter posts. These classifiers are often used in text analysis and have produced excellent performance in previous studies on textual-based sentiment analysis[19] and malicious web domain identification.[25]

The performance of the featuring approach with the above classifiers was assessed using four common measurements for prediction or classification (see Table 3): accuracy, precision, recall, and F-measure (also known as F1 score). All machine learning classifiers, ensemble models, and measurements were built using scikit-learn components.[26] Default parameters were used for all classification models to ensure that the results can only be affected by the implementation of our approach and not by the modification of classifier parameters.

[a]http://kaggle.com/bababullseye/depression-analysis

[b]http://pypi.org/project/textstat

TABLE 2. Features.

Group	No.	Description
Sentiment lexicon features		
A: Sentiment lexicon features based on SentiWordNet	1	Total of sentiment items
	2-4	Total of (positive, neutral, negative) sentiment terms
	5, 6	The ratio of (positive, negative) sentiment to neutral terms
	7	The ratio of negative to positive sentiment terms
	8, 9	(Positive, negative) sentiment scores
B: Sentiment lexicon features based on SenticNet	10	Total of sentiment terms
	11-13	Total of (positive, neutral, negative) sentiment terms
	14, 15	The ratio of (positive, negative) sentiment to neutral terms
	16	The ratio of negative to positive sentiment terms
	17, 18	(Positive, negative) sentiment scores
C: Additional lexicon features based on SenticNet	19	Total introspection value
	20	Total temper value
	21	Total attitude value
	22	Total sensitivity value
Content-based features		
D: Basic text information	23-26	Total (letters, words, stop words, sentences) in the text
	27	Total words with capitalized 1st letter
	28	Total negative terms (e.g., 'does not', 'do not', 'will not', etc.)
	29	Total elongated words (e.g., 'yesss', 'fiiine', 'yoouu', etc.)
	30, 31	Total exclamation and question sentences
	32	The existence of weblink inside the text
E: POS	33-68	Total existence of 36 Tags of Penn POS
F: Linguistic characteristics	69	The ratio of adjectives and adverbs
	70	Average of number of words per sentence
	71	The ratio of word repetition to total words
	72	The average number of letters per word
	73	Average of words with 1st capital to total sentences
	74	The ratio of words with 1st capital to total words
	75-77	Total of (1st, 2nd, 3rd) person pronouns
	78-80	The ratio of (1st, 2nd, 3rd) person pronouns to total pronouns
G: Readability scores	81-87	Flesch Reading Ease, Simple Measure of Gobbledygook Index, Flesch Kincaid Grade, Coleman-Liau Index, Gunning Fog Index, DaleChall Readability and Linsear Write Formula.
	88	Automated Readability Index
	89	Difficult words
	90	Estimation of school grade level required to understand the text.

EFFECTS OF SENTIMENT LEXICON FEATURES

In this section, we present the results of our investigation into the effects of sentiment lexicon feature groups on prediction performance. The tenfold cross-validation experiments were run on the LR classifier, which was identified as one of the best classifiers in previous experiments,[19] using the two datasets described above (see Table 1).

The results in Table 4 clearly indicate that, when similar sentiment features were compared (Group A versus Group B), the features extracted using SenticNet (Group B) outperformed the features extracted using SentiWordNet (Group A) for both the datasets. Thus, we can conclude that the sentiment terms in SenticNet and their sentiment scores are more suitable for depression detection in Twitter texts.

The performance of Group C, which consists of additional features that could only be provided by SenticNet, was also satisfactory. The accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 scores for Group C were above 50% for Shen *et al.*'s dataset. In the case of Eye's dataset, the accuracy was even better (>81%), but the recall and F1 scores were much worse. These results indicate that the features in Group C are not suitable for detecting the target class, i.e., the depression class (in binary classification, recall and the accuracy of the target class are the same). It should be noted, however, that the results from combining Group C with other groups were marginally better than without Group C.

Between the two datasets, the results show that the accuracy was always higher for Eye's dataset compared to Shen *et al.*'s dataset. However, the recall and



FIGURE 1. Design of the proposed framework used for detecting depression in this study.

F1 scores were always lower for Eye's dataset. This implies that the classifier trained using Eye's samples found it difficult to detect the target class (i.e., depression class) than the other class, and we suspect that this is due to the imbalanced nature of Eye's dataset (see Table 1). This problem could be easily solved by applying sampling methods[25,27] to the dataset, but in this study, we attempt to overcome the problem by implementing ensemble models [see Figure 3(b)].

ADDITIONAL FEATURES BASED ON THE CONTENT-BASED APPROACH

The above results demonstrated that sentiment lexicon features can perform well in terms of detecting depression from Twitter posts. Next, we explore whether content-based features (Groups D, E, F, and G) could further improve performance. As above, we conducted experiments on the LR classifier but, based on the above results, used only Shen *et al.*'s dataset to train it. The results in Table 5 show that each content-based group improved the detection measurements when combined with sentiment lexicon features. Group E (POS) provided the best improvement, followed by Group G (readability scores), Group D (basic text information), and Group F (linguistic characteristics). However, the overall best improvement was achieved when all sentiment lexicon and content-based features were used at the same time; all measurements were higher than 95%. It is also worth mentioning that the F1 scores obtained with our approach are better than the baseline results (85%) in Shen *et al.* [6]

IDENTIFYING THE BEST CLASSIFIER

The following set of experiments was conducted with the best feature setting from the above experiments (Groups A to G) on all single classifiers (LR, MLP, SVM,

TABLE 3. Measurement functions and formulas.

Name	Function	Formula
Accuracy	accuracy_score ()	$Accuracy(y, \hat{y}) = \frac{1}{n_{samples}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_{samples}-1} 1(\hat{y}_i = y_i)$, where y is the set of predicted pairs, $\hat{y}$ is the set of true pairs, and $n_{samples}$ is the total number of samples.
Precision	precision_score ()	$Precision(y_i, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$, where i is the set of classes, y_i is the subset of y with class i, TP is true positive, and FP is false positive.
Recall	recall_score()	$Recall(y_i, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$, where FN is false negative.
F-measure/ F1	f1_score()	$F1(y_i, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{2 \times Precision(y_i, \hat{y}_i) \times Recall(y_i, \hat{y}_i)}{Precision(y_i, \hat{y}_i) + Recall(y_i, \hat{y}_i)}$.

TABLE 4. Effects of sentiment lexicon features on depression detection.

Sentiment lexicon group(s)	Dataset	Measurements (%) *				Class accuracy(%) *	
		Acc	Pre	Rec	F1	Dep	Non-Dep
A	Eye's	82.33	74.04	32.76	45.36	32.76	96.68
	Shen et al.'s	76.50	78.79	78.07	78.41	78.07	74.61
B	Eye's	88.51	82.74	61.59	70.57	61.59	96.28
	Shen et al.'s	80.34	83.80	79.37	81.52	79.37	81.49
C	Eye's	81.30	84.98	20.32	32.70	20.32	98.94
	Shen et al.'s	63.80	64.42	75.50	69.50	75.50	49.71
B, C	Eye's	89.03	83.67	63.49	72.16	63.49	96.42
	Shen et al.'s	84.20	85.76	85.28	85.51	85.28	82.91
A, B, C	Eye's	89.58	84.09	66.11	73.96	66.11	96.38
	Shen et al.'s	84.91	85.75	86.82	86.27	86.82	82.61

*: Acc = Accuracy; Pre = Precision; Rec = Recall; F1 = F-measure; Dep = Depression; Non-Dep = Nondepression.

and DT) and both datasets to further investigate the performance of the best feature setting. We can see in Figure 2(a) and (b) that the features performed better with other single classifiers than LR. The MLP was the best single classifier for Shen *et al.*'s dataset, whereas the DT was the best for Eye's dataset.

It is important to note that both the MLP and DT performed significantly better than other classifiers in terms of recall; their recall scores were at least 90% for Eye's dataset. Similar experiments were also conducted with the ensemble models (AB, BP, GB, and RF) for both datasets, and the results can be seen in Figure 3(a) and (b). The results show that all ensemble models performed well on both datasets and GB achieved the highest measurements for both datasets, with an accuracy of more than 98%. The results in Figure 3(b) also show that all ensemble models provided recall values of around 95% despite Eye's dataset being heavily imbalanced, thus, obviating the need for any further action to overcome the class imbalance issue.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this study, we proposed 90 different features that can be used by machine learning classifiers for

TABLE 5. Effects of content-based features on depression detection when trained using Shen *et al.*'s dataset.

Sentiment lexicon group(s)	Content-based group(s)	Measurements (%) *				Class accuracy (%) *	
		Acc	Pre	Rec	F1	Dep	Non-Dep
A, B, C	D	88.73	89.21	90.31	89.75	90.31	86.82
A, B, C	E	94.62	94.51	95.72	95.11	95.72	93.31
A, B, C	F	86.63	87.29	88.40	87.84	88.40	84.48
A, B, C	G	91.30	90.58	93.85	92.18	93.85	88.23
A, B, C	D, E	95.21	95.10	96.19	95.64	96.19	94.02
A, B, C	D, F	88.99	89.55	90.42	89.97	90.42	87.27
A, B, C	D, G	92.62	92.31	94.37	93.32	94.37	90.51
A, B, C	D, E, F	95.32	95.19	96.30	95.74	96.30	94.14
A, B, C	D, E, G	96.34	96.37	96.95	96.66	96.95	95.59
A, B, C	D, F, G	92.71	92.50	94.32	93.40	94.32	90.77
A, B, C	D, E, F, G	96.50	96.48	97.14	96.81	97.14	95.73

*: Acc = Accuracy; Pre = Precision; Rec = Recall; F1 = F-measure; Dep = Depression; Non-Dep = Nondepression.



FIGURE 2. Results for feature groups A-G on four single classifiers trained using two different datasets.



FIGURE 3. Results for feature groups A-G on ensemble models trained using two different datasets.

detecting depression by analyzing the social media messages of users. These features were extracted using the combination of sentiment lexicons and content-based approaches. While our experiments were conducted using datasets comprising of Twitter posts, these features can be used for any textual content. Through extensive experiments, involving two datasets of Twitter posts, four single classifiers, and four ensemble models, we were able to verify the effectiveness of these features.

The best results were obtained when all the proposed features were utilized together for depression detection; however, the effectiveness of different feature groups greatly varied. In particular, the content-based features were able to improve the accuracy to $>96\%$ for both datasets. Whereas all single classifiers and ensemble models provided excellent results, the GB ensemble was able to provide accuracies $>98\%$ for both datasets. Our analysis also revealed that the ensemble models were able to overcome the data imbalance issue, which the single classifiers were unable to do.

As future work, we plan to investigate a novel idea about the combination of multiple classifiers for improving accuracy. We will also investigate the possibility of using sentiment analysis datasets, which can be easily constructed in larger sizes, for depression detection in social media texts.

REFERENCES

1. O. Edo-Osagie *et al.* "A scoping review of the use of twitter for public health research," *Comput. Biol. Med.*, vol. 122, 2020, Art no. 103770.
2. S. Ji, S. Pan, X. Li, E. Cambria, G. Long, and Z. Huang, "Suicidal ideation detection: A review of machine learning methods and applications," *IEEE Trans. Comput. Social Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 214–226, Feb. 2021.
3. J. Hussain *et al.* "Exploring the dominant features of social media for depression detection," *J. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 739–759, 2019.
4. S. A. Qureshi, S. Saha, M. Hasanuzzaman, and G. Dias, "Multitask representation learning for multimodal estimation of depression level," *IEEE Intell. Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 45–52, Sep./Oct. 2019.
5. M. D. Choudhury *et al.* "Predicting depression via social media," in *Proc. 7th Int. AAAI Conf. Weblogs Social Media*, 2013, pp. 128–137.

6. G. Shen *et al.* "Depression detection via harvesting social media: A multimodal dictionary learning solution," in *Proc. 26th Int. Joint Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2017, pp. 3838–3844.
7. H. S. Alsagri and M. Ykhlef, "Machine learning-based approach for depression detection in twitter using content and activity features," *IEICE Trans. Inf. Syst.*, vol. E103.D, no. 8, pp. 1825–1832, 2020.
8. S. Ji *et al.* "Suicidal ideation and mental disorder detection with attentive relation networks," *Neural Comput. Appl.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s00521-021-06208-y.
9. R. Chiong *et al.* "A textual-based featuring approach for depression detection using machine learning classifiers and social media texts," *Comput. Biol. Med.*, vol. 135, 2021, Art. no. 104499.
10. A. U. Hassan *et al.* "Sentiment analysis of social networking sites (SNS) data using machine learning approach for the measurement of depression," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Inf. Commun. Technol. Convergence*, 2017, pp. 138–140.
11. M. R. Islam *et al.* "Depression detection from social network data using machine learning techniques," *Health Inf. Sci. Syst.*, vol. 6, 2018, Art. no. 8.
12. Y. Chen *et al.* "Sentiment analysis based on deep learning and its application in screening for perinatal depression," in *Proc. IEEE 3rd Int. Conf. Data Sci. Cyberspace*, 2018, pp. 451–456.
13. S. L. Lo *et al.* "A multilingual semi-supervised approach in deriving singlish sentic patterns for polarity detection," *Knowl.-Based Syst.*, vol. 105, pp. 236–247, 2016.
14. L. Yang *et al.* "Sentiment analysis for e-commerce product reviews in Chinese based on sentiment lexicon and deep learning," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 23522–23530, 2020.
15. Y. Susanto *et al.* "Ten years of sentic computing," *Cogn. Comput.*, vol. 13, pp. 1–19, 2021.
16. F. Xing, F. Pallucchini, and E. Cambria, "Cognitive-inspired domain adaptation of sentiment lexicons," *Inf. Process. Manage.*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 554–564, 2019.
17. A. Yousefpour, R. Ibrahim, and H. N. A. Hamed, "Ordinal-based and frequency-based integration of feature selection methods for sentiment analysis," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 75, pp. 80–93, 2017.
18. P. Bansal and R. Kaur, "Twitter sentiment analysis using machine learning and optimization techniques," *Int. J. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 179, no. 19, pp. 5–8, 2018.
19. G. S. Budhi *et al.* "Using machine learning to predict the sentiment of online reviews: A new framework for comparative analysis," *Arch. Comput. Methods Eng.*, vol. 28, pp. 2543–2566, 2021.
20. S. Baccianella, A. Esuli, and F. Sebastian, "SentiWordNet 3.0: An enhanced lexical resource for sentiment analysis and opinion mining," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Lang. Resour. Eval.*, vol. 10, 2010, pp. 2200–2204.
21. E. Cambria *et al.* "SenticNet 6: Ensemble application of symbolic and subsymbolic AI for sentiment analysis," in *Proc. 29th ACM Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Manage.*, 2020, pp. 105–114.
22. G. S. Budhi *et al.* "Using a hybrid content-based and behaviour-based featuring approach in a parallel environment to detect fake reviews," *Electron. Commerce Res. Appl.*, vol. 47, 2021, Art no. 101048.
23. S. Buchholz, "Memory-based grammatical relation finding," Thesis, Eigen Beheer, Tilburg, 2002.
24. S. Bird, E. Klein, and E. Loper, *Natural Language Processing With Python*. Newton, MA, USA: O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2009.
25. Z. Hu *et al.* "Malicious web domain identification using online credibility and performance data by considering the class imbalance issue," *Ind. Manage. Data Syst.*, vol. 119, no. 3, pp. 676–696, 2019.
26. F. Pedregosa *et al.* "Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 85, pp. 2825–2830, 2011.
27. G. S. Budhi, R. Chiong, and Z. Wang, "Resampling imbalanced data to detect fake reviews using machine learning classifiers and textual-based features," *Multimedia Tools Appl.*, vol. 80, no. 9, pp. 13079–13097, 2021.

RAYMOND CHIONG is an associate professor at the School of Electrical Engineering and Computing, The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia. His research interests include machine learning, data analytics, evolutionary optimization, and evolutionary game theory. He is the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, an Editor of *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, and an associate editor of *Engineering Reports*. He is the corresponding author. Contact him at Raymond.Chiong@newcastle.edu.au.

GREGORIOUS SATIA BUDHI is working toward the PhD degree at the School of Electrical Engineering and Computing, The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia. He is also an academic staff member with Petra Christian University in Indonesia. His research interests include sentiment analysis, machine learning, and data/text mining. Contact him at Gregorious.Satiabudhi@uon.edu.au.

SANDEEP DHAKAL is working toward the PhD degree at the School of Electrical Engineering and Computing, The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia. His research interests include modeling of complex adaptive systems, evolutionary game theory, and sentiment analysis. Contact him at Sandeep.Dhakal@newcastle.edu.au.