

Exactus Like: Plagiarism detection in scientific texts

Ilya Sochenkov^{1,2}, Denis Zubarev², Ilya Tikhomirov², Ivan Smirnov²,
Artem Shelmanov², Roman Suvorov², and Gennady Osipov²

¹ Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Moscow, Russia

² Federal Research Center "Computer Science and Control" of
Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

{sochenkov, zubarev, tih, ivs, shelmanov, suvorov, gos}@isa.ru

Abstract. The paper presents an overview of Exactus Like – a plagiarism detection system. Deep parsing for text alignment helps the system to find moderate forms of disguised plagiarism. The features of the system and its advantages are discussed. We describe the architecture of the system and present its performance.

1 Introduction

Plagiarism is a serious problem in education and science. Improper citations, textual borrowings, and plagiarism often occur in student and research papers. Academics, peer reviewers, and editors of scientific journals should detect plagiarism in all forms and prevent substandard works from being published [1].

Numerous computer-assisted plagiarism detection systems (CaPD) were recently developed: Turnitin, Antiplagiat.ru, The Plagiarism Checker, PlagScan, Chimpsky, Copyscape, PlagTracker, Plagiarisma.ru. The difference between these systems lies in search engines used to find similar textual fragments, ranking schemas, and result presentations. Most of the aforementioned systems implement simple techniques to detect copy-and-paste borrowings based on exact textual matching or w-shingling algorithms [2, 3]. Such an approach shows good computational performance, but it cannot find heavily disguised plagiarism [4].

In this demonstration we present Exactus Like¹ – an applied plagiarism detection system, which finds besides simple copy-and-paste plagiarism also moderately disguised borrowings (word/phrase reordering, substitution of some words with synonyms). To do this, the system leverages deep parsing techniques.

2 System User Interface and Features

Exactus Like is a web application. The start page contains fields to input a suspicious text or upload a file. Most of the popular file formats are supported: Adobe PDF, Microsoft Word, RTF, ODT, HTML, etc. One can specify the year

¹ The demo is available online at <http://like.exactus.ru/index.php/en/>

2 Authors Suppressed Due to Excessive Length




Fig. 1. Visualization of plagiarism detection results

[Go to previous fragment](#) [Go to next fragment](#)




Fig. 2. Found reused fragments in the checked document and their sources

of the publishing to distinguish the sources of borrowings from the documents that reuse fragments from the checked document. The fragment of the user interface with plagiarism detection results is presented in Fig. 1.

The diagram shows the percentage of original fragments, the percentage of potentially incorrectly borrowed fragments, and the percentage of the fragments that are found in documents from the bibliography of the checked text. One can compare fragments from the checked and source documents one by one or use a convenient tool shown in Fig. 2 for visualization of the non-original content in the uploaded document. This tool presents the checked document divided into pages with highlighted sentences that might be reused from the found documents.

Exactus Like extracts bibliographic references from the uploaded document and matches them with titles and authors of found source documents. Successfully matched documents have a mark in the “In references” field. The fragments from these documents are considered not to be incorrectly reused fragments. The system detects well-known fragments (that are shared by at least 10 documents). They are also presented on the results page.

Currently Exactus Like indexes about 3 million documents in Russian (PhD theses, student essays, etc.) and 5.5 million documents in English (ArXiv, ACL, the dump of Wikipedia from June 2015). The size of the index database is about 300 Gb. Users are not restricted to the collections provided by the system, one can search in the whole web. This functionality becomes available only after searching the collections. Only limited amount of sentences (200), for which nothing was found in the collections, are sent to the Yandex search engine.

3 Architecture and implemented approach

The architecture of Exactus Like comprises the following main subsystems: a) crawling subsystem; b) linguistic analysis subsystem; c) index database subsystem; d) search subsystem e) web user interface.

The crawling subsystem downloads documents and extracts texts and the corresponding metadata from documents and side web-pages (i.e. sitemaps) using XPath rules and regular expressions. The linguistic analysis subsystem performs deep parsing of texts, which includes posttagging, syntactic parsing, semantic role labeling, and semantic relation extraction [5]. The index database subsystem contains a set of incrementally updatable indexes, which provide an effective data access for the search subsystem.

The search subsystem implements the following approach. First, we use the inverted spectral index for searching for documents on the topic of the suspicious document. This index stores a mapping from single words and two-word noun phrases to their TF-IDF weights [6] (as the modification of the inverted index described in [7]). IDF weights are calculated based on word and phrase frequencies in the all collections. The 600 most similar documents are retrieved on this stage. We will refer to them as candidates. The following operations are performed only on the candidates. Second, we choose sentences from the suspicious document. For the text alignment, we select top 2000 weighted sentences using various kinds of filters: a TF-IDF weight threshold, a length of a sentence, a complexity of a syntactic structure, etc. Third, we intersect each selected sentence from the suspicious document with all other sentences from the candidates. We use fast set intersection algorithm [8] to exclude irrelevant sentences with unmatched lexis. Pairs of sentences that share at least 50% of words are passed to the next stage. Fourth, the calculation of a sentence similarity is performed on the basis of the similarity evaluation of the two graphs that present the syntax and semantic structures of the sentences [9].

For search on the whole web, we use the approach that was evaluated at PAN CLEF 2014 and scored at the level of the top-rated systems [9].

Internally Exactus Like is a distributed system currently running on 4 servers (quad-core CPU, 16 Gb RAM, HDD RAID). The mean processing time for a document (250 selected sentences on average) under the stress testing with 20 active parallel checks is about 20 seconds (47% – linguistic analysis, 48% – search, 5% – other operations).

4 Conclusion

The demo of Exactus Like is available online at <http://like.exactus.ru/index.php/en/>. We are working on computational performance of our linguistic tools to provide a faster detection. Our current research is focused on the detection of heavily disguised plagiarism.

Acknowledgments. The reported study was partially funded by RFBR, according to the research projects No. 14-07-31149 mol_a and 16-37-60048 mol_a_dk.

References

1. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Sochenkov, I., Shelmanov, A., Shvets, A.: Information retrieval for R&D support. In: Professional Search in the Modern World. Springer (2014) 45–69
2. Stein, B.: Fuzzy-fingerprints for text-based information retrieval. In: Proceedings of the 5th international conference on knowledge management. (2005) 572–579
3. Brin, S., Davis, J., Garcia-Molina, H.: Copy detection mechanisms for digital documents. In: Proceedings of the 1995 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data. Volume 24. (1995) 398–409
4. Hagen, M., Potthast, M., Stein, B.: Source retrieval for plagiarism detection from large web corpora: recent approaches. Working Notes of CLEF 2015 – Conference and Labs of the Evaluation forum (2015)
5. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Shelmanov, A.: Relational-situational method for intelligent search and analysis of scientific publications. In: Proceedings of the Workshop on Integrating IR technologies for Professional Search, in conjunction with the 35th European Conference on Information Retrieval. Volume 968. (2013) 57–64
6. Shvets, A., Devyatkin, D., Sochenkov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Popov, K., Yarygin, K.: Detection of current research directions based on full-text clustering. In: Proceedings of Science and Information Conference, IEEE (2015) 483–488
7. Elsayed, T., Lin, J., Oard, D.W.: Pairwise document similarity in large collections with mapreduce. In: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Human Language Technologies: Short Papers. (2008) 265–268
8. Takuma, D., Yanagisawa, H.: Faster upper bounding of intersection sizes. In: Proceedings of the 36th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval. (2013) 703–712
9. Zubarev, D., Sochenkov, I.: Using sentence similarity measure for plagiarism source retrieval. In: Working Notes for CLEF 2014 Conference. (2014) 1027–1034