Writing Style

5th percentile — **Writing Style** = -1.17

```
...       & \multicolumn{5}{c!{\vrule width \heav
yrulewidth}}{\textbf{DementiaBank Pitt}}
& \multicolumn{3}{c!{\vrule width \heavyrulewidth}
}{\textbf{JCCOCC MoCA}} & \multicolumn{4}{c}{\text
bf{TORGO}}
\\  ⏎ \cline{7-18} ⏎
&                             &
&                             &
&                        & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{Dev
}                      & \multicolumn{2}{c|}{Eval
}     & \multirow{2}{*}{Overall} & \multirow{2}{*}
{Dev}  & \multirow{2}{*}{Eval} & \multirow{2}{*}{O
verall}   & \multirow{2}{*}{Seve.} & \multirow{2}{
*}{Mod.} & \multirow{2}{*}{Mild} & \multirow{2}{*}
{Overall}  \\  ⏎ \cline{7-10} ⏎
&                             &
&                             &
&                        & PAR.
& INV.                   & PAR.
& INV.  &                           &
&                        &
```

30th percentile — **Writing Style** = -0.24

```
... _1)^2\}\\ ⏎ &=\frac{1}{b_{n+1}}\exp\{-\frac{1}
{2\sigma_{22\cdot 1}}\left(\log b_{n+1}-(\mu_{n+1}
+\boldsymbol{r}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}_{n\times
n}(\log\boldsymbol{b}^{n}-\boldsymbol{\mu}^{n}))\r
ight)^2\}. ⏎ \end{align*} ⏎ Therefore, according t
o the probability density function of a log-normal
distribution, we have $b_{n+1}|\boldsymbol{b}^n \s
im \mathcal{LN}(\mu^*,v^*)$, where $\mu^*=\mu_{n+1
}+\boldsymbol{r}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}_{n\times
n}(\log\boldsymbol{b}^n-\boldsymbol{\mu}^{n})$ ⏎
and  ⏎ $v^*=\sigma_{22\cdot 1}=\sigma^2_{n+1}-\bol
dsymbol{r}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{n\times n}^{-1}\bo
ldsymbol{r}$. ⏎ \end{proof} ⏎  ⏎  ⏎ \begin{lemma}
\label{lemma2} ⏎ Consider the model (1) (without t
ime-series), given $(p(\mathbf{x}_1),\ldots,p(\mat
hbf{x}_n))'=\boldsymbol{p}^n$, the conditional dis
tribution of $p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1})$ is a logit-norm
al distribution, that is, ⏎ $ ⏎ p(\mathbf{x}_{n+1}
)|\boldsymbol{p}^n\sim Logitnormal(m(\boldsymbol{p
}^n), v(\boldsymbol{p}^n)) ⏎ $ ⏎ with ⏎ $$m(\bold
symbol{p}^n)=\mu(\mathbf{x}_{n+1})+\boldsymbol{r}_
```

70th percentile — **Writing Style** = 0.33

```
... ance levels, $\alpha = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1,$ and $
0.2$. The knockoff method using lasso-based LCD fe
ature statistics outperforms BH by a wide margin w
hen $\alpha = 0.2$ by successfully exploiting spar
sity, but it fails for smaller values of $\alpha$
due to the threshold phenomenon. The cKnockoff met
hod described in this paper outperforms both BH an
d knockoffs.} ⏎     \label{fig:mcc-block} ⏎ \end{
figure} ⏎  ⏎  ⏎ \subsection{Outline and contribut
ions} \label{sec:outline} ⏎  ⏎ In this work, we pr
opose the {\em calibrated Knockoff procedure} (cKn
ockoff), a method that controls finite-sample FDR
in the Gaussian linear model with fixed design. Ou
r method acts as a ``wrapper'' around any implemen
tation of fixed-$X$ knockoffs, uniformly improving
its power by means of a {\em fallback test} that a
llows for the rejection of variables not rejected
by knockoffs.  ⏎  ⏎ For a generic fallback test st
atistic $T_j(\vct y)$, we calibrate a data-adaptiv
e rejection threshold $\hat{c}_j(\vct y)$, and rej
ect $H_j$ for any $j$ in the knockoff rejection se
```

95th percentile — **Writing Style** = 0.91

```
... en ⏎ one of these point particles is modelled
as the source of  ⏎ an appropriate metric of gener
al relativity. For example, neutral particles  ⏎ a
re modelled by Schwarzschild metric and electrical
ly or magnetically charged  ⏎ particles are modell
ed by Reissner-Nordstr\"om metric. Finally,  ⏎ the
quantum mechanical wave-function of the other part
icle in the  ⏎ background of this space-time is an
alysed to deduce the corresponding  ⏎ scattering a
mplitude. The effect of electromagnetism is also s
tudied when  ⏎ the particles also carry electric a
nd/or magnetic charges. ⏎  ⏎ Next, we replace thes
e black hole metrics by their counterparts in  ⏎ d
ilaton gravity, i.e. those that arise in low energ
y string theory. Here,  ⏎ we see that the above me
ntioned modelling cannot be done by generic black
⏎ holes as was the case for general relativity. If
we consider charged  ⏎ particles, for example, the
modelling can be successfully done only by  ⏎ extr
emal black holes to be able to calculate the scatt
ering amplitudes.  ⏎ This supports the conjecture
```

Facts & Trivia

5th percentile — **Facts & Trivia** = -1.63

```
... ations (3.9) and $\phi l = l\phi$ imply ⏎ \be
gin{equation} ⏎   (A\phi - \phi A)V = 0. ⏎ \end{eq
uation} ⏎  On the other hand the action of $\phi$
on the second of (3.9) yields ⏎ $\phi (l\phi V) =
\frac{c}{4}\phi^{2}V + \alpha \phi A\phi V$, ⏎ whi
ch, by virtue of (1.1), is written in the form ⏎ \
begin{equation} ⏎ (\phi l)\phi V = -\frac{c}{4}V
+ \alpha (\phi A)\phi V, ⏎ \end{equation} ⏎ Moreo
ver, from (1.1) and (3.9) we obtain: ⏎ $$(l\phi) \
phi V = l \phi^{2}V = - l V = ⏎ -\frac{c}{4}V  -
\alpha A V,$$ therefore ⏎ \begin{equation} ⏎ (l\p
hi) \phi V = -\frac{c}{4}V + \alpha (A\phi) \phi V
⏎ \end{equation} ⏎ Comparing (3.11) and (3.12), an
d using $\phi l = l \phi$ we have ⏎ \begin{equati
on} ⏎   (A\phi - \phi A)\phi V = 0. ⏎ \end{equati
on} ⏎  But from (1.1) and (3.8) we also have ⏎ \be
gin{equation} ⏎   (A\phi - \phi A)\xi = 0. ⏎ \end
{equation} ⏎ Therefore, (3.10), (3.13) and (3.14)
imply that $A\phi = \phi A$. ⏎ This ⏎ result and
the theorems (0.1) and (0.2) complete the proof of
the theorem 0.3. \qed \\ ⏎ \ ⏎ \\ ⏎ \section{Proof
```

30th percentile — **Facts & Trivia** = -0.89

```
... d}_{\mathcal{S}^{*},n} \to \ensuremath{\tilde{
\mathfrak{p}}}(m) \text{-mod}_{\mathcal{S},n}$ fro
m \cref{Udottilde,SS:websforP,SS:Chevalleyisomorph
ism}, respectively.  Consider the following compos
ition of functors: ⏎ \begin{equation}\label{E:comp
ositefunctor} ⏎ \begin{tikzcd}[column sep = 8 ex]
⏎ \mathbf{\dot U}(\ensuremath{\mathfrak{p}}(n))  \
arrow{r}{\operatorname{pr} \circ \Psi} &   \mathbf
{\dot U}(\ensuremath{\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}}(n))_{\g
eq 0}  \arrow{r}{H_n} & \mathfrak{p}\textup{-}\mat
hbf{Web}_{\uparrow, n} \arrow{r}{\operatorname{ref
l}} &  \mathfrak{p}\textup{-}\mathbf{Web}_{\downar
row,n}  \arrow{r}{\mathcal{T}_m \circ G_{\downarro
w, n}}  & \ensuremath{\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}}(m) \te
xt{-mod}_{\mathcal{S},n}. ⏎ \end{tikzcd} ⏎ \end{eq
uation} ⏎ Since $\Psi$ and $\operatorname{refl}$
are both contravariant superfunctors and the other
s are covariant, the entire composite is covariant
.  In addition, since each functor is full and ess
entially surjective, so is the composite.  That is
, we have the following result. ⏎  ⏎ \begin{theore
```

70th percentile — **Facts & Trivia** = 0.01

```
... ng trend when adding 6400 or more labeled revi
ews. ⏎ One possible reason is that when adding int
o the training data a small number of English revi
ews translated from the labeled Chinese data, ⏎ th
e training signals they produce might be lost in t
he vast number of English training samples, ⏎ thus
not effectively improving the performance. ⏎ Anoth
er interesting find is that it seems a very small
amount of supervision (e.g. 100 labels) could sign
ificantly help \texttt{DAN}. ⏎ However, with the s
ame number of labeled reviews, \texttt{ADAN} still
outperforms the \texttt{DAN} baseline. ⏎  ⏎ \begin
{figure}[h] ⏎    \vspace{-3mm} ⏎    \centering ⏎
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{resources/se
mi-sup-wadan.pdf} ⏎    \caption{\texttt{ADAN} perfo
rmance for Chinese in the semi-supervised setting
when using various amount of labeled Chinese data.
} ⏎    \label{fig:semi-sup} ⏎    \vspace{-3mm} ⏎ \e
nd{figure} ⏎  ⏎ \begin{figure*}[ht] ⏎    \centerin
g ⏎    \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{resources
/wadan_coarselabels_example.pdf} ⏎    \caption{\sma
```

95th percentile — **Facts & Trivia** = 1.04

```
... m+1}$ by utilizing the history of template ind
ices $H=t_0,\dots,t_m$. In other disciplines, nume
rous deep learning methods increase their performa
nces by incorporating large amounts of data availa
ble through the internet. A common approach to use
these data is unsupervised learning. In natural la
nguage processing (NLP), word2vec~\cite{mikolov201
3distributed} and more recent language models BERT
~\cite{devlin2018bert} are standard and responsibl
e for significant improvements in various NLP task
s. These models are pretrained on large corpora of
text such as Wikipedia and later fine-tuned on the
particular task or dataset. Recent studies in log
anomaly detection~\cite{meng2019loganomaly, zhang2
019robust} utilize a pre-trained word embeddings t
o numerically represent the log templates instead
of the integer log sequences~\cite{du2017deeplog},
where they observe small improvements in the predi
ction of unseen logs.  ⏎  ⏎ However, the learning
of the sequence of template indices and the enhanc
ed log message embedding approaches still have lar
```

Educational Value

5th percentile — **Educational Value** = -0.85

```
... (-0.4,0.2) to[out=135,in=-90] (-0.6,0.6) to[ou
t=90,in=180] (-0.4,0.9) to[out=0,in=90] (-0.1,0.4)
;   ⏎ \draw (0.4,0.2) to[out=45,in=-90] (0.6,0.6)
to[out=90,in=0] (0.4,0.9) to[out=180,in=90] (0.1,0
.4); ⏎ \end{scope} ⏎ \end{tikzpicture}} \end{equat
ion} ⏎ $A_{n,1}$ admits dual theory. The form of t
he dual depends on the parity of $n$. ⏎ \subsubsec
tion*{$n$ odd}  ⏎ The duality in this case is give
n by ⏎ \begin{equation} \label{UVdualitiesFamilyII
Odd} \scalebox{0.9}{\begin{tikzpicture}[node dista
nce=2cm,gSUnode/.style={circle,red,draw,minimum si
ze=8mm},gUSpnode/.style={circle,blue,draw,minimum
size=8mm},fnode/.style={rectangle,draw,minimum siz
e=8mm}]    ⏎ \begin{scope}[shift={(0,0)}] ⏎ \node
at (-2.2,1.6) {$\star_1)$}; ⏎ \node[gSUnode] (G1)
at (0,0) {$2N+1$}; ⏎ \node[fnode] (F1) at (0,-2) {
$8$}; ⏎ \draw (G1) -- (F1); ⏎ \draw (-0.8,0.3) to[
out=135,in=-90] (-1,0.8) to[out=90,in=180] (-0.7,1
.3) to[out=0,in=90] (-0.2,0.8);   ⏎ \draw (0.8,0.3
) to[out=45,in=-90] (1,0.8) to[out=90,in=0] (0.7,1
.3) to[out=180,in=90] (0.2,0.8); ⏎ \end{scope} ⏎ \
```

30th percentile — **Educational Value** = 0.13

```
...  deux fibr\'es ⏎ ad\'eliques hermitiens sur $\
Spec K$, et ⏎ $f:E\rightarrow F$ un homomorphisme.
Pour toute ⏎ $v\in\Sigma$, on d\'esigne par $h_v(f
)$ le logarithme ⏎ de la norme (d'op\'erateur) de
l'application ⏎ $f_{\mathbb C_v}:E\otimes_K\mathbb
C_v\rightarrow ⏎ F\otimes_K\mathbb C_v$. On note e
n outre ⏎ \[h(f)=\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb Q]}\sum_{v\in
\Sigma} ⏎ n_vh_v(f).\] ⏎  ⏎ L'in\'egalit\'e de pen
te suivante, qui relie les pentes ⏎ maximales de l
a source et du but d'un homomorphisme ⏎ injectif d
e fibr\'es vectoriels ad\'eliques, sera ⏎ utilis\'
ee plus loin dans la minoration des invariants ⏎ a
rithm\'etiques. ⏎  ⏎ \begin{prop} ⏎ Soient $\overl
ine E$ et $\overline F$ deux fibr\'es ⏎ vectoriels
ad\'eliques non-nuls, $f:E\rightarrow F$ une ⏎ app
lication $K$-lineaire injective. Alors on a ⏎ l'in
\'egalit\'e suivante~: ⏎ \begin{equation}\label{Eq
u:pente} ⏎ \widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\overline E)\leqsl
ant ⏎ \widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\overline F)+h(f). ⏎ \e
nd{equation} ⏎ \end{prop} ⏎ \begin{proof} ⏎ Voir
\cite[Lemme 6.4]{Gaudron07} pour la ⏎ d\'emonstrat
```

70th percentile — **Educational Value** = 0.75

```
... as a computer (MIL-5min model) and $2\times 50
00$ samples when the sample was a single URL strin
g (MIL-URL model). The gradient descend was run fo
r 50 000 iterations. Because loading the data was
very time consuming, the stochastic gradient desce
nds used a circular buffer of size 5, which means
that every minibatch was reused 5 times. This mean
s that although the SGD used 50 000 steps, it has
seen only 10 000 "new" mini-batches. ⏎  ⏎  ⏎ \subs
ection{Prior art} ⏎ The proposed solution has been
compared to two approaches --- manually designed f
eatures used in a random forest classifier~\cite{m
achlica2017learning} (called R. Forest) and an app
roach based on convolution neural network~\cite{sa
xe2017expose} (called eXpose). They were selected
as they represent state complementary approaches i
n the prior art. ⏎  ⏎ R. Forest classifier~\cite{m
achlica2017learning} uses a set of 398 hand-design
ed features that are used with a random forest cla
ssifier to separate URL strings of benign and mali
cious applications. This approach is a good protot
```

95th percentile — **Educational Value** = 1.43

```
... \Pi $ (i.e., $ \hat{\epsilon}_{min} $) and the
empirical average regret of the learner (i.e., $ \
hat{\epsilon}_{regret} $). Similar to DAGGER~\cite
{ross2011reduction}, the second term can be elimin
ated if a no-regret algorithm such as Follow-the-L
eader~\cite{hazan2007logarithmic} is used. The thi
rd term implies the number of training examples $
KN $ needs to be $\mathcal{O}\left(T^2l^2_{max}\lo
g{\frac{1}{\mu}}\right) $ in order to become negli
gible. We can achieve $\mathcal{O}\left(T^2l^2_{ma
x}\log{\frac{1}{\mu}}\right) $ samples easily as A
DAPS uses principled simulations for generating th
em. With these changes, this theorem can lead to t
he following Corollary. ⏎  ⏎ \begin{corollary} ⏎
If $ l $ is convex in $ \pi $ for any $ s $ and i
t upper bounds $ C $, and Follow-the-Leader is use
d to select the learned policy, then for any $ \ep
silon > 0 $, after collecting $ \mathcal{O}\left(\
frac{T^2l^2_{max}\log{\frac{1}{\mu}}}{\epsilon^2}\
right) $ training examples, with probability at le
ast $ 1 - \mu $, $\mu \in(0,1)$, ADAPS offers the
```

Required Expertise

5th percentile — **Required Expertise** = 0.46

```
... and HP values allows for a multi-faceted compa
rison of learning algorithms across data sets incl
uding robustness to varying parameter settings for
the learner. ⏎  ⏎ We believe that having more insi
ght on the behavior of a learner is especially use
ful  ⏎ when dealing with novel, unseen data. ⏎ Ind
eed, being able to calculate and possibly visualiz
e its performance map provides more confidence in
how the learner would behave in the future and wha
t subset of parameter settings are likely to produ
ce  ⏎ high performing outcomes: the highest the HP
(k) values, the highest the probability that the l
earner will operate within the [bestperformance *(
1-k), bestperformance] range when variation to its
configurations settings will happen in the future.
⏎  ⏎ \begin{table*}[htb] ⏎ \caption{High Performan
ce values $HP(k)$)in several learning contexts.  }
⏎ \label{highperf} ⏎ \begin{tabular}{cccccc} ⏎ Dat
a set   & Learner and  & Best Accuracy & HP(0.05)
& HP(0.10)  &  HP(0.20)    \\ ⏎   &  Meta Optimiz
ation    &                 & (within 5\% of best)
```

30th percentile — **Required Expertise** = 1.60

```
... e advantage of DQN-LTA.  ⏎  ⏎ \begin{figure*}[
!htbp] ⏎  ⏎  \centering ⏎   \includegraphics[widt
h=0.48\textwidth]{figures/LunarLander-v2_sweep_nh2
} ⏎  \caption{ ⏎   Evaluation learning curves on
LunarLander, averaging over $5$ runs with the shad
e indicating standard error. The learning curve is
smoothed over a window of size $20$ before averagi
ng across runs.  ⏎  }\label{fig:discrete-control-
lunarsweep} ⏎ \end{figure*} ⏎  ⏎ \subsection{Proof
s}\label{sec-proofs} ⏎ We now provide the proof fo
r Proposition~\ref{thm-onehot-guarantee}, Proposit
ion~\ref{thm-apponehot}, Theorem~\ref{thm-sparsity
-guarantee} and Corollary~\ref{cor-sparsity} below
. ⏎  ⏎ \subsubsection{Proof for Proposition~\ref{t
hm-onehot-guarantee}}\label{sec-proof-thm-onehot}
⏎  ⏎ For convenience, we define the $k$-dimensiona
l one-hot vector $\mathbf{e}_i$ whose $i$th entry
is one and otherwise zero.  ⏎  ⏎ \begin{prop}\labe
l{thm-onehot-guarantee} ⏎ Under Assumption~\ref{as
sum-k-delta}, for any $z \in [l, u]$, ⏎  \begin{en
umerate}[leftmargin=1cm,itemsep=0ex,topsep=0pt] ⏎
```

70th percentile — **Required Expertise** = 2.09

```
... nd $w_2= \exp(-\theta){\dot \phi}$. The ⏎ comp
lete and vertical lifts of the above basis are ⏎ \
[ ⏎ \clift X = \fpd{}{x}, \quad \vlift X = \fpd{}
{\dot x},\quad ⏎ \clift{\hat E}_1 = \fpd{}{\theta}
, \quad \clift{\hat E}_2 = ⏎ \exp(\theta)\Big(\fp
d{}{\phi} +{\dot \theta}\fpd{}{{\dot ⏎ \phi}}\Big)
,\quad \vlift{\hat E}_1 = \fpd{}{{\dot \theta}},
\quad ⏎ \vlift{\hat E}_2 = \exp(\theta)\fpd{}{{\do
t \phi}}. ⏎ \] ⏎  ⏎ Finally, the matrix ${\mathcal
A}$, defined by the relation ${\hat ⏎ E}_a(x,g)= {
A}_a^b(g){\tilde E}_b(x,g)$, is here ⏎ \[ ⏎ {A}(g)
= \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ -\phi & \exp(
\theta) ⏎ \end{array}\right). ⏎ \] ⏎ At the identi
ty of the Lie group, the matrix ${A}$ is the ident
ity ⏎ matrix, as it should be. ⏎  ⏎ If we use the
invariant fibre coordinates $(v^0,w^a)$, the induc
ed ⏎ action on $TM$ is simply\\ ⏎ $\psi^{TM}_{(\ph
i_1,\theta_1)}(x,(\phi,\theta), \dot x, w_1, w_2)
= ⏎ (x,(\phi_1,\theta_1)*(\phi,\theta), \dot x, w_
1, w_2)$. Since the ⏎ coordinates $(x, \dot x, w_1
, w_2)$ can be interpreted as ⏎ coordinates on $TM
```

95th percentile — **Required Expertise** = 2.51

```
... of the points $P_i$. Take the fiber  $F_i$ of
the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle morphism of $\mathbb{F}_
1$ to $\mathbb{P}^1$ that passes through the point
$P_i$ for each $i$. We have ⏎ \[-K_{\mathbb{F}_1}\
equiv 2C+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^6F_i.\] ⏎ We then o
btain ⏎ \[-K_{S}\equiv 2\tilde{C}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_
{i=1}^6(\tilde{F}_i-E_i),\] ⏎ where $\tilde{C}$ an
d $\tilde{F}_i$'s are the proper transforms of $C$
and $F_i$ by $\phi_1$, respectively. ⏎ Since $B\eq
uiv \tilde{F}_i+E_i$ for each $i$, we have ⏎ \[-K_
{S}+aB\equiv 2\tilde{C}+\left(\frac{a}{6}+\frac{1}
{2}\right)\sum_{i=1}^6\tilde{F}_i ⏎ +\left(\frac{a
}{6}-\frac{1}{2}\right)\sum_{i=1}^6E_i.\] ⏎ Since
$a>3$,  Example~\ref{example:lines} verifies that
$S$ has an $H$-polar cylinder. ⏎ \end{proof} ⏎  ⏎
Theorems~\ref{theorem:BR3-7}, \ref{theorem:BR2}, \
ref{theorem:CL3-6} and  \ref{theorem:CL0-2} imply
⏎ (1), (2), (3), and (4) in Theorem~ \ref{theorem:
main-hard}, respectively. ⏎  ⏎ \subsection{Cylinde
rs in del Pezzo surfaces of degree $1$} ⏎ \label{s
ection:cylinders-degree-1} ⏎  ⏎  ⏎  ⏎ In order to
```