



# Beyond Transformers: fault type detection in maintenance tickets with Kernel Methods, Boost Decision Trees and Neural Network



S. Campese<sup>123</sup> F. Agostini<sup>124</sup> J. Pazzini<sup>12</sup> D. Pozza<sup>3</sup>



<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Padua

<sup>2</sup>National Institute for Nuclear Physics, Padua Division

<sup>3</sup>R&D Department, Omnys SRL

<sup>4</sup>Department of Control and Computer Engineering, Polytechnic University of Turin




## Introduction

The proper handling of **customer tickets and maintenance requests** is pivotal for enterprises. It directly impacts customer satisfaction and consequently it leads to **higher economic and brand-image revenues**. Several methods based on **Natural Language Processing (NLP)** have been developed to classify, tag, and prioritize customer support requests and maintenance tickets. However, the **specific domain** of each company, in conjunction with the different products and services offered, make it **difficult to develop generalized solutions**.

## Purpose


In this work, we propose two approaches to predict the type of fault from the text of maintenance support tickets: (i) Kernel Methods in conjunction with Boost Decision Trees (**Spectrumboost**), and (ii) Neural Network for Multiple Representation Learning (**DeepMRL**). Those models are tested and compared against state-of-the-art solutions based on Transformers architectures on a **real-world set of 131305 tickets in the Italian language**. Results suggest that the **proposed models outperform Transformers** both in the prediction **accuracy** and in the **time and computational resources** required for their training.



Dataset	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Avg. Seq. length
Training	42885	29246	22378	59.87 $\pm$ 39.47
Validation	4659	3378	2465	59.15 $\pm$ 39.40
Test	11888	8113	6293	59.92 $\pm$ 38.88
Total	59432 (45.3%)	40737 (31.0%)	31136 (23.7%)	59.82 $\pm$ 39.34

Maintenance tickets sequence length and division in training, validation and test set.

## Deep Multiple Representation Learning




The novel **Multiple Representation Learning (MRL)** layer mimics the logic behind Multiple Kernel Learning by learning a **new data representation**  $X_{comb}$  as a **linear or non-linear combination of base representations**  $\phi_i(x)$ , where  $\phi_i$  can be an arbitrary function (also a kernel one), a BERT encoding, a NN embedding, or other.

By applying **constraints to the learned weights**  $\omega_i$ , it is possible to compute different type of combinations, such as Convex and Affine approaches. The new representation is then passed through a **fully-connected layer** with L1 and L2 regularization to **learn non-linear dependencies**.

## SpectrumBoost

**SpectrumBoost** extracts features from text using the **p-Spectrum kernel** with **Nyström Approximation**. This kernel counts any possible contiguous sub-sequence of length  $p$  and it focuses on local information. These are fed into an **XGBoost classifier**, that provides the label.





## Results

Experiments have been conducted using 2x Nvidia GTX 1070, with the exception of 2x Nvidia V100 for Transformer-based models.

Transformers outperform the SGD baseline, but they require a large training time even employing high-performance Nvidia V100 GPUs.

Our **SpectrumBoost** is able to **surpass in performance all the models based on Transformers**, achieving a gain of 2.8% with respect to SGD and 1.1% with respect to the Electra architecture in terms of AUC. It also **outperforms the other models in terms of F1**, with a time comparable with SGD.

The newly proposed **DeepMRL** **outperforms all other models in all the considered metrics**. In terms of AUC, DeepMRL shows a 3% improvement compared to our baseline and 1.7% with respect to Electra. Considering the other metrics, DeepMRL outperforms the baseline and Transformer models, leading to an overall **gain of 0.9% for F1 score**, and **1.3% for Balanced Accuracy**.



Algorithm	F1 score	Balanced Accuracy	AUC score	Time
SGD ( $p = 5$ )	0.693 $\pm$ 0.004	0.684 $\pm$ 0.014	0.837 $\pm$ 0.006	1:05:03 $\pm$ 0:00:04
BERT	0.720 $\pm$ 0.001	0.716 $\pm$ 0.003	0.843 $\pm$ 0.005	2:13:25 $\pm$ 0:16:07
Electra	0.720 $\pm$ 0.002	0.709 $\pm$ 0.012	0.850 $\pm$ 0.002	5:33:56 $\pm$ 0:18:39
Gilberto	0.720 $\pm$ 0.003	0.713 $\pm$ 0.002	0.838 $\pm$ 0.005	5:45:38 $\pm$ 1:36:04
Umberto	0.716 $\pm$ 0.001	0.713 $\pm$ 0.004	0.837 $\pm$ 0.002	4:31:53 $\pm$ 2:18:46
Alberto	0.717 $\pm$ 0.001	0.714 $\pm$ 0.001	0.834 $\pm$ 0.001	2:23:08 $\pm$ 0:07:26
SpectrumBoost ( $p = 4$ )	0.726 $\pm$ 0.001	0.711 $\pm$ 0.001	0.861 $\pm$ 0.001	<b>1:13:23</b> $\pm$ 0:00:08
DeepMRL ( $p = [4, 5, 6]$ )	<b>0.729<math>\pm</math>0.001</b>	<b>0.729<math>\pm</math>0.001</b>	<b>0.867<math>\pm</math>0.002</b>	3:19:48 $\pm$ 0:00:27