

# Interleaved Snowballing: Reducing the Workload of Literature Curators

Ralf Stephan

Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE)

Address correspondence to: Ralf Stephan, Institute for Globally Distributed Open Research and Education (IGDORE),  
<https://igdore.org>. E-mail: [ralf.stephan@igdore.org](mailto:ralf.stephan@igdore.org)

February 14, 2024

## Abstract

We formally define the literature (reference) snowballing method and present a refined version of it. We show that the improved algorithm can substantially reduce curator work, even before application of text classification, by reducing the number of candidates to classify. We also present a desktop application named LitBall[1] that implements this and other literature collection methods, through access to the Semantic Scholar academic graph[7].

TO INTERLEAVE: to put layers or flat pieces of something between layers or flat pieces of something else

---

## Introduction

Snowballing is the method of choice to get a complete list of literature on a specific topic, and is applied by authors of systematic reviews, especially scoping reviews[2, 4, 12, 15]. Software that helps with snowballing is scarce and depends on the availability of a specific academic graph (AG) to work at all; as to recent implementations, we could only find Snowglobe[8] and Paperfetcher[10]. The first uses the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG)[13], which is no longer online, and the second uses Open Citations[11] and CrossRef[6]. We decided to write our own application, LitBall[1], which uses the Semantic Scholar (S2) AG[7] that is arguably the largest open AG at the moment (Google Scholar AG lacks an API).

However, even with the snowballing process being automated, the number of articles that, in the end, have to be filtered out, can be enormous. If the filtering is done by hand/eye, it amounts to the bulk of the workload before the literature can be curated. Even using an ML classifier[5], the classifier needs to be trained on the specific task to be useful, and it will never have a 100 percent hit rate. In this paper, we offer a refined snowballing algorithm that gives the same result as the original one, but reduces eyeballing by factors of up to  $\approx 6$ .

## Definitions

Literature curation requires the preliminary choice which scientific articles are *curatable* at all, by looking at the title, the abstract (if available), or summaries of this information, like TLDR's from Semantic Scholar, or the full text. Later actual curation will use the full text. Here,  $F$  denotes the filtering process that decides which articles are curatable.

$$\text{Curatable}(\text{article}) = F(\text{title, abstract, summary, full text}) = \begin{cases} 1 \\ 0 \end{cases}$$

An **academic graph** (AG) is a directed acyclic graph, consisting of nodes (academic articles) and edges (references and citations). Ideally, the set of all curatable articles  $\mathcal{C}$  on a specific topic is determined

over the complete academic graph **CAG** but, in reality, the graph used is a subset of **CAG**, so  $\mathcal{C}$  depends on which AG is used.

$$\mathcal{C}(\text{AG}, F) = \{\mathbf{article} \in \text{AG} \mid F(\mathbf{article}) = 1\}$$

Most of the time the subgraph  $\mathcal{C}$  of AG, having nodes from  $\mathcal{C}$  is connected but this is not always the case.

We define the filter function  $F$  as the conjunction of a simple pattern matching function  $F_1$  that takes a **regular or logical expression** given by the curator, and a second function  $F_2$  that effectively tries to filter out off-topic and non-curatable articles in the output of  $F_1$ .

$$F = F_2 \circ F_1$$

$F_2$  is performed by the curator or, increasingly, by text classification systems benefiting from recent progress in machine learning. Still, specialized systems need training data, and the accuracy is never 100%, so the results have to be checked. This means the amount of work by the curator performing  $F_2$  depends on and is proportional to the size of  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{\mathbf{article} \mid F_1(\mathbf{article}) = 1\}$ , i.e., what comes out of  $F_1$ .

$$\#\mathbf{Work} \propto \#\mathcal{M}_1 = \#\{\mathbf{article} \in \text{AG} \mid F_1(\mathbf{article}) = 1\}$$

Using the **full text** of articles would improve the accuracy of classifiers but full text in bulk is not available for the majority of articles. Still, improving classification accuracy for the subset of the AG which is available in bulk is an interesting option.

## Snowballing and Interleaved Snowballing

In this section we will assume that the set of articles suited for curation  $\mathcal{C}$  (the goal of the literature search) is connected. The idea of snowballing methods is then that it suffices to start with any node  $\in \mathcal{C}$  as part of AG, and doing a breadth-first graph walk on AG will soon encounter all members of  $\mathcal{C}$ , by stopping the walk at nodes that are not  $\in \mathcal{C}$  (as determined by  $F$ ), followed by backtracking[2].

If the AG is seen as having directed edges, the walk will only use references of nodes—this is called **backward snowballing**. But if the reference edges of AG are seen as bidirectional, it will include the citations for any node (**forward snowballing**, e.g.[3]). Only a combination of backward and forward snowballing can succeed to visit all members of  $\mathcal{C}$  in AG.

Now, since the function  $F$ , that determines membership in  $\mathcal{C}$ , consists of two consecutive filters, it matters when both filters are applied. Usually, literature snowballing applies pattern matching ( $F_1$ ) during the snowballing rounds, and supervised classification ( $F_2$ ) after the snowball is done:

---

### Algorithm 1 Forward/Backward Snowballing

---

**Require:** academic graph AG,

set of starting nodes  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i\}$ ,

pattern matching function  $F_1$ ,

supervised filter function  $F_2$

set of accepted nodes  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$

set of rejected nodes  $\mathcal{R}_0 = \emptyset$

$\mathcal{A}_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{S}$

$n \leftarrow 1$

**while**  $\mathcal{A}_n \supset \mathcal{A}_{n-1}$  **do**

$\mathcal{A}_{n+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_n \cup \{\text{node} \in \text{AG} \mid \exists \text{edge}(\text{node}, a) \wedge a \in \mathcal{A}_n \wedge F_1(\text{node}) = 1\}$

$n \leftarrow n + 1$

**end while**

$\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{A}_n$

$\mathcal{C} = \{a \in \mathcal{M}_1 \mid F_2(a) = 1\}$

---

We present an improved version of algorithm 1 that reduces the number of calls to  $F_2$  significantly, see alg. 2. The difference to algorithm 1 is that  $F_2$  is already applied during the expansion loop, reducing the increase of  $\mathcal{A}_{n+1}$ . The number of calls to  $F_2$  is smaller than in algorithm 1 by a factor of (usually) up to  $\approx 6$ , see the examples in Table 1.

Since the filter  $F_2$  is often applied by humans through supervision (e.g. eyeballing of titles or abstracts) the algorithm could also be called *Snowballing with Interleaved Supervision*.

---

**Algorithm 2** Interleaved Snowballing

---

**Require:** academic graph AG,set of starting nodes  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i\}$ ,pattern matching function  $F_1$ ,supervised filter function  $F_2$ set of accepted nodes  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$ set of rejected nodes  $\mathcal{R}_0 = \emptyset$  $\mathcal{A}_1 \leftarrow \mathcal{S}$  $n \leftarrow 1$ **while**  $\mathcal{A}_n \supset \mathcal{A}_{n-1}$  **do** $\mathcal{A}_{n+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{A}_n \cup \{\text{node} \in \text{AG} \mid \exists \text{edge}(\text{node}, a) \wedge a \in \mathcal{A}_n \wedge F_1(\text{node}) = 1 \wedge F_2(\text{node}) = 1\}$  $n \leftarrow n + 1$ **end while** $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_n$ 

---

**Examples for reduction of  $F_2$** 

In order to get an overview of the improvement interleaved snowballing provides, we compare the number of applications of  $F_2$  by both algorithm 1 and 2 on the same search, where each search is defined by the academic graph (S2[7] in all cases), and identical parameters  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $F_1$ , and  $F_2$  for both runs.

We used LitBall, which implements both algorithms: first using algorithm 2, in our daily work as biocurator, to search for lab-experimental articles and reviews. After that we simply ran algorithm 1 with the same parameters and recorded the number of "accepted" papers. The details are in Table 1.

A further result of interest was the number of accesses to the AG to get the paper data, which is, in both algorithms,  $\#\mathcal{A}_n + \#\mathcal{R}_n$ . The reduction factor for this number is of the same order of magnitude than that for  $F_2$ . However, cost is not a problem if the AG API has a bulk access option.

Name	Alg.1 $\#F_2$	Alg.2 $\#F_2$	Alg.1/Alg.2	Alg.1 $\#\mathcal{A}_n + \#\mathcal{R}_n$	Alg.2 $\#\mathcal{A}_n + \#\mathcal{R}_n$	Alg.1/Alg.2
SLG25A10	95	49	<b>1.9</b>	5491	1116	<b>4.9</b>
CSKMT	258	42	<b>6.1</b>	11644	513	<b>22.7</b>
TAT	> 1000	286	N/A	> 10000	1273	N/A
HGD	265	133	<b>2.0</b>	658	6859	<b>10.4</b>
GSTZ1	113	93	<b>1.2</b>	5260	622	<b>8.5</b>
HPD	689	125	<b>5.5</b>	22900	490	<b>46.7</b>
FAH	427	150	<b>2.8</b>	18076	559	<b>32.3</b>
PDSS1,2	75	49	<b>1.5</b>	3915	526	<b>7.4</b>
COQ2	109	53	<b>2.1</b>	4000	527	<b>7.6</b>
COQ6	54	44	<b>1.2</b>	2509	715	<b>3.5</b>
COQ3	27	21	<b>1.3</b>	1710	472	<b>3.6</b>
COQ5	22	15	<b>1.5</b>	1046	374	<b>2.8</b>
COQ7	75	44	<b>1.7</b>	4018	706	<b>5.7</b>

Table 1: Results of snowballing processes in the S2 AG. Searches were for lab-experimental articles about specific proteins, starting with 1-5 articles referenced in UniProt. For exact regular expressions used see the appendix. In the case of TAT the search was stopped before completion, as the numbers in each cycle of algorithm 1 kept growing exponentially. This is a sign that the regex used for  $F_1$  was too broad.

**LitBall: the application**

LitBall[1] is a JVM desktop app for systematic literature collection using the Semantic Scholar AG. LitBall offers several search methods: expression search, snowballing, interleaved snowballing, and similarity search. It saves the state of snowball processing steps in a local database and all retrieved graph data. Output can be visualized or exported as a database for import in any spreadsheet.

LitBall uses Kotlin/Compose. There are binaries for Linux/Windows/Mac, made with the help of Conveyor. If you use LitBall, please give us feedback, especially on Win/Mac, as we only test on Linux.

## Discussion

We have formalized the snowballing algorithm and presented both an improvement and its implementation. Through Semantic Scholar, the research community is lucky to have open and free access to an academic graph with metadata on > 200 million documents and > 2.4B citation edges (as of 2022[7]). The success of snowballing relies on the completeness of the underlying AG and, so, the S2 AG is a natural choice for applications using this method.

Early attempts on replacing the eyeballing part of snowballing with an ML classifier (e.g. SYMBALS [5]) were made, and we also tried to include a classifier interface with LitBall[14]. The work associated with curating the training data for this classifier, however, was substantial, with the topic covered being only a tiny part of possible topics that come up in biocuration, for example. The biggest hurdle for us is the general nonavailability of full text for articles, because only with full text lab-experimental articles can be reliably recognized. It may be possible to approximate the ideal by using large language models on abstracts, but then, abstracts aren't generally available, either.

Usage of snowballing is not confined to authors of systematic reviews. In our biocuration work for Reactome[9], we daily use LitBall in interleaved snowballing, but also in other modes. For the frequent curator, it should be an important tool, but only one of many.

## References

- [1] URL: <https://github.com/rwst/LitBall>.
- [2] Miew Keen Choong et al. "Automatic evidence retrieval for systematic reviews". In: *Journal of medical Internet research* 16.10 (2014), e223. DOI: [10.2196/jmir.3369](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.3369).
- [3] Katia Romero Felizardo et al. "Using forward snowballing to update systematic reviews in software engineering". In: *Proceedings of the 10th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*. 2016, pp. 1–6. DOI: [10.1145/2961111.2962630](https://doi.org/10.1145/2961111.2962630).
- [4] Trisha Greenhalgh and Richard Peacock. "Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources". In: *Bmj* 331.7524 (2005), pp. 1064–1065. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.38636.593461.68](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38636.593461.68).
- [5] Max van Haastrecht et al. "SYMBALS: A systematic review methodology blending active learning and snowballing". In: *Frontiers in research metrics and analytics* 6 (2021), p. 685591. DOI: [10.3389/frma.2021.685591](https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.685591).
- [6] Ginny Hendricks et al. "Crossref: The sustainable source of community-owned scholarly metadata". In: *Quantitative Science Studies* 1.1 (2020), pp. 414–427. DOI: [10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00022](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00022).
- [7] Rodney Michael Kinney et al. "The Semantic Scholar Open Data Platform". In: *ArXiv abs/2301.10140* (2023). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2301.10140](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.10140). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:256194545>.
- [8] S McWeeny, J Choe, and E Norton. *SnowGlobe: An iterative search tool for systematic reviews and meta-analyses*. 2021. DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/U25RN](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/U25RN).
- [9] Marija Milacic et al. "The Reactome Pathway Knowledgebase 2024". In: *Nucleic acids research* 52.D1 (2024), pp. D672–D678. DOI: [10.1093/nar/gkad1025](https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkad1025).
- [10] Akash Pallath and Qiyang Zhang. "Paperfetcher: A tool to automate handsearching and citation searching for systematic reviews". In: 14.2 (Oct. 2022), pp. 323–335. DOI: [10.1002/jrsm.1604](https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1604). URL: <https://paperfetcher.github.io/>.
- [11] Silvio Peroni and David Shotton. "OpenCitations, an infrastructure organization for open scholarship". In: *Quantitative Science Studies* 1.1 (2020), pp. 428–444. DOI: [10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00023](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00023).
- [12] Ian Shemilt et al. "Pinpointing needles in giant haystacks: use of text mining to reduce impractical screening workload in extremely large scoping reviews". In: *Research Synthesis Methods* 5.1 (2014), pp. 31–49. DOI: [10.1002/jrsm.1093](https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1093).
- [13] Arnab Sinha et al. "An overview of microsoft academic service (mas) and applications". In: *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*. 2015, pp. 243–246. DOI: [10.1145/2740908.2742839](https://doi.org/10.1145/2740908.2742839).
- [14] Ralf Stephan. *Automatizing biocurators' intuition: filtering scientific papers by analyzing titles and short summaries*. Sept. 2023. DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.8388963](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8388963).
- [15] Claes Wohlin. "Guidelines for snowballing in systematic literature studies and a replication in software engineering". In: *Proceedings of the 18th international conference on evaluation and assessment in software engineering*. 2014, pp. 1–10. DOI: [10.1145/2601248.2601268](https://doi.org/10.1145/2601248.2601268).

## Appendix - Expressions used for filtering (case-insensitive, word-boundary)

CSKMT	CSKMT ∨ METTL12 ∨ CS-KMT ∨ Methyltransferase-like
TAT	TAT ∨ tyrosine aminotransferase ∨ L-tyrosine:2-oxoglutarate
HGD	HGD ∨ Homogentisate 1.2-dioxygenase ∨ Homogentisate dioxygenase ∨ HGO ∨ Homogentisate oxygenase ∨ Homogentisic acid oxidase ∨ Homogentisicase
GSTZ1	Maleylacetoacetate isomerase ∨ MAAI ∨ GSTZ1 ∨ GSTZ1-1 ∨ Glutathione S-transferase zeta 1
HPD	HPD ∨ 4-hydroxyphenylpyruvic acid dioxygenase ∨ 4-hydroxyphenylpyruvate dioxygenase ∨ 4HPPD ∨ HPPDase ∨ PPD
FAH	FAH ∨ Fumarylacetoacetase ∨ Beta-diketonase ∨ Fumarylacetoacetate hydrolase
PDSS1,2	PDSS1 ∨ PDSS2 ∨ All trans-polyprenyl-diphosphate synthase ∨ Decaprenyl pyrophosphate synthase ∨ Decaprenyl-diphosphate synthase ∨ Solanesyl-diphosphate synthase ∨ Trans-prenyltransferase ∨ TPT ∨ TPT1 ∨ TPT2 ∨ DPS1 ∨ DPS2 ∨ TPRT ∨ C6orf210
COQ2	COQ2 ∨ 4-hydroxybenzoate polyprenyltransferase ∨ 4-HB polyprenyltransferase ∨ Para-hydroxybenzoate–polyprenyltransferase ∨ PHB:PPT ∨ PHB:polyprenyltransferase ∨ CL640
COQ6	Coenzyme Q10 monooxygenase 6 ∨ COQ6 ∨ CGI-10
COQ3	COQ3 ∨ 3-demethylubiquinol 3-O-methyltransferase ∨ Polyprenyldihydroxybenzoate methyltransferase ∨ UG0215E05
COQ5	COQ5 ∨ 2-methoxy-6-polyprenyl-1,4-benzoquinol methylase
COQ7	COQ7 ∨ 5-demethoxyubiquinone hydroxylase ∨ DMQ hydroxylase ∨ Timing protein clk-1 homolog