

Explainable assessment of financial experts' credibility by classifying social media forecasts and checking the predictions with actual market data

Silvia García-Méndez^{a,*}, Francisco de Arriba-Pérez^a, Jaime González-González^a, Francisco J. González-Castaño^a

^a*Information Technologies Group,atlanTTic, University of Vigo, Vigo, Spain*

Abstract

Social media include diverse interaction metrics related to user popularity, the most evident example being the number of user followers. The latter has raised concerns about the credibility of the posts by the most popular creators. However, most existing approaches to assess credibility in social media strictly consider this problem a binary classification, often based on a priori information, without checking if actual real-world facts back the users' comments. In addition, they do not provide automatic explanations of their predictions to foster their trustworthiness. In this work, we propose a credibility assessment solution for financial creators in social media that combines Natural Language Processing and Machine Learning. The reputation of the contributors is assessed by automatically classifying their forecasts on asset values by type and verifying these predictions with actual market data to approximate their probability of success. The outcome of this verification is a continuous credibility score instead of a binary result, an entirely novel contribution by this work. Moreover, social media metrics (*i.e.*, user context) are exploited by calculating their correlation with the credibility rankings, providing insights on the interest of the end-users in financial posts and their forecasts (*i.e.*, drop or rise). Finally, the system provides natural language explanations of its decisions based on a model-agnostic analysis of relevant

*Corresponding author: sgarcia@gti.uvigo.es

Email addresses: sgarcia@git.uvigo.es (Silvia García-Méndez), farriba@gti.uvigo.es (Francisco de Arriba-Pérez), jaimegonzalez@gti.uvigo.es (Jaime González-González), javier@det.uvigo.es (Francisco J. González-Castaño)

features.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, explainability, financial user credibility, Machine Learning, Natural Language Processing

1. Introduction

Data credibility depends on the information source (*e.g.*, humans or bots), the content, and its context (*e.g.*, user relations, content domain, etc.). This problem has gained renewed attention owing to the popularity of social media (Kaliyar et al., 2021; Nian et al., 2021) and their anonymity and effortless fast information-sharing features (Huang et al., 2021). Social media posts and user profiles are valuable input data to assess creators’ credibility for decision-making (Kurniati & Widyanoro, 2017). For example, identifying reliable and trustworthy creators is crucial to fight disinformation from fake news (*i.e.*, deliberate disinformation) (Kozik et al., 2022; Verma et al., 2022). Nevertheless, social media platforms lack, in general, appropriate mechanisms to distinguish valuable from useless data (Kamkarhaghighi et al., 2016; Hanaforoosh et al., 2021), hence the interest in these mechanisms (Huang et al., 2021; Jing et al., 2021).

Most existing research on user credibility has focused on analyzing shared content, rather than considering the context of the creators and their profiles (Asfand-E-Yar et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). We can identify different approaches: (*i*) graph-based (*i.e.*, measuring the users’ credibility from other directly or indirectly connected users) (Qureshi et al., 2021), (*ii*) those performing Sentiment Analysis (SA) of the content (Kurniati & Widyanoro, 2017), and (*iii*) solutions with domain-dependent features (Huang et al., 2019). Additional features related to the users’ profiles (*i.e.*, the number of followers) and their demographic data (*e.g.*, age) have been identified as helpful (Verma et al., 2022). As an example of a complete approach combining diverse strategies, the recent work by Li et al. (2023) describes a Machine Learning (ML) based assessment tool of Twitter profiles applying SA, content-based features and user-context features. It is also interesting to observe that most current solutions for credibility analysis tend to approach the problem as a strictly binary classification task, instead of producing continuous rankings (Zhou et al., 2017).

Moreover, eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) techniques are scarce in the literature on the target problem. These techniques take advantage

of the intrinsically interpretable nature of some ML models, or are *ad hoc* solutions to circumvent the opacity of black-box algorithms (Jung et al., 2022; Akbar et al., 2023). They help professionals and end-users better understand the decisions of the ML models to foster their trustworthiness. The most popular XAI approaches are (i) counterfactual descriptions (Chen et al., 2023), (ii) feature importance (Huang et al., 2021), (iii) natural language explanations (Cambria et al., 2023), and (iv) visual dashboards (Batic et al., 2024).

Summing up, our work focuses on the financial domain, owing to the many credibility concerns about stock market forecasts (Huang et al., 2019). It contributes to the investors’ well-informed decision-making through reliable and updated information from social media (Evans et al., 2021). Specifically, we classify financial posts in forecast categories and automatically verify if actual market events back these predictions to measure the level of success of the users. This success percentage is presented as a continuous credibility score instead of a binary result. Additionally, user context is exploited by comparing credibility scores with social media user metrics, providing insights related to the user interests about the forecasts in financial posts. Finally, the model predictions are automatically explained in natural language.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant works on user credibility assessment. Section 3 introduces the proposed solution. Section 4 describes the experimental data set, the implementations, and the results obtained. Finally, Section 5 highlights the contributions and proposes future research.

2. Related work

2.1. Social media and ML for credibility assessment

Since the information in social media may come from untrustworthy users, filtering advertisements, scams, and spam from credible data is crucial in professional domains (Huang et al., 2019).

There exists plenty of prior work on social media credibility assessment (Huang et al., 2019), covering domains such as business (Abdullah et al., 2021; Al-Yazidi et al., 2022), disaster scenarios (Assery et al., 2022), news (Pelau et al., 2023; Shrestha et al., 2024), politics (Page & Duffy, 2018) and finance (Evans et al., 2021).

Two typical limitations of current works on credibility assessment are that (i) they often approach the problem as a binary classification in which user

credibility is not ranked as a continuous variable; and (ii) they do not provide explanations on their predictions. Also, many works ignore the user’s context and focus on the content. The latter is not the case, for example, in the work by Prada & Iglesias (2020), who presented a user reputation prediction solution for Wallapop based on generalized linear models (GLMs) (parametric models that are more straightforward than non-parametric traditional ML algorithms). The features included elementary linguistic ones, the bad word ratio, and the user’s Twitter profile data.

Earlier works by Zhou et al. (2017); Abu-Salih et al. (2019) assessed the credibility of diverse sources based on rules. The analysis by Alrubaian et al. (2017) relied on the relations in a network of reputable individuals to detect and prevent malicious events in social networks. Bukhari et al. (2017) classified tweets into high- and low-impact ones by analyzing their content with SA. They also predicted the users’ areas of expertise by considering some user-context features.

2.2. Social media and ML for financial credibility assessment

In the financial domain, we should mention the work by Kamkarhaghighi et al. (2016), which measured credibility from the number of seed tweets of a user, the number of stock market-oriented followers identified with \$cash-tags, and the ratio between these and other followers. Conversely, Huang et al. (2019) calculated trust scores based on PageRank (PR) and Hyperlink-Induced Topic Search (HITS) models to identify credible data in financial tweets. A list of credible users was extracted from prestigious independent financial authorities. Four trust filters were proposed: experience, expertise, authority, and reputation. The first two considered the user posting frequency, while the others were based on the user’s social network structure, favoring well-connected users. Then, the authors applied SA to the tweet content. Evans et al. (2021) followed a supervised classification approach trained with metadata from the content and the user context, obtaining the best results with tree-based models. They employed counters of Bag of Words (BOW), Part of Speech (POS) tags, and URLs. Moreover, Huang et al. (2021) proposed a solution to identify credible Twitter users based on trustworthy experts. As Kamkarhaghighi et al. (2016), they filtered finance-oriented users with \$cashtags and took financial experts from well-known sources. Then, they trained an ML model with content-oriented and user context features. Interpretability was provided by checking the importance of the features of a Random Forest (RF) classifier.

2.3. Contribution

In light of the comparison with competing solutions in Table 1, our work is the first that (i) assesses user credibility from social media financial posts that are automatically classified into types of forecasts and then validated with actual market data, (ii) provides a credibility ranking as a continuous scale, (iii) analyzes the correlations between this credibility ranking and diverse user context metrics to gain insights on the interest of the audience in financial posts, and (iv) describes the model predictions with natural language explainability techniques. Our solution has been validated using financial posts, and unlike other XAI-based systems in the literature, it exploits the relevance of the features to create natural language descriptions. Even though the training process is time-consuming compared to rule-based approaches presented by Kamkarhaghighi et al. (2016) and Huang et al. (2021), and the approach based on PR and HITS by Huang et al. (2019), the prediction is performed in real-time. In contrast to Evans et al. (2021) and Huang et al. (2021), it offers a credibility ranking on a continuous scale.

Table 1: Comparison of financial user credibility solutions considering the approach, type of features used (content and user context), and availability of continuous-scale ranking (Rank), real-world validation (Val.), and explainability (Ex.)—including feature relevance (FR) and natural language (NL).

Authorship	Social media	Approach	Features	Rank	Val.	Ex.
Kamkarhaghighi et al. (2016)	Twitter	Rules ML	User	✓	✗	✗
Huang et al. (2019)	Twitter	PR, HITS	Content User	✓	✗	✗
Evans et al. (2021)	Twitter	ML	Content User	✗	✗	✗
Huang et al. (2021)	Twitter	Rules ML	Content User	✗	✗	FR
Proposed solution	Twitter Yahoo	ML	Content User	✓	✓	FR NL

3. Methodology

Figure 1 shows the scheme of the proposed solution for the credibility assessment of finance-oriented users. Firstly, the pre-processing module prepares the textual content. Then, the feature engineering module generates n -grams and side features. The hybrid classification module automatically classifies posts in types of forecasts with term detectors and ML algorithms. Prediction quality is ranked by the quality assessment module and described by the explainability module.

3.1. Pre-processing module

Prior to feature extraction is essential to remove meaningless data to ensure optimal knowledge extraction from the textual content. Regular expressions are applied to remove links to external sources (*e.g.*, journals, blogs, etc.) and images. Stop words and special characters (*e.g.*, currency symbols, percentage symbols, etc.) and emoticons are discarded. Finally, the remaining textual content is lemmatized.

3.2. Feature engineering module

Regarding content-based features, we focus on stylistic data such as readability score, reading time, and the number of complex words in the post. Emotion and polarity data are also considered. Textual features are obtained as char and word n -grams. Table 2 details the features engineered. Some require *ad hoc* processing, as explained in Section 4.3.

3.3. Classification module

The hybrid classification module combines categorization based on term detection and ML prediction. As forecast categories, we consider short-term drops, short-term rises, and ‘other,’ a third category for any other post mentioning stock values. As for the short-term time range, we consider up to four weeks. For term-based detection, a term lexicon is defined for each target category. The system considers that a post belongs to a specific category if it contains at least one term in the corresponding lexicon¹, generated in practice as described in Section 4.4. This prior term-based detection increases the system’s efficiency, leaving the remaining posts to be classified using supervised ML models trained with the features detailed in Section 3.2. The ML

¹These lexica are composed of unique terms.




Figure 1: System scheme.

Table 2: Features engineered by data type.

Type	ID	Name	Description
Boolean	1	Emotion	Indicates if the content expresses anger, fear, happiness, sadness, or surprise.
	2	Complex word counter	Number of complex words in the content.
Numerical	3	FRE	Flesch reading ease score to assess readability based on the number of words and the number of syllables per word.
	4	Hashtag counter	Number of hashtags in the content.
	5	MER	McAlpine EFLAW Readability score considering the number of words and mini-words (up to 3 characters) and the number of sentences.
	6	Neg. num.	Amount of negative numerical values referring to a stock or market.
	7	Neg. per.	Amount of negative percentages.
	8	Polarity	Indicates the sentiment of the content, negative (-1), neutral (0), or positive (+1).
	9	POS distributions	Percentages of adjectives, adverbs, auxiliary elements, determiners, nouns, pronouns, and punctuation marks.
	10	Pos. num.	Amount of positive numerical values referring to a stock or market.
	11	Pos. per.	Amount of positive percentages.
	12	Reading time	Estimated time needed to read the content, 14.69 ms per character.
	13	Word count	Number of words in the content.
Textual	14	Char-grams	List of char n -grams in the content.
	15	Word-grams	List of word n -grams in the content.
	16	Word tokens	List of char n -grams only from text inside word boundaries.

algorithms selected, based on their satisfactory performance in the literature (Huang et al., 2021; Ryans, 2021; Alzanin et al., 2022; González-González et al., 2022; Hudon et al., 2022; Jalal et al., 2022; Raheja & Asthana, 2022; Bengesi et al., 2023; Darad & Krishnan, 2023), are (i) Linear Support Vector Machines (LSVM), (ii) Decision Trees (DT), (iii) k-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), (iv) Naive Bayes (NB), (v) Random Forest (RF), and (vi) Gradient Boosting (GB).

3.4. Quality assessment module

This module computes the quality of the predictions according to the category they were classified into. It compares the predicted forecast with the actual evolution of the stock values, identified with \$cashtags and financial tickers. The final quality rank depends on the number of successful predictions. Only posts mentioning stocks or markets are considered for quality evaluation.

3.5. Explainability module

In order to foster the trustworthiness of the automatic analysis, this module presents explanations in natural language based on relevant terms or features. In the case of posts directly classified by term-based detection, the corresponding terms are included in the explanations. The system employs a model-agnostic approach for posts classified by the ML models to extract all the relevant features as explained in Section 4.6. The explanations are presented in natural language using templates. Finally, Figure 2 shows the block diagram of the system from the pre-processing stage to the final quality assessment.




Figure 2: System's block diagram.

4. Evaluation and discussion

This section presents the experimental data set, the implementations of the modules, and the results obtained. The experiments were performed on a computer with the following specifications:

- **Operating System.** Ubuntu 20.04.3 LTS 64 bits
- **Processor.** AMD[®] Ryzen 7 3800X 3.9 GHz
- **RAM.** 32 GB DDR4
- **Disk.** 1 TB SSD

4.1. Experimental data set

The experimental data set contains 15 000 tweets published by 12 Spanish trading advisors (1000 posts per advisor) between January 16, 2017, and June 5, 2023. Following a prior screening using ChatGPT, these posts were manually annotated by financial experts into three categories: (*i*) short-term drop, (*ii*) short-term rise, and (*iii*) other, as previously described. The profiles of the creators were selected to ensure diversity in Twitter statistics (*e.g.*, number of followers, posts per day, etc.). Table 3 shows the distribution of the samples in the experimental data set by category and advisor, while Table 4 details the global distribution of samples by category.

4.2. Pre-processing module

\$cashtags, images, links, and special characters were identified using the regular expressions in Listing 1.

LISTING 1: Regular expressions applied to detect \$cashtags, images, links, and special characters.

```
$cashtags = r '\$[a-zA-Z0-9=][a-zA-Z][a-zA-Z0-9=]+'\n\nr '^ [a-zA-Z0-9=][a-zA-Z][a-zA-Z0-9=]+'\n\nImages/links = r "(?: (pic | http | www | w+)? \\. (//)* ) \S+"\n\nSpecial char. = r "(\\* | \\[ | \\] | = | \\( | \\) | \\$ | \\\" | \\} | \\{ | \\| | \\+ | & | € | £ | / | | °) +"
```

Other financial tickers not expressed in \$cashtag format (*i.e.*, lacking the “\$” symbol or written as hashtags) were detected using regular expressions

Table 3: Distribution of the samples by advisor and category.

Ad.	Short-term drop (%)	Short-term rise (%)	Other (%)
1	3.55	31.81	64.64
2	17.64	42.89	39.48
3	10.26	27.97	61.77
4	13.81	26.23	59.96
5	9.70	39.19	51.11
6	5.00	77.70	17.30
7	16.35	29.49	54.16
8	5.94	30.38	63.68
9	10.09	23.41	66.50
10	7.34	34.31	58.35
11	35.43	27.02	37.55
12	11.42	23.75	64.83

Table 4: Global distribution of samples by category.

Category	% samples
Short-term drop	12.20
Short-term rise	34.53
Other	53.26

combined with dictionaries from the main American² and European³ stock markets. Moreover, stop words were removed using the Spanish NLTK stop word list⁴ while Emoticons by applying the NFKD Unicode normalization form⁵. Finally, posts were lemmatized using the `es_core_news_md` core model of the `spaCy` Python library⁶.

4.3. Feature engineering module

Emotion and polarity (features 1 and 8 in Table 2) were calculated with the `text2emotion`⁷ and `textblob` tools⁸ from the `spaCy` Python library, respectively.

Stylistic features related to complex word count (feature 2), Flesch reading ease (feature 3), McAlpine EFLAW Readability (feature 5), and reading time (feature 12) were obtained with the `textstat`⁹ Python library.

The distribution of POS tags in the posts (feature 9) was computed using the `textdescriptives`¹⁰ Python library.

To compute the textual features, that is, char and word n -grams and word tokens (features 14, 15, and 16), the system employs the `CountVectorizer` function¹¹ from the `scikit-learn` Python library. Listings 2-4 shows the optimal parameters in bold. Even though the ranges provided were established based on preliminary coarse experiments, the best values were identified using the `GridSearchCV`¹² function from the `scikit-learn` Python library, as commonly used in the literature (Evans et al., 2021).

The rest of the features in Table 2 were computed using regular expressions or standard procedures in Python, as in the case of the hashtag counter

²Available at <https://www.sec.gov/file/company-tickers>, June 2024.

³Available at https://www.cboe.com/europe/equities/market_statistics/symbols_traded, June 2024.

⁴Available at <https://www.nltk.org>, June 2024.

⁵Available at <https://unicode.org/reports/tr15>, June 2024.

⁶Available at <https://spacy.io/models/es>, June 2024.

⁷Available at <https://pypi.org/project/text2emotion>, June 2024.

⁸Available at <https://spacy.io/universe/project/spacy-textblob>, June 2024.

⁹Available at <https://pypi.org/project/textstat>, June 2024.

¹⁰Available at <https://pypi.org/project/textdescriptives>, June 2024.

¹¹Available at https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.feature_extraction.text.CountVectorizer.html, June 2024.

¹²Available at https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.model_selection.GridSearchCV.html, June 2024.

(feature 4¹³), and the negative and positive number counters (features 6, 7, 10 and 11¹⁴). After content tokenization, feature 13 is engineered using the Python `len` function.

LISTING 2: Parameter selection for char-grams (best values in bold).

```
max_df = [0.1, 0.12, 0.14, 0.16, 0.18, 0.2, 0.22, 0.24, 0.26,
0.28, 0.3, 0.32, 0.34, 0.36, 0.38, 0.4],
min_df = [0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05],
ngram_range = [(3, 4), (3, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7), (4, 5), (4, 6),
(5, 6)],
max_features = [100, 1000, None]
```

LISTING 3: Parameter selection for word-grams (best values in bold).

```
max_df = [0.17, 0.20, 0.23, 0.26, 0.29, 0.32, 0.35, 0.38, 0.41,
0.44, 0.47, 0.5],
min_df = [0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05],
ngram_range = [(1, 1), (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 2), (2, 3)],
max_features = [100, 1000, None]
```

LISTING 4: Parameter selection for word tokens (best values in bold).

```
max_df = [0.17, 0.20, 0.23, 0.26, 0.29, 0.32, 0.35, 0.38, 0.41,
0.44, 0.47, 0.5],
min_df = [0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05],
ngram_range = [(3, 4), (3, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7), (4, 5), (4, 6),
(5, 6)],
max_features = [100, 1000, None]
```

4.4. Classification module

The representative terms for each category lexicon were created using `CountVectorizer`¹¹. For each category, we selected the 10% most frequent unique terms (*i.e.*, those which only appear in posts of a given category). If one post contained at least one term from the list of a category, it was assigned to that category. For the rest of the posts, the implementations for ML classification algorithms used were:

¹³`r#[a-zA-Z0-9]+'$`.

¹⁴`r'?[0-9.,]+[€%]'?`.

- LSVM. `LinearSVC` implementation¹⁵ from the `scikit-learn` Python library.
- DT. `DecisionTreeClassifier` algorithm¹⁶ from the `scikit-learn` Python library.
- KNN. `KNeighborsClassifier` implementation¹⁷ from the `scikit-learn` Python library.
- NB. Two configurations, Complement Naive Bayes (CNB) and Multinomial Naive Bayes (MNB). The corresponding implementations were `ComplementNB`¹⁸ and `MultinomialNB`¹⁹, both from the `scikit-learn` Python library.
- RF. `RandomForestClassifier` function²⁰ from the `scikit-learn` Python library.
- GB. `GradientBoostingClassifier` function²¹ from the `scikit-learn` Python library.

We estimated the optimal hyperparameters²² for these models using `GridSearchCV`¹², similarly to the feature engineering module. Listings 5-11 contain the ranges of values tested. In the case of KNN, the only valid setting for the `metric` parameter was Minkowski, as the input matrix was not square.

¹⁵Available at <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.svm.LinearSVC.html>, June 2024.

¹⁶Available at <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.tree.DecisionTreeClassifier.html>, June 2024.

¹⁷Available at <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.neighbors.KNeighborsClassifier.html>, June 2024.

¹⁸Available at https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.naive_bayes.ComplementNB.html, June 2024.

¹⁹Available at https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.naive_bayes.MultinomialNB.html, June 2024.

²⁰Available at <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.ensemble.RandomForestClassifier.html>, June 2024.

²¹Available at <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.ensemble.GradientBoostingClassifier.html>, June 2024.

²²Note that we refer to parameters when generating features, while hyperparameters are those applied in ML models.

Term-based detection allowed predicting 62.99% of the samples in the experimental data set, considerably saving computing resources and time. For the subsequent evaluation with ML classification algorithms, we applied 10-fold cross-validation (Aoumeur et al., 2023), implemented using the `StratifiedKFold`²³ function from the `scikit-learn` Python library.

LISTING 5: Hyperparameter selection for LSVM (best values in bold).

```
class_weight = [None, balanced],
loss = [hinge, squared_hinge],
max_iter = [500, 1000, 2000],
multi_class = [ovr],
tol = [0.000001, 0.00001, 0.0001, 0.001, 0.01],
penalty = [l2],
dual = [True],
C = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10]
```

LISTING 6: Hyperparameter selection for DT (best values in bold).

```
criterion = [gini, entropy],
splitter = [best, random],
class_weight = [None, balanced],
max_features = [None, sqrt, log2],
max_depth = [5, 10, 50, 100],
min_samples_split = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],
min_samples_leaf = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1]
```

LISTING 7: Hyperparameter selection for KNN (best values in bold).

```
n_neighbors = [5, 10, 25],
weights = [uniform, distance],
algorithm = [auto, ball_tree, kd_tree, brute],
leaf_size = [5, 10, 15, 25, 30, 50],
p = [1, 2],
metric = [minkowski]
```

LISTING 8: Hyperparameter selection for CNB (best values in bold).

```
alpha = [0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1],
fit_prior = [True, False],
norm = [True, False]
```

²³Available at https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.feature_selection.SelectPercentile.html, June 2024.

LISTING 9: Hyperparameter selection for MNB (best values in bold).

```
alpha = [0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1],
fit_prior = [True, False]
```

LISTING 10: Hyperparameter selection for RF (best values in bold).

```
n_estimators = [50, 100, 250, 500, 1000],
criterion = [gini, entropy],
class_weight = [None, balanced],
max_features = [None, sqrt, log2],
max_depth = [5, 10, 50, 100],
min_samples_split = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],
min_samples_leaf = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1]
```

LISTING 11: Hyperparameter selection for GB (best values in bold).

```
learning_rate = [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],
n_estimators = [10, 100, 1000],
max_depth = [5, 100, 100, 1000],
min_samples_split = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],
min_samples_leaf = [0.0001, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],
max_features = [sqrt, None],
subsample = [0.1, 0.5, 1],
tol = [0.000001, 0.00001, 0.0001, 0.001],
```

Table 5 shows the combined results of term-based and ML classifications. The best values for each measurement are expressed in bold. Note that the best model varies depending on the metric analyzed (i.e., precision, recall, and F -measure) and the target category (i.e., drop and rise). In the particular application of this work, it is necessary to maximize precision by assuming that the quality assessment module receives enough correctly predicted samples.

In light of the results obtained, we can conclude that the most promising models are KNN, MNB, RF, and GB with the best values superior to 80% for all metrics. However, other aspects must also be considered, such as computing time. In this regard, KNN and GB are highly demanding. Lastly, taking into account the interpretable nature of the RF model in favor of explainability, it was selected. On the other hand, Table 6 shows the performance of the final hybrid classification module.

4.5. Quality assessment module

In order to assess the predictions, we obtained the actual market prices for the stocks mentioned in the posts. A valuable resource for this purpose

Table 5: Classification metrics (lexica + ML).

Model	Precision (%)		Recall (%)		F1 (%)		Time (s)	
	Drop	Rise	Drop	Rise	Drop	Rise	Fit	Predict
LSVM	93.51	91.29	71.22	84.47	80.86	87.75	55.70	0.0057
DT	91.08	88.76	68.75	81.82	78.36	85.15	0.03	0.0006
KNN	91.32	91.47	71.50	81.70	80.20	86.31	0.01	0.8525
MNB	72.13	90.75	82.83	80.24	77.11	85.17	0.02	0.0005
CNB	80.83	89.08	77.34	82.40	79.05	85.61	0.02	0.0005
RF	93.77	89.39	72.39	85.87	81.71	87.60	1.89	0.0508
GB	88.90	90.36	76.99	88.25	82.52	89.29	39.73	0.1174

Table 6: Classification metrics by advisor (lexica + RF).

Ad.	Samples			Precision (%)		Recall (%)	
	Drop	Rise	Other	Drop	Rise	Drop	Rise
1	35	314	638	86.67	97.35	74.29	93.63
2	176	428	394	97.33	90.00	82.95	94.63
3	102	278	614	95.45	84.78	61.76	84.17
4	138	262	599	92.00	84.54	50.00	66.79
5	96	388	506	88.89	86.93	66.67	84.02
6	50	777	173	100.00	93.67	76.00	98.97
7	163	294	540	99.15	87.26	71.78	93.20
8	59	302	633	95.12	86.27	66.10	58.28
9	100	232	659	92.31	83.43	60.00	65.09
10	73	341	580	96.00	93.00	65.75	81.82
11	350	267	371	91.74	85.08	85.71	94.01
12	114	237	647	91.30	87.55	73.68	86.08

is the `yfinance` Python library²⁴, which retrieves information about stock prices from Yahoo[®]finance API²⁵.

In this research, the posts were annotated as short-term forecasts or one type or another if they referred to a maximum time range of about four weeks. The latter is because, in short-term trading, the results of the predictions are checked weekly (Weng et al., 2018; Shen & Shafiq, 2020; Duarte et al., 2021). Our assessment considered a drop (/rise) for a particular stock if its minimum (/maximum) price during three work weeks from Monday to Friday was at least 3% lower (/higher)²⁶ than the stock’s closing price the day the post was published. Listing 12 shows examples of two correctly classified posts, one of each essential category.

LISTING 12: Example of two correctly classified posts.

<p>Short-term rise. <i>\$NNOX Está alcista en el corto plazo y mejoraría bastante si superase los 14,73.</i> \$NNOX is bullish in the short term and will improve if it gets over 14.73.</p> <p>Short-term drop. <i>\$ASML inmerso en un canal bajista de corto plazo</i> \$ASML lost on a downward channel in the short term.</p>
--

Figure 3 shows the evolution of these stocks’ prices from the post’s publication until the end of the 4-week window. Both plots clearly show that the predictions of the posts’ forecasts are coherent with the evolution of the stock values. A colored dot marks the first day the 3% difference was fulfilled. Therefore, both predictions were correct, and the respective quality rankings were updated.


Moreover, Table 7 shows the quality rankings of the predictions estimated per advisor as success probabilities, which are continuous variables, as desired. In light of the results, we can observe three different profiles: one more balanced, represented by advisors 2 and 12, with similar qualities for both drops and rises; another better in drops, like that of advisors 4, 5, and 7; and another in rises, like advisors 1 and 6.

Additionally, Table 8 shows the social network metrics (user-context metrics) of the advisors’ accounts on June 5, 2023. The peak and average likes,


²⁴Available at <https://pypi.org/project/yfinance>, June 2024.

²⁵Available at <https://finance.yahoo.com>, June 2024.

²⁶Established based on experimental tests.



(a) Nano-X Imaging Ltd stock price evolution.



(b) ASML stock price evolution.

Figure 3: Evolution of \$NNOX and \$ASML stocks.

retweets, and replies were calculated using the last 1,000 published posts.

Finally, we studied the correlations between the continuous quality rankings and the user-context metrics of the users’ accounts, the number of followers, and the average and peak number of likes, retweets, and replies. This test offered insights into the reputation of the advisors in the social network and why the users preferred them. Table 9 shows the correlations.

Table 7: Advisors’ rankings.

Ad.	Prediction quality (%)		
	Drop	Rise	Global
1	50.00	83.33	80.77
2	76.04	78.00	77.27
3	70.00	76.00	73.24
4	79.63	66.10	69.61
5	73.17	62.21	64.18
6	60.61	67.49	67.36
7	77.91	63.27	67.70
8	80.95	75.86	76.25
9	75.76	72.86	73.58
10	90.91	84.34	85.26
11	73.95	69.28	72.29
12	64.37	63.37	63.91

The strongest correlations in the table suggest that users are more fond of advisors who correctly predict rises and do not value those who predict drops. However, we can observe a relation between drop predictions with retweets and replies. The latter suggests that, even though drop predictions are less popular (as they are more challenging to convert into gains for inexpert investors) regarding likes, they attract the interest of investors who comment about them and share them with other users.

4.6. Explainability module

A model-agnostic approach evaluates a model according to its performance regardless of its internal structure. The LIME²⁷ (Local Interpretable

²⁷Available at <https://lime-ml.readthedocs.io/en/latest>, June 2024.

Table 8: Social network metrics of the advisors.

Ad.	Followers	Retweets		Likes		Replies	
		Avg.	Max.	Avg.	Max.	Avg.	Max.
1	10800	6.50	66	5.95	404	0.19	22
2	2657	40.57	12	3.74	52	0.73	74
3	33933	176.11	1919	31.61	313	2.25	54
4	18796	187.68	1188	18.74	246	1.18	26
5	5218	245.02	56109	5.04	70	0.78	13
6	891	1.32	8	0.78	11	0.08	2
7	3609	4.39	9	4.36	34	0.34	12
8	12062	37.29	1070	4.86	72	1.08	16
9	8574	210.72	92565	10.55	254	0.84	38
10	3465	183.45	34457	3.54	116	0.77	20
11	4650	106.03	11	5.39	66	0.92	14
12	3662	11.77	1049	2.90	160	0.70	43

Table 9: Correlations between social network metrics and quality rankings.

Social metric		Correlations		
		Drop	Rise	Global
Followers	Num.	-0.029	0.184	0.091
	Avg.	0.473	-0.018	0.031
Retweets	Max.	0.264	-0.007	0.021
	Avg.	0.049	0.084	0.011
Likes	Max.	-0.406	0.403	0.302
	Avg.	0.331	0.107	0.056
Replies	Max.	0.030	0.284	0.180

Model-Agnostic Explanations) algorithm trains a local model that reproduces the performance of the original model and evaluates the impact of the presence (or absence) of a given input feature in the final classification result.

From the resulting most relevant features, we explained in natural language the prediction outcome using the template in Listing 13, where *<tweet>* represents the original published post, *<category>* the prediction of the classification module and *<terms>* and *<features>* unique terms and the most relevant features involved in the classification, respectively.

As the textual features may include char-grams not corresponding to understandable words, we implemented the methodology in our previous research (González-González et al., 2023), which approximates those char-grams to the extended most frequent words that contain them.

LISTING 13: Natural language explanation template (in English).


```
The classification of the post <tweet> as <category> can be explained by the presence of these terms: <terms>. Additionally, the process considered the following features: <features>.
```

Listing 14 contains a real example of an explanation generated for a classified post.

LISTING 14: Explanation example.

```
The classification of the post “#SANTANDER Bullish divergence monitoring 4.54 euros at close as short-term rise can be explained by the presence of these terms: [‘bullish’, ‘divergence’]. Additionally, the process considered the following features: [‘Pos. num.’].
```

The post, classified as a short-term rise, contains unique terms *bullish* and *divergence*. Additionally, the model-agnostic methodology considered favorable prices (feature 10 in Table 2) a relevant feature. This explanation in natural language is descriptive and understandable for a user without expert knowledge in finance or ML. Figure 4 shows the mobile application. In the picture on the left (a), the list of posts displayed includes information about the author, ticker, and short-term prediction. When the end user selects a particular post, a new window pops up (picture on the right (b)) to explain the prediction in natural language.



(a) List of analyzed posts.



(b) Selected post explanation.

Figure 4: Mobile application.

4.7. Discussion and comparison with prior work

The credibility of social media in finance has already been studied in prior work. However, this research follows a more integral solution by comparing automatic classifications of posts’ forecasts with the actual evolution of market values. The results are comparable or superior to those in the literature (Kamkarhaghighi et al., 2016; Evans et al., 2021). Our system offers high classification performance and a quality ranking that we have compared with user-context social media metrics. The solution accurately classifies financial social media posts using a hybrid approach that combines term-based and ML techniques with average precision values exceeding 90% in the case of RF. It then automatically assesses user credibility from social media, providing a credibility ranking on a continuous scale. As valuable insights toward understanding human behavior related to stock market predictions, we have identified a positive correlation between drop predictions and retweets and replies and an inverse correlation between those predictions and the number of likes.

As a side contribution to explainability, we offer model-agnostic descriptions using natural language templates, which are legible and easily understandable. For example, the latter is more flexible than the approach by Huang et al. (2021), which requires previous knowledge about the structure of the DT model and does not provide explanations in natural language.

5. Conclusions

Social media anonymity, fast-spreading, and low-effort information-sharing have raised credibility concerns about users regarded as experts. Since the amount of information users post is enormous, there is a need for automatic mechanisms to evaluate their reputation. Most current works on credibility assessment have mainly approached this task as a binary classification problem instead of ranking credibility as a continuous metric and do not compare their outcome with real-world data. Moreover, they do not have automatic explainability capabilities.

The main contribution of this research is a credibility assessment methodology combining ML and Natural Language Processing (NLP), applied to financial posts’ forecasts, which are automatically classified and compared with the actual evolution of the market values. This allows ranking credibility to be a continuous metric of success probability. Moreover, the correlations between the credibility ranking and the social media metrics (*i.e.*, the user

context) produce insights related to the interest of the end-users regarding the posts' forecasts. Concerning explainability, the system generates descriptions of its decisions in natural language, which are legible and easily understandable, using a model-agnostic approach. Therefore, the classification can be entirely modular and interchangeable. This explainable system may allow non-expert investors to understand the classifier's decisions and quickly judge investment recommendations, thus empowering them with valuable financial knowledge on market strategies. The resulting application supports continuous real-time analysis of the posts (the prediction time with RF was 0.05 seconds).

Furthermore, given the fact that the underlying term-based and ML techniques can be applied to many NLP tasks (*i.e.*, SA, detection of fake news, classification of medical or legal texts), the strategy in this work can be applied to any field with a strong presence in social media in which reputation assessment has value, such as recommendation platforms or online gaming, complementing traditional metrics like the past return rate (yield) and percentage of success.

In future work, we plan to take advantage of real-time data to train our models in streaming mode, introduce new approaches (*e.g.*, reinforcement learning) to further enhance the system's adaptability, and analyze how new features influence the assessment, including the effect of the elapsed time between the post and the current date, which will be addressed with sliding windows. We will explore how to improve recall in our system by reducing the data drift problems in posts written by different authors. We will also study adaptive precision methods to select the safest investment recommendations and explore long-term stock market opportunities. Finally, we will consider the application to other fields, such as online gaming with sports bets.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Silvia García-Méndez: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Francisco de Arriba-Pérez:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Jaime González-González:** Software, Validation, Re-

sources, Data Curation, Writing – original draft. **Francisco J. González-Castaño**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no competing financial interests or personal relationships that could influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

Data are available on request from the authors.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by (i) Xunta de Galicia grants ED481B-2021-118, ED481B-2022-093, and ED431C 2022/04, Spain; (ii) Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación grant TED2021-130824B-C21, Spain; and (iii) University of Vigo/CISUG for open access charge.

References

- Abdullah, B., Alosaimi, N., & Almotiri, S. (2021). Reputation Measurement based on a Hybrid Sentiment Analysis Approach for Saudi Telecom Companies. *Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl.*, 12, 929–937. doi:10.14569/IJACSA.2021.01206107.
- Abu-Salih, B., Wongthongtham, P., Chan, K. Y., & Zhu, D. (2019). Cred-SaT: Credibility ranking of users in big social data incorporating semantic analysis and temporal factor. *J. Inf. Sci.*, 45, 259–280. doi:10.1177/0165551518790424.
- Akbar, M. A., Khan, A. A., Mahmood, S., Rafi, S., & Demi, S. (2023). Trustworthy artificial intelligence: A decision-making taxonomy of potential challenges. *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, (pp. 1–30). doi:10.1002/spe.3216.
- Al-Yazidi, S. A., Berri, J., & Hassan, M. M. (2022). Novel hybrid model for organizations' reputation in online social networks. *J. King Saud Univ. Comput. Inf. Sci.*, 34, 5305–5317. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2022.01.006.

- Alrubaian, M., Al-Qurishi, M., Al-Rakhami, M., Hassan, M. M., & Alamri, A. (2017). Reputation-based credibility analysis of Twitter social network users. *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.*, *29*, 1–12. doi:10.1002/cpe.3873.
- Alzanin, S. M., Azmi, A. M., & Aboalsamh, H. A. (2022). Short text classification for Arabic social media tweets. *J. King Saud Univ. Comput. Inf. Sci.*, *34*, 6595–6604. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2022.03.020.
- Aoumeur, N. E., Li, Z., & Alshari, E. M. (2023). Improving the Polarity of Text through word2vec Embedding for Primary Classical Arabic Sentiment Analysis. *Neural Process. Lett.*, *55*, 2249–2264. doi:10.1007/s11063-022-11111-1.
- Asfand-E-Yar, M., Hashir, Q., Tanvir, S. H., & Khalil, W. (2023). Classifying Misinformation of User Credibility in Social Media Using Supervised Learning. *Comput. Mater. Contin.*, *75*, 2921–2938. doi:10.32604/cmc.2023.034741.
- Assery, N., Xiaohong, Y. D., Xiuli, Q., Kaushik, R., & Almalki, S. (2022). Evaluating disaster-related tweet credibility using content-based and user-based features. *Inf. Discov. Deliv.*, *50*, 45–53. doi:10.1108/IDD-04-2020-0044.
- Batic, D., Stankovic, V., & Stankovic, L. (2024). Towards Transparent Load Disaggregation – A Framework for Quantitative Evaluation of Explainability Using Explainable AI. *IEEE Trans. Consum. Electron.*, (pp. 1–12). doi:10.1109/TCE.2023.3300530.
- Bengesi, S., Oladunni, T., Olusegun, R., & Audu, H. (2023). A Machine Learning-Sentiment Analysis on Monkeypox Outbreak: An Extensive Dataset to Show the Polarity of Public Opinion From Twitter Tweets. *IEEE Access*, *11*, 11811–11826. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3242290.
- Bukhari, A., Qamar, U., & Ghazia, U. (2017). URWF: user reputation based weightage framework for Twitter micropost classification. *Inf. Syst. bus. Manag.*, *15*, 623–659. doi:10.1007/s10257-016-0320-0.
- Cambria, E., Malandri, L., Mercurio, F., Mezzanzanica, M., & Nobani, N. (2023). A survey on XAI and natural language explanations. *Inf. Process. Manag.*, *60*, 1–16. doi:10.1016/j.ipm.2022.103111.

- Chen, R., Li, J., Zhang, H., Sheng, C., Liu, L., & Cao, X. (2023). Sim2Word: Explaining Similarity with Representative Attribute Words via Counterfactual Explanations. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.*, *19*, 220–242. doi:10.1145/3563039.
- Darad, S., & Krishnan, S. (2023). Sentimental analysis of COVID-19 twitter data using deep learning and machine learning models. *Ingenius*, *2023*, 108–117. doi:10.17163/ings.n29.2023.10.
- Duarte, J. J., González, S. M., & Cruz, J. C. (2021). Predicting Stock Price Falls Using News Data: Evidence from the Brazilian Market. *Comput. Econ.*, *57*, 311–340. doi:10.1007/s10614-020-10060-y.
- Evans, L., Owda, M., Crockett, K., & Vilas, A. F. (2021). Credibility assessment of financial stock tweets. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, *168*, 1–16. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2020.114351.
- González-González, J., Arriba-Pérez, F., García-Méndez, S., Busto-Castiñeira, A., & González-Castaño, F. J. (2023). Automatic explanation of the classification of Spanish legal judgments in jurisdiction-dependent law categories with tree estimators. *J. King Saud Univ. Comput. Inf. Sci.*, (pp. 101634–101645). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2023.101634.
- González-González, J., García-Mendez, S., Arriba-Pérez, F. D., González-Castaño, F. J., & Barba-Seara, O. (2022). Explainable Automatic Industrial Carbon Footprint Estimation From Bank Transaction Classification Using Natural Language Processing. *IEEE Access*, *10*, 126326–126338. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3226324.
- Hanaforoosh, M., Ashtiani, M., & Azgomi, M. A. (2021). An approach based on multiplex networks for modeling cascading trust failures in social networks. *J. Comput. Sci.*, *54*, 101430–101446. doi:10.1016/j.jocs.2021.101430.
- Huang, T.-C., Zaeem, R. N., & Barber, K. S. (2019). It Is an Equal Failing to Trust Everybody and to Trust Nobody: Stock price prediction using trust filters and enhanced user sentiment on Twitter. *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, *19*, 1–20. doi:10.1145/3338855.

- Huang, T.-C., Zaeem, R. N., & Barber, K. S. (2021). Identifying Real-world Credible Experts in the Financial Domain. *Digit. Threat. Res. Pract.*, *2*, 1–14. doi:10.1145/3446783.
- Hudon, A., Beaudoin, M., Phraxayavong, K., Dellazizzo, L., Potvin, S., & Dumais, A. (2022). Implementation of a machine learning algorithm for automated thematic annotations in avatar: A linear support vector classifier approach. *Health Inform. J.*, *28*, 1–12. doi:10.1177/14604582221142442.
- Jalal, N., Mehmood, A., Choi, G. S., & Ashraf, I. (2022). A novel improved random forest for text classification using feature ranking and optimal number of trees. *J. King Saud Univ. Comput. Inf. Sci.*, *34*, 2733–2742. doi:10.1016/j.jksuci.2022.03.012.
- Jing, N., Wu, Z., Lyu, S., & Sugumaran, V. (2021). Information credibility evaluation in online professional social network using tree augmented naïve Bayes classifier. *Electron. Commer. Res.*, *21*, 645–669. doi:10.1007/s10660-019-09387-y.
- Jung, S., Noh, Y., Moon, J., & Hwang, E. (2022). VAPER: A deep learning model for explainable probabilistic regression. *J. Comput. Sci.*, *63*, 101824–101836. doi:10.1016/j.jocs.2022.101824.
- Kaliyar, R. K., Goswami, A., & Narang, P. (2021). DeepFakE: improving fake news detection using tensor decomposition-based deep neural network. *J. Supercomput.*, *77*, 1015–1037. doi:10.1007/s11227-020-03294-y.
- Kamkarhaghighi, M., Chepurna, I., Aghababaei, S., & Makrehchi, M. (2016). Discovering Credible Twitter Users in Stock Market Domain. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence* (pp. 66–72). IEEE. doi:10.1109/WI.2016.0020.
- Kozik, R., Kula, S., Choraś, M., & Woźniak, M. (2022). Technical solution to counter potential crime: Text analysis to detect fake news and disinformation. *J. Comput. Sci.*, *60*, 101576–101583. doi:10.1016/j.jocs.2022.101576.
- Kurniati, R., & Widiantoro, D. H. (2017). Identification of Twitter User Credibility Using Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the International*

Conference on Instrumentation, Communications, Information Technology, and Biomedical Engineering (pp. 282–286). IEEE. doi:10.1109/ICICI-BME.2017.8537765.

- Li, J., Paananen, V., Suryanarayana, S. A., Huusko, E., Kuuttila, M., Mäntylä, M., & Hosio, S. (2023). It is an online platform and not the real world, I don't care much: Investigating Twitter Profile Credibility with an Online Machine Learning-Based Tool. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval* (pp. 117–127). Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3576840.3578308.
- Nian, F., Shi, Y., & Cao, J. (2021). Modeling information propagation in high-order networks based on explicit–implicit relationship. *J. Comput. Sci.*, *55*, 101438–101445. doi:10.1016/j.jocs.2021.101438.
- Page, J. T., & Duffy, M. E. (2018). What Does Credibility Look like? Tweets and Walls in U.S. Presidential Candidates' Visual Storytelling. *J. Political Mark.*, *17*, 3–31. doi:10.1080/15377857.2016.1171819.
- Pelau, C., Pop, M.-I., Stanescu, M., & Sanda, G. (2023). The Breaking News Effect and Its Impact on the Credibility and Trust in Information Posted on Social Media. *Electronics*, *12*, 1–11. doi:10.3390/electronics12020423.
- Prada, A., & Iglesias, C. A. (2020). Predicting Reputation in the Sharing Economy with Twitter Social Data. *Appl. Sci.*, *10*, 1–18. doi:10.3390/app10082881.
- Qureshi, K. A., Malick, R. A. S., & Sabih, M. (2021). Social Media and Microblogs Credibility: Identification, Theory Driven Framework, and Recommendation. *IEEE Access*, *9*, 137744–137781. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3114417.
- Raheja, S., & Asthana, A. (2022). Sentiment Analysis of Tweets During the COVID-19 Pandemic Using Multinomial Logistic Regression. *Int. J. Softw. Innov.*, *11*, 1–16. doi:10.4018/IJSI.315740.
- Ryans, J. P. (2021). Textual classification of SEC comment letters. *Rev. Account. Stud.*, *26*, 37–80. doi:10.1007/s11142-020-09565-6.

- Shen, J., & Shafiq, M. O. (2020). Short-term stock market price trend prediction using a comprehensive deep learning system. *J. Big Data*, 7, 1–33. doi:10.1186/s40537-020-00333-6.
- Shrestha, A., Duran, J., Spezzano, F., & Serra, E. (2024). Joint Credibility Estimation of News, User, and Publisher via Role-relational Graph Convolutional Networks. *ACM Trans. Web*, 18, 1–24. doi:10.1145/3617418.
- Verma, P. K., Agrawal, P., Madaan, V., & Gupta, C. (2022). UCred: fusion of machine learning and deep learning methods for user credibility on social media. *Soc. Netw. Anal. Min.*, 12, 1–10. doi:10.1007/s13278-022-00880-1.
- Weng, B., Lu, L., Wang, X., Megahed, F. M., & Martinez, W. (2018). Predicting short-term stock prices using ensemble methods and online data sources. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 112, 258–273. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2018.06.016.
- Zhou, F., Jin, J., Du, X., Zhang, B., & Yin, X. (2017). A calculation method for social network user credibility. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Communications* (pp. 1–6). IEEE. doi:10.1109/ICC.2017.7997425.