

# From Words to Worth: Newborn Article Impact Prediction with LLM

Penghai Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Qinghua Xing<sup>1</sup>, Kairan Dou<sup>1</sup>, Jinyu Tian<sup>1</sup>, Ying Tai<sup>3</sup>, Jian Yang<sup>1</sup>,  
Ming-Ming Cheng<sup>12</sup>, Xiang Li<sup>\*12</sup>

<sup>1</sup>VCIP, CS, Nankai University <sup>2</sup>NKIARI, Shenzhen Futian <sup>3</sup>PCALab, Nanjing University  
zhaopenghai@mail.nankai.edu.cn, xiang.li.implus@nankai.edu.cn

## Abstract

As the academic landscape expands, the challenge of efficiently identifying potentially high-impact articles among the vast number of newly published works becomes critical. This paper introduces a promising approach, leveraging the capabilities of fine-tuned LLMs to predict the future impact of newborn articles solely based on titles and abstracts. Moving beyond traditional methods heavily reliant on external information, the proposed method discerns the shared semantic features of highly impactful papers from a large collection of title-abstract and potential impact pairs. These semantic features are further utilized to regress an improved metric,  $TNCSI_{SP}$ , which has been endowed with value, field, and time normalization properties. Additionally, a comprehensive dataset has been constructed and released for fine-tuning the LLM, containing over 12,000 entries with corresponding titles, abstracts, and  $TNCSI_{SP}$ . The quantitative results, with an  $NDCG@20$  of 0.901, demonstrate that the proposed approach achieves state-of-the-art performance in predicting the impact of newborn articles when compared to competitive counterparts. Finally, we demonstrate a real-world application for predicting the impact of newborn journal articles to demonstrate its noteworthy practical value. Overall, our findings challenge existing paradigms and propose a shift towards a more content-focused prediction of academic impact, offering new insights for assessing newborn article impact.

## Introduction

The emerging field of article impact prediction is becoming increasingly critical in advancing scientific research. Generally, it focuses on forecasting the potential future citation counts of academic publications by exploiting the external data related to the article (Xia, Li, and Li 2023), such as early citation feature, venue characteristics, and author reputation, *etc.* Unlike traditional bibliometric evaluations that measure established influence, article impact prediction typically encompasses a broader range of applications. Large institutions utilize it for research funding decisions and academic promotions. Individuals may also benefit from impact predictions, which help them efficiently identify cutting-edge articles and remain leading in their fields, especially given the hundreds of daily arXiv submissions across various academic disciplines.




Figure 1: A taxonomy of article impact prediction (AIP): since there are virtually no other Lv. II methods, the “newborn AIP” segment represents the proposed approach, which predicts future academic impact in a “double-blind peer-review” manner.

Recently, as the field of Large Language Model (LLM) agent-based automated scientific research systems rapidly evolves (de la Torre-López, Ramírez, and Romero 2023; Wang et al. 2023), article impact prediction has never been more important than it is today. Imitating human experts, these autonomous systems typically start with identifying the most relevant and valuable research literature from extensive academic articles. Only then do these systems extract and synthesize knowledge from the retrieved literature, thereby enabling practical applications such as idea generation (Baek et al. 2024) and compound discovery (M. Bran et al. 2024), *etc.* As the saying goes, *You can’t make bricks without straw*, article impact prediction has thus become a central component of automated research systems.

However, almost all existing impact prediction approaches rely on external historical data (Vergoulis et al. 2020; Wang et al. 2021; Zhao and Feng 2022; Abbas et al. 2023; Zhang and Wu 2024), which limits the practical value of these methods. Particularly, for those newly uploaded papers on pre-print websites (*e.g.*, arXiv), the absence of his-

torical citation data and publication venue information poses challenges for existing methods to make accurate predictions. In addition, although most academic efforts prefer to predict citation counts, the validity of citation counts themselves remains debatable. As the Leiden Manifesto (Hicks et al. 2015) and the DORA Declaration (San Francisco 2018) indicate, citation count is not well suited for cross-disciplinary comparable evaluations and should not be used as the sole metric for assessing research impact. For example, a paper (Li et al. 2023) with one hundred citations might be unsurprising in the booming field of artificial intelligence, but in a relatively narrow yet equally important field such as paleontology, the paper with one hundred citations (Turner 2011) could be considered a cornerstone. Since automated scientific research systems mostly start from estimating the value of articles, such limitations undoubtedly weaken their ability to gather knowledge from other fields, thereby reducing the efficiency of knowledge synthesis.

To address the potential issues of regarding citation counts as the regression target, we first draw inspiration from the design principles of the Topic Normalized Citation Success Index (TNCSI) (Zhao et al. 2024) and make tailored improvements to adapt it for predicting the impact of newborn papers across various fields. The improved metric is named  $TNCSI_{SP}$ , where  $SP$  stands for the Same Period, to highlight that the proposed metric is capable of comparing papers across varying time frames. In response to the problem of over-reliance on external information, we contend that the “worth” of an article can typically be assessed by “words”, since key elements such as contribution, novelty, and insights are often reflected in the title and abstract. Therefore, we try to regress the  $TNCSI_{SP}$  by feeding only the title and abstract of the article to fine-tuning the LLMs for reliable impact predictions.

For better clarity on the current state of impact prediction methods, we summarize and introduce a taxonomy based on the information required for the prediction (See in Fig. 1). The first level is called unrestricted article impact prediction, where predictions are permitted to rely on external historical information, and authors’ reputation; this is the level at which most current methods are situated. The second level is named newborn article impact prediction, which particularly emphasizes making predictions about the impact only based on the article itself. This task is similar to a double-blind review process, where the model predicts the future impact without any author and affiliation information, publication details, or early citation data. Such an approach is particularly valuable for screening newly uploaded manuscripts, such as arXiv pre-prints and conference papers, as it may help researchers effectively identify the most promising articles. In this paper, we focus on the most challenging yet most valuable task: newborn article impact prediction.

To summarize, the core contributions of this work are as follows:

- **New Task:** We introduce a taxonomy and define a novel task entitled newborn article impact prediction, which aims to accurately predict the scholarly impact of newly published articles without external information.

- **New Method:** Tailored improvements have been made to the TNCSI, and for the first time, we demonstrate that LLMs are capable of predicting the future impact of newborn articles in a “double-blind review” setup.
- **New Dataset:** Accordingly, we have constructed and released the TKPD and NAID datasets. They are used to guide ChatGPT in generating topic key phrases and to train state-of-the-art LLMs for accurate article impact predictions, respectively.
- **Application:** Finally, we discuss and present an example of the proposed method’s application in a real-world scenario, specifically in predicting the impact of journal articles published in 2024, with the hope of inspiring further advancements in the broader research field.

Our code framework, datasets are released at [sway.cloud.microsoft/KOH09sPR21Ubojbc](https://sway.cloud.microsoft/KOH09sPR21Ubojbc).

## Related Work

**Bibliometrics** is a research field that utilizes quantitative analysis and statistical methods to assess the impact of scholarly publications. Typically, bibliometrics can be divided into two major categories: metrics for evaluating journals and metrics for evaluating individual articles. As the Leiden Manifesto (Hicks et al. 2015) and the DORA Declaration (San Francisco 2018) recommend, *do not use journal-based metrics to measure the quality of individual research articles*. Therefore, in this paper, we do not intend to use any journal-level bibliometric indicators (such as JIF (Garfield 1955)) as inputs or prediction targets. Instead, we focus on bibliometric indicators for individual articles. Tab. 1 illustrates the differences among them. Although FWCI and RCR are excellent metrics, their non-normalized numerical properties may impair the convergence of neural networks. Proposed by Zhao *et al.*, TNCSI (Zhao et al. 2024) features a clear physical meaning and favorable mathematical properties, representing the probability (ranges between 0 and 1) that an article’s impact surpasses that of other articles in the same field. However, TNCSI is initially designed to evaluate review papers across different fields and is therefore not suitable for assessing normal research papers. Furthermore, TNCSI primarily focuses on assessing the existing impact of a review paper and does not normalize the impact of papers published in different years. This may lead to potential unfair comparisons in newborn article impact prediction tasks. Therefore, we propose an improved version to address the limitations of TNCSI. More details can be found in the Approach section.

**Article Impact Prediction** approaches typically adopt machine learning methods to forecast the future impact of articles. Most existing methods tend to exploit article statistical features, author characteristics, journal attributes, and historical citation data to aid decision trees, LSTM, MLP, and other machine learning algorithms in making predictions (Fu and Aliferis 2008; Wang, Yu, and Yu 2011; Qiu and Han 2024; Kousha and Thelwall 2024). Ruan *et al.* (Ruan et al. 2020) aims to enhance the prediction accuracy of five-year citation counts using a four-layer Back Propagation (BP) neural network by leveraging multiple features related

Bibliometric	Value	Field	Time
Cites	×	×	×
FWCI (Colledge 2014)	×	✓	×
RCR (Hutchins et al. 2016)	×	✓	×
TNCSI (Zhao et al. 2024)	✓	✓	×
TNCSI <sub>SP</sub> ( <i>Ours</i> )	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Several article-level bibliometrics for evaluating scholar Impact: value, field, and time respectively indicate whether the metric is a value between 0 and 1, whether it allows for cross-field comparisons, and whether it is suitable for the comparison of papers published at different times.

to papers, journals, authors, references, and early citations. Ma *et al.* (Ma et al. 2021) propose a citation count prediction model that uses early citations and paper semantic features as input and employs Bi-LSTM for final predictions. Another notable citation-based machine learning approach exploits static features and time-dependent citation features to predict potentially excellent papers (Hu, Cui, and Lin 2023). In ABBAS’s work (Abbas et al. 2023), an MLP-based method leveraging only time-related features is proposed to make prediction of future citation counts, achieving a decent performance with an NDCG of 0.95. Zhang et al. (Zhang and Wu 2024) discover that employing different models for papers in various domains significantly enhances the accuracy of prediction by leveraging early citation data. De (de Winter 2024) attempts to guide ChatGPT-4 in scoring over 2,000 paper abstracts from multiple perspectives, finding that the scores have Spearman correlation coefficients greater than 0.4 with Mendeley readership, and a correlation of 0.18 with citation counts. To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no method capable of accurately predicting the impact of an article based solely on the internal content.

**Large Language Models** have demonstrated powerful long-form text modeling capabilities and have been widely applied to various NLP tasks over the past few years, including dialogue systems, machine translation, sentiment analysis, *etc.* (Zhao et al. 2023) Many commercial large language models (OpenAI 2022, 2023; Google 2024; Kimi.ai 2024) are not openly accessible, which prevents us from fine-tuning or instruction-tuning them. Therefore, we turned our attention to several excellent open-access large language models. LLaMA series (Touvron et al. 2023; AI 2024) are advanced language models created by Meta AI, available in multiple versions ranging from 7B to 70B parameters. It demonstrates decent performance on most tasks and has been widely adopted for various applications. Apart from LLaMA, there are several other notable open-source large language models, such as Qwen (Bai et al. 2023), Mistral (Jiang et al. 2023), Falcon (Almazrouei et al. 2023), *etc.* Regardless of the specific large language model, they were originally developed for autoregressive text generation. In this study, we use only the first generated token for numerical regression. Detailed descriptions and comprehensive evaluations of these models will be provided in the Approach and Experiment sections.

## Approach

### Tailored Improvement to the TNCSI

As mentioned in the Related Work section, TNCSI suffers from certain limitations, such as being restricted to evaluating review papers and only taking into account the cumulative impact of articles. We conducted a detailed analysis of its computational process and identified the reasons behind these limitations. First, TNCSI requires a predefined prompt template to guide ChatGPT in generating a corresponding review research area from the given title and abstract. The original prompt is specifically designed for review papers rather than normal research papers. Therefore, using their prompt directly on regular papers results in poor performance. Second, TNCSI primarily considers the cumulative impact of an article since its publication. However, for constructing datasets of the article impact prediction task, this approach may lead to potential issues of unfair comparison. Specifically, papers published earlier typically exhibit higher TNCSI values than recently published ones. This could potentially confuse the network’s learning process, making LLM difficult to model the relationship between text features and its impact values.

Based on the discussion above, we make tailored improvements to the TNCSI and name the improved metric as TNCSI<sub>SP</sub>. Similar to the computational procedure of TNCSI, the procedure of the proposed TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> is divided into three steps. In the first step, a well-designed prompt is utilized to guide ChatGPT (currently refer to gpt-3.5-turbo-0125) to identify the topic key phrase of an article. We have designed and tested a variety of prompt templates for identifying the article key phrase from different perspectives. To further mitigate individual cognitive biases, we enlisted the help of numerous researchers in the prompt creation process. All prompt templates are tested on a human-annotated dataset to evaluate the corresponding performance in the key phrase identification task. The second step involves using ChatGPT-generated key phrases to retrieve 1,000 related papers and their meta-info (*e.g.*, citation counts) from the Semantic Scholar API. Unlike TNCSI, which considers citation counts over the entire timeframe, TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> focuses on the concurrent papers within a 6-month window before and after the publication date. This approach ensures that each paper is compared only to others published within a similar timeframe, thereby minimizing the citation advantage that older papers accumulate due to their extended presence. As a result, this method endows TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> with the ability to normalize citation impact across different publication times. The final step remains consistent with TNCSI. The simplified mathematical expressions are shown as follows:

$$P(X = x) = \frac{\text{Count}(p_x)}{C}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $C = 1000$  refers to the total number of retrieved papers.  $\text{Count}(p_x)$  represents the number of paper  $p$  with  $x$  citations.  $P(X = x)$  is a discrete probability distribution that describes the probability of a paper having exactly  $x$  citations among the retrieved  $C$  papers.

In their work (Zhao et al. 2024),  $P(X = x)$  has been thoroughly discussed and is shown to follow an exponen-




Figure 2: Flowchart for calculating  $TNCSI_{SP}$ :  $TNCSI_{SP} \in [0, 1]$  represents the probability that a paper’s citation count outperforms other papers in the same field and time period. “S2” refers to Semantic Scholar.

tially decaying distribution. Therefore, it could be converted into a probability density function using the maximum likelihood estimation. As shown in Eq. (2), we may derive the final  $TNCSI_{SP} \in [0, 1]$  by calculating the value of the corresponding definite integral:

$$TNCSI_{SP} = \int_0^{cites} \lambda e^{-\lambda x} dx, x \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

where *cites* represents the number of citations that the paper being evaluated has received.

### LLM for Newborn Article Impact Prediction

The autoregressive mechanism of large language models has been well-documented (Zhao et al. 2023). Essentially, these decoder-only models generate text in a sequential manner, with each token prediction relying on the context provided by the previously generated tokens. Such a paradigm allows it to fully leverage unlabeled data for self-supervised learning.




Figure 3: LLM as scholar impact predictor: overall framework of the proposed approach.

In this paper, we maintain the autoregressive generation scheme of the large language model unchanged. However, unlike conventional text generation, we focus solely on the first token that the model generates autoregressively in response to user input. Specifically, assume the current input sequence is  $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t\}$ . The relationship between the LLM and the generation of the next token  $w_{t+1}$  can be expressed as:

$$w_{t+1} = \text{LLM}(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t), \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{LLM}(\cdot)$  represents a large language model that predicts the next token in the sequence based on the input token sequence  $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t\}$ .

To facilitate the LLM’s prediction of a single numerical value, We employ a simple multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to transform  $w_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times 1 \times D}$  into a real number  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, the value  $v$  is fed to a Sigmoid function, resulting in the predicted  $TN\hat{C}SI_{SP} \in [0, 1]$ . Here,  $B$  represents the batch size,  $D$  is the dimension, and  $\mathbb{R}$  denotes the set of real numbers. The process can be represented by the following equations:

$$TN\hat{C}SI_{SP} = \sigma(\text{MLP}(w_{t+1})), \quad (4)$$

where  $TN\hat{C}SI_{SP}$  is obtained by passing  $w_{t+1}$  through a MLP and then applying the Sigmoid function  $\sigma$  to the MLP output.

Finally, we aim to minimize the mean square error (MSE) loss to align the predicted output  $TN\hat{C}SI_{SP}$  of the network to the  $TNCSI_{SP}$  obtained from previous statistical calculations.

In practice, the immense number of parameters in large language models requires substantial computational resources for training, which exceeds our practical capacity. Therefore, we adopted low-rank matrix decomposition (LoRA) (Hu et al. 2021) and model quantization techniques (Dettmers et al. 2022) to reduce computational resource consumption and accelerate network training and inference processes. We recommend readers refer to the original papers for further details.

### Datasets

We have constructed a total of two datasets, the Topic Key Phrase Dataset (TKPD) and Normalized Article Influence Dataset (NAID). Each of these datasets serves different purposes, which will be described in more detail below.

**Topic Key Phrase Dataset:** TKPD includes 251 entries encompassing titles, abstracts, and core task or field names of random articles across various fields in artificial intelligence. To mitigate subjectivity in our study and ensure consistent annotations, we employ manual labeling of key phrases by a seasoned AI researcher. Due to the specialized knowledge required for data annotation, this paper is precluded from annotating articles from non-AI fields. Nevertheless, we believe that the inconsistencies between the different subfields

within the AI field are sufficient to simulate the differences between the distinct disciplines.

**Normalized Article Impact Dataset:** NAID is used to train LLMs to predict the impact of articles. It comprises the title, abstract, and the corresponding  $TNCSI_{SP}$ , *etc.* In total, NAID includes more than 12,000 data entries from different AI fields. We selected papers with category IDs containing “cs.CV”, “cs.CL”, and “cs.AI” that were uploaded to arXiv between 2020 and 2022. NAID is a uniformly distributed dataset, meaning that the sources of the papers, the original publication year of the papers, and the corresponding  $TNCSI_{SP}$  values are evenly distributed. For more details on how we construct the dataset, please refer to our project webpage.

Both TKPD and NAID are released at our project page.

## Experiments

### Metrics

**Mean Absolute Error:** MAE is employed to assess the prediction accuracy. It is a measure used to evaluate the discrepancy between the predicted value and the ground truth  $y_i$ , which is defined as follows:

$$MAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |y_i - \hat{y}_i|, \quad (5)$$

where  $n$  represents the number of samples in the test set,  $y_i$  denotes the actual output (*e.g.*,  $TNCSI_{SP}$ ),  $\hat{y}_i$  stands for the predicted value (*e.g.*,  $\hat{TNCSI}_{SP}$ ),  $|y_i - \hat{y}_i|$  is the absolute difference between the actual and predicted values. Generally, a lower MAE indicates a higher accuracy of the model’s predictions.

**Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain** (Järvelin and Kekäläinen 2000): NDCG is another metric to evaluate the effectiveness of the prediction. NDCG, originally developed for recommendation systems to measure the gain of a document based on its position in the recommended list, is calculated as follows:

$$NDCG@K = \frac{DCG@K}{IDCG@K}, \quad (6)$$

where  $DCG@K = \sum_{i=1}^K (2^{\hat{y}_i} - 1) / \log_2(i + 1)$ , and  $IDCG@K = \sum_{i=1}^K (2^{y_i} - 1) / \log_2(i + 1)$ .  $K = 20$  represents the position cutoff for the recommended list. NDCG is a metric that ranges from 0 to 1, with scores closer to 1 reflecting that more influential documents are ranked higher, signifying better performance.

**Normalized Edit Distance** (Yujian and Bo 2007): NED is a metric to measure the similarity between two strings by normalizing the edit distance by the length of the longer string. It is defined as:

$$NED(A, B) = \frac{ED(A, B)}{\max(|A|, |B|)}, \quad (7)$$

where  $ED(A, B)$  is the edit distance between strings  $A$  and  $B$ , and  $\max(|A|, |B|)$  is the length of the longer string. The lower the NED value, the more similar the two strings are.

## Comparison with Previous Methods

This subsection compares the proposed method with previous state-of-the-art methods. Due to the different prediction targets of various methods, we employ NDCG to evaluate the effectiveness of these methods in identifying potentially high-impact papers. As previously mentioned, nearly all methods heavily rely on external data from the papers. Therefore, to ensure a fair comparison, we removed the external information relied upon by previous methods. Details of the reproduction process are provided in the Appendix.

Tab. 2 clearly illustrates the performance differences between our proposed method and previous SOTA methods in identifying potentially high-impact papers. The proposed method demonstrates a notable superiority in the newborn article impact prediction setting compared to earlier representative works. Most level I methods underperform without external information. For example, the LSTM-based method (Ma et al. 2021) reports an NDCG of 0.84 when leveraging external information, but its performance drops significantly to 0.196 when relying solely on the title and abstract, suggesting a limited capacity to effectively map semantic features to the target  $TNCSI_{SP}$ . The less favorable performance of ChatGPT-generated and LLaMA-3-generated approaches in identifying high-impact papers suggests that zero-shot LLM-generated approaches still require further exploration.

### Performance of Various LLMs

As the core task of this paper, we have extensively measured the performance of various large language models on the NAID test set. The data in Tab. 3 shows that LLaMA-3 with its 8B parameters achieved the best performance. Additionally, we observe that MAE values are not always negatively correlated with NDCG values. A lower MAE might not necessarily lead to a higher NDCG. Taking Falcon and Phi-3 as an example, we find that although Falcon achieves a better MAE, its NDCG is slightly reduced when compared to the Phi-3. This may indicate that the model is more accurate in predicting papers with lower influence but less effective in predicting those with higher influence. Considering that our primary focus is on predicting high-impact papers, a higher NDCG value is generally more advantageous than a lower MAE in most scenarios.

The Qwen family is selected to further explore the effects of model size on the performance of article impact prediction tasks. Compared to the LLaMA series, the Qwen series features more official models with smaller parameter sizes, specifically 0.5B, 1.5B, and 7B. We train each of these models on the NAID train set, and the test results are illustrated in Fig. 4. It can be observed that as the model parameter size increases, the performance correspondingly improves.

### Effectiveness of Prompt Engineering

This paper conducts prompt engineering on two tasks: identifying the topic key phrase for calculating  $TNCSI_{SP}$ , and guiding the LLM to make predictions.

**For Identifying Key Phrase:** We carried out numerous experiments to test the performance of different models and

Methods	Ori. Lv.	Input Feature for Fair Comparison	Ori. Target	NDCG $\uparrow$
MLP-based (Ruan et al. 2020)	I	paper length, reference numbers, <i>etc.</i>	Cites	0.147
LSTM-based (Ma et al. 2021)	I	title, and abstract	Cites	0.196
Model Ensemble (Zhang and Wu 2024)	I	(Ruan et al. 2020) + research filed	Cites	0.201
MLP-based (Hu, Cui, and Lin 2023)	I	the same to (Ruan et al. 2020)	Is Top 5%	0.464
ChatGPT-generated (de Winter 2024)	II	title, and abstract	Score	0.597
LLaMA-3-generated	II	title, and abstract	TNCISI <sub>SP</sub>	0.674
Fine-tuned LLaMA-3-based ( <i>ours</i> )	II	title, and abstract	TNCISI <sub>SP</sub>	<b>0.901</b>

Table 2: Comparison with previous approaches: an upward arrow indicates that a higher value is better, and vice versa. Bold font denotes the best performance among all methods. ‘Ori. Lv.’ refers to the taxonomy level of the original study, while ‘Ori. Target’ denotes the predicted target type in the original research. See the Appendix for more reproduction details.

LLMs	Size $\downarrow$	MAE $\downarrow$	NDCG $\uparrow$	Memory $\downarrow$
Phi-3	<b>3.8B</b>	0.226	0.742	<b>6.2GB</b>
Falcon	7B	0.231	0.740	8.9GB
Qwen-2	7B	0.223	0.774	12.6GB
Mistral	7B	0.220	0.850	15.4GB
LLama-3	8B	<b>0.216</b>	<b>0.901</b>	9.4GB

Table 3: Performance comparison of different LLMs on the NAID test set: size refers to the number of model parameters, and memory stands for the minimum memory usage during inference.

prompts on the TPKD. Tab. 4 reports the NED for 4 representative prompts on the TPKD. Ultimately, we employ the prompt template from the last row, along with gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, to generate topic key phrases. Extended experimental records can be found in the Supplementary Material and our project page.

User Prompt Template	NED $\downarrow$
Identify the research field from the given title and abstract. You MUST respond with the keyword ONLY in this format: xxx	0.30
Based on the title and abstract, determine the main area of study for the paper, focusing on a keyword that accurately represents the field. You MUST respond with the keyword ONLY in this format: xxx.	0.29
Given the title and abstract below, determine the specific research field by focusing on the main application area and the key technology. You MUST respond with the keyword ONLY in this format: xxx.	<b>0.26</b>

Table 4: Effectiveness of prompt engineering: comparison of various user prompts for identifying key phrase.

**For Guiding LLM:** As shown in Tab. 5, We test several prompt templates to wrap the title and abstract before inputting them into the fine-tuned LLM. Despite PEFT, variations in prompt templates affect performance; more detailed




Figure 4: The impact of various model parameters on performance: the larger the number of model parameters, the better the performance.

descriptions often lead to better results. However, overly detailed prompts may sometimes cause a slight NDCG decrease.

### Comparative Analysis of the TNCISI<sub>SP</sub>

We have trained LLaMA-3 on articles from different years and with various regression targets to demonstrate the superiority of the proposed TNCISI<sub>SP</sub>. As shown in Fig. 5, when targeting the improved TNCISI<sub>SP</sub>, the model provides more stable predictions regarding articles from different years. Table 6 further demonstrates the generalizability of TNCISI<sub>SP</sub>. It enables various types of models to better resist the bias accumulated over time. This suggests that TNCISI<sub>SP</sub> empowers the model to identify semantic features shared by high-impact articles across different years, thereby achieving significant improvements in overall task performance.

### Applications

In this section, we present an intriguing example, journal average impact prediction, to further demonstrate the effectiveness of our method in real-world applications.

Theoretically, journals in different quartiles are expected to exhibit varying average impacts. Therefore, we guide the LLaMA-3 to predict the average TNCISI<sub>SP</sub> of articles published in 2024 across several journals from different

Prompt Template	NDCG $\uparrow$
Title: {title} \n Abstract: {abstract}.	0.849
Given the provided title and abstract, predict the future normalized academic impact on a scale from 0 (lowest impact) to 1 (highest impact). You may consider factors such as the language clarity, novelty of the research, or the claim of state-of-the-art, etc. Title: {title} \n Abstract: {abstract}	0.869
Given a certain paper entitled {title}, and its abstract: {abstract}. Predict its normalized scholar impact:	0.889
Given a certain paper entitled {title}, and its abstract: {abstract}. Predict its normalized scholar impact (between 0 and 1):	<b>0.901</b>

Table 5: Effectiveness of prompt engineering: comparison of various prompts for guiding LLMs to predict the future impact.




Figure 5: Impact of different prediction targets on performance: TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> demonstrates superior performance over TNCSI with training data from different years.

JCR quartiles within the field of computer science. Since LLaMA-3’s training data only extends up to early 2023, it is highly unlikely that the model has encountered these articles, significantly reducing the risk of data leakage. It is also worth noting that a journal’s impact factor would be significantly influenced by a small number of highly cited papers (Lei and Sun 2020; Leydesdorff 2012). To this end, we analyzed over 500 randomly selected articles from various journals across different quartiles for impact prediction, focusing on the average predicted TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> of the top 5% and 25% of notable papers within each quartile. In Fig. 6, we observe a clear positive correlation between the predicted impact of the notable top 5% of articles and their respective quartiles. Although the predicted impact of the top 25% of articles in the Q2 quartile is slightly higher than that of Q1, it is still considered a reasonable phenomenon.

Beyond journal impact prediction, our system holds promise for a variety of other real-world applications. For instance, given the vast number of daily pre-print submis-

Methods	Target	NDCG $\uparrow$
MLP-based	TNCSI	0.464
MLP-based	TNCSI <sub>SP</sub>	0.634
LSTM-based	TNCSI	0.373
LSTM-based	TNCSI <sub>SP</sub>	0.646
Fine-tuned LLama-3-based	TNCSI	0.865
Fine-tuned LLama-3-based	TNCSI <sub>SP</sub>	<b>0.901</b>

Table 6: Performance comparison using the TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> metric: all methods show improvements when targeting TNCSI<sub>SP</sub>. The input data of each method is consistent with Tab. 2.

sions, the proposed approach may also help efficiently identify high-quality research worth closer examination. It may significantly reduce the time researchers spend reviewing large volumes of papers on arXiv, thereby enhancing overall research efficiency.




Figure 6: Predicted TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> values for journals in different JCR quartiles: higher quartiles show higher predicted values. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, we denote Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 to represent articles from journals in JCR quartiles 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

## Conclusion

In this paper, we demonstrate the potential of LLMs for predicting the tailored TNCSI<sub>SP</sub> of newborn papers with titles and abstracts only. The NAID dataset, comprising over 12,000 entries, is constructed and utilized to fine-tune various advanced LLMs. Empirical evaluations demonstrate that the LLaMA-3 model, with an MAE of 0.216 and an NDCG@20 of 0.901, significantly surpasses the performance of prior methods when solely relying on internal information. Furthermore, the impact values predicted by our method show a strong positive correlation with the quartile rankings of journals for articles published in 2024, illustrating the practical applicability of our approach in real-world settings. Overall, the proposed approach effectively estimates a future impact score from 0 to 1 for newly published papers, presenting considerable benefits for individuals, institutions, and automated scientific research systems.

## Appendices

### Implementation Details

In this paper, We partition the NAID into training, validation, and test sets in a ratio of 8:1:1. We conduct a grid search on the validation set and identify optimal settings for several key hyperparameters. The initial learning rate is set to  $5e-5$  and is dynamically adjusted based on the effective batch size and training steps. The maximum length for the LLM is 1024. The rank  $r$  for LoRA is set to 16 and is only applied to the  $q$  and  $v$  matrices in the self-attention mechanism. To further reduce memory consumption, we employ 8-bit model quantization techniques. All experiments are carried out on the server with  $8 \times$  NVIDIA A40 GPUs. Unless otherwise stated, all models are trained for 5 epochs. All the metrics mentioned in this paper are calculated in July 2024. Please note that the citation counts provided by Semantic Scholar are typically lower than those displayed by Google Scholar. More experiment settings could be found in the provided code framework.

### Reproduction Details of Previous Methods

To demonstrate the superiority of our proposed method, we compare it with previous SOTA methods in the Approach section. In this subsection, we further explain how we replicate these methods.

As previously mentioned, article impact prediction methods at different levels rely on varying data and exhibit different task complexities. Directly comparing methods across all levels may lead to potential unfairness. Therefore, we excluded external features such as journals characteristics, citation features, as well as author and affiliation reputation when making predictions for level I methods.

To mitigate potential issues such as gradient explosion, we normalize the inputs for all MLP-based methods to ensure that different features are on a consistent scale. Specifically, for the work by Hu et al. (Hu, Cui, and Lin 2023), which primarily focuses on classifying whether an article belongs to the notable top 5%, we convert their approach into a regression task that represents cumulative impact (TNCSI). For the approach proposed by Zhang et al. (Zhang and Wu 2024), we divide the training data into three groups based on arXiv category IDs: cs.CV, cs.CL, and cs.AI. Then, we train separate models for each group and utilize the corresponding model weights for inference based on the category of the data during testing. For the ChatGPT-based method (de Winter 2024), we replicated the approach using the exact prompts provided by the authors. Surprisingly, the original performance of ChatGPT in predicting article impact is unsatisfactory (about an NDCG of 0.05). This may be due to the fact that the original method is not specifically designed for impact prediction but rather aims to investigate the correlation between ChatGPT’s scores and various factors, and is not specifically designed to predict scores that reflect academic impact. Therefore, we emulate the prompt used by LLaMA3 to guide ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo-0125) in generating responses, which significantly increases the corresponding NDCG value to 0.597. LLaMA-3-generated refers to employing LLaMA-3 in a chat-based

manner, where the pre-trained LLaMA-3 model generates autoregressive outputs to predict influence.

Due to the specialized nature of the field, most papers are designed to serve specific institutions, resulting in limited availability of open-source code. Additionally, the high cost of accessing certain databases has further hindered our ability to reproduce experiments from some papers. Consequently, despite our best efforts to replicate the reported methods, there may still be minor differences in the details compared to the original authors’ approaches. Nevertheless, we maintain that these discrepancies are unlikely to have a significant impact on the overall experimental outcomes.

### Preview of the TKPD and NAID

We provide a preview of the TKPD and NAID datasets in Tab. 7 and Tab. 8, respectively. The TKPD dataset includes over 200 entries, consisting of titles, abstracts, and manually annotated topic key phrases. The NAID dataset comprises over 12,000 entries, featuring fields such as titles, abstracts, TNCSI, TNCSI<sub>sp</sub>, open-source status, and RQM values, etc. Both datasets are available in our Supplementary Material and project page.

Title	Topic
Oracle-MNIST: a Dataset of Oracle Characters for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms	oracle character recognition
Bridging Cross-Lingual Gaps During Leveraging the Multilingual Sequence-to-Sequence Pretraining for Text Generation and Understanding	cross-lingual text generation
UniSar: A Unified Structure-Aware Autoregressive Language Model for Text-to-SQL	text-to-SQL
Inpainting at Modern Camera Resolution by Guided PatchMatch with Auto-Curation	image inpainting

Table 7: A preview of the TKPD: for clarity of presentation, we have excluded the abstract field.

### Will Additional Information Boosting Performance?

We have already demonstrated that LLMs are capable of predicting future impact using only titles and abstracts. This raises the question of whether additional information not included in the abstract could further enhance prediction performance. Therefore, we design multiple experiments to quantitatively analyze whether the availability of a paper’s open-source code, achievement of SOTA performance, contribution of a new dataset, and the quality of its references (Zhao et al. 2024) may boost the performance. The additional information is extracted by gpt-3.5-turbo-0125, which reads as much of the article text as possible.

The prompt templated is slightly modified from the original one: “Given a certain paper, Title: {title} Abstract:



Title	Abstract	Cites	TNCSI <sub>SP</sub>
LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models	An important paradigm of natural language processing consists of ...	4421	1
HuBERT: Self-Supervised Speech Representation Learning by Masked Prediction of Hidden Units	Self-supervised approaches for speech representation learning are challenged by three unique problems: (1) there are multiple ...	1793	1
YOLOX: Exceeding YOLO Series in 2021	In this report, we present some experienced improvements to YOLO series ...	2651	0.906
MobileBERT: a Compact Task-Agnostic BERT for Resource-Limited Devices	Natural Language Processing (NLP) has recently achieved great success by using huge pre-trained models with ...	665	0.963
A Time Series is Worth 64 Words: Long-term Forecasting with Transformers	We propose an efficient design of Transformer-based models for multivariate time series forecasting and self-supervised representation learning. It ...	298	0.825
XLM-T: Multilingual Language Models in Twitter for Sentiment Analysis and Beyond	Language models are ubiquitous in current NLP, and their multilingual capacity has recently attracted considerable attention. However, ...	152	0.426
Confidence Score for Source-Free Unsupervised Domain Adaptation	Source-free unsupervised domain adaptation (SFUDA) aims to obtain high performance ...	42	0.299
An Improved Dilated Convolutional Network for Herd Counting in Crowded Scenes	Crowd management technologies that leverage computer vision are widespread in contemporary times. There exists many ...	2	0.004

Table 8: A preview of the NAID: displaying only key fields for clarity.

Input Type	MAE↓	NDCG↑
Title&Abstract	0.216	0.901
+ Open Access Status	0.214	0.878
+ Release Dataset	0.212	0.915
+ SOTA Claim	0.215	0.881
+ RQM (Zhao et al. 2024)	0.211	<b>0.931</b>
+ All above	<b>0.209</b>	0.917

Table 9: Ablation study on additional information: additional information boosts prediction performance.

*{abstract}*. *State-of-the-Art Performance*: {'Yes' or 'No'}. *Released a New Dataset*: {'Yes' or 'No'}. *Code Open Access*: {'Yes' or 'No'}. *Reference Quality Metric (on a scale from lowest 0 to highest 1)*: {RQM}. *Predict its normalized academic impact (between 0 and 1)*:”.

As observed in Tab. 9, nearly all additional information contributes to an improvement in the MAE metric. However, only the availability of an open-source dataset and the quality of references positively impact the NDCG metric. This effect may be attributed to the fact that abstracts typically already include key information, such as SOTA performance, and adding redundant data may bring unnecessary complexity to the LLM. Nevertheless, when the model is provided with all of the information, both the MAE and NDCG metrics exhibit improvements compared to scenarios where no additional information is included. This suggests that the incorporation of additional information may enhance overall performance.

### Impact of Different Training Schemes on Predictive Performance

In our paper, we adopt one of the most common methods for fine-tuning LLMs, LoRA (Hu et al. 2021). This section explores how other fine-tuning approaches may influence performance. As shown in Tab. 10, we also experiment with several fine-tuning methods, including freezing the backbone and fine-tuning only the classification head MLP, as well as employing rsLoRA (Kalajdziewski 2023), and DoRA (Liu et al. 2024) to fine-tune the model.

Training schemes	MAE↓	NDCG↑
LoRA (Hu et al. 2021)	0.216	0.901
Classification Head Only	0.237	0.839
rsLoRA (Kalajdziewski 2023)	<b>0.213</b>	0.897
DoRA (Liu et al. 2024)	0.217	<b>0.902</b>

Table 10: Comparison of Various Training Schemes: fine-tuning with LoRA yields better results than fine-tuning only the classification head.

### Impact of the Various Loss Function on Predictive Performance

We investigate the impact of different loss functions on model performance. In addition to MSE loss, we test the performance when using L1, SmoothL1, and BCELoss as the loss functions. It is crucial to note that for BCELoss, we employ PyTorch’s built-in BCEWithLogitsLoss during training to enhance numerical stability. The sigmoid function is applied separately during the inference phase to normalize the

outputs.

The experimental results are presented in Tab. 11, showing that the model’s ability to identify high-impact papers is strongest when MSE is used as the loss function. The performance of L1 and SmoothL1 is similar, which may be due to the balanced nature of the NAID dataset. BCELoss performs slightly worse than SmoothL1, with an NDCG score of 0.762.

Loss Function	NDCG $\uparrow$
MSE Loss	<b>0.901</b>
L1 Loss	0.831
SmoothL1 Loss	0.787
BCE Loss	0.762

Table 11: Comparison of adopting various loss functions: MSE loss delivers the best performance in terms of NDCG.

## Ethical Statement

We are aware of the potential for manipulation through excessive optimization of titles and abstracts. Researchers must refrain from excessively embellishing titles and abstracts, particularly by making false claims about unachieved performance or overly exaggerating the significance of their methods, in an attempt to manipulate predicted impact values.

Due to constraints such as the access frequency limits of the Semantic Scholar API, we are unable to construct a larger dataset. Therefore, our proposed method only serves as a preliminary exploratory approach. The predictions generated by this method are probabilistic estimates and should never be considered definitive assessments of an article’s quality. The method is intended to provide additional insights and must not replace the existing peer-review process, which remains essential for maintaining the integrity and rigor of academic research. The authors are not responsible for any decisions made based on the predictions.

## Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Young Scientists Fund of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.62206134), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities 070-63233084, and the Tianjin Key Laboratory of Visual Computing and Intelligent Perception (VCIP). Computation is supported by the Supercomputing Center of Nankai University (NKSC). This work was supported by the National Science Fund of China under Grant No. 62361166670.

## References

Abbas, K.; Hasan, M. K.; Abbasi, A.; Mokhtar, U. A.; Khan, A.; Abdullah, S. N. H. S.; Dong, S.; Islam, S.; Alboaneen, D.; and Ahmed, F. R. A. 2023. Predicting the future popularity of academic publications using deep learning by considering it as temporal citation networks. *IEEE Access*.

AI, M. 2024. Meta LLaMA 3: Advancements in Open-Source Large Language Models. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>. Accessed: 2024-07-04.

Almazrouei, E.; Alobeidli, H.; Alshamsi, A.; Cappelli, A.; Cojocaru, R.; Debbah, M.; Goffinet, É.; Hesslow, D.; Lounay, J.; Malartic, Q.; et al. 2023. The falcon series of open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867*.

Baek, J.; Jauhar, S. K.; Cucerzan, S.; and Hwang, S. J. 2024. Researchagent: Iterative research idea generation over scientific literature with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07738*.

Bai, J.; Bai, S.; Chu, Y.; Cui, Z.; Dang, K.; Deng, X.; Fan, Y.; Ge, W.; Han, Y.; Huang, F.; et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.

Colledge, L. 2014. Snowball metrics recipe book. *Amsterdam: Snowball Metrics Program Partners*, 110: 82.

de la Torre-López, J.; Ramírez, A.; and Romero, J. R. 2023. Artificial intelligence to automate the systematic review of scientific literature. *Computing*, 105(10): 2171–2194.

de Winter, J. 2024. Can ChatGPT be used to predict citation counts, readership, and social media interaction? An exploration among 2222 scientific abstracts. *Scientometrics*, 1–19.

Dettmers, T.; Lewis, M.; Belkada, Y.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2022. Gpt3. int8 (): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 30318–30332.

Fu, L. D.; and Aliferis, C. 2008. Models for predicting and explaining citation count of biomedical articles. In *AMIA Annual symposium proceedings*, volume 2008, 222. American Medical Informatics Association.

Garfield, E. 1955. Citation indexes for science: A new dimension in documentation through association of ideas. *Science*, 122(3159): 108–111.

Google. 2024. Gemini: Google’s AI Model. <https://www.google.com/gemini>. Accessed: 2024-07-04.

Hicks, D.; Wouters, P.; Waltman, L.; De Rijcke, S.; and Rafols, I. 2015. Bibliometrics: the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520(7548): 429–431.

Hu, E. J.; Shen, Y.; Wallis, P.; Allen-Zhu, Z.; Li, Y.; Wang, S.; Wang, L.; and Chen, W. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.

Hu, Z.; Cui, J.; and Lin, A. 2023. Identifying potentially excellent publications using a citation-based machine learning approach. *Information Processing & Management*, 60(3): 103323.

Hutchins, B. I.; Yuan, X.; Anderson, J. M.; and Santangelo, G. M. 2016. Relative citation ratio (RCR): a new metric that uses citation rates to measure influence at the article level. *PLoS biology*, 14(9): e1002541.

Järvelin, K.; and Kekäläinen, J. 2000. IR evaluation methods for retrieving highly relevant documents. In *ACM SIGIR Forum*, volume 51, 243–250. ACM New York, NY, USA.

Jiang, A. Q.; Sablayrolles, A.; Mensch, A.; Bamford, C.; Chaplot, D. S.; Casas, D. d. l.; Bressand, F.; Lengyel, G.; Lample, G.; Saulnier, L.; et al. 2023. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.

Kalajdzievski, D. 2023. A rank stabilization scaling factor for fine-tuning with lora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03732*.

- Kimi.ai. 2024. Kimi.ai. <https://kimi.moonshot.cn/>. Accessed: 2024-07-04.
- Kousha, K.; and Thelwall, M. 2024. Factors associating with or predicting more cited or higher quality journal articles: An Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) paper. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 75(3): 215–244.
- Lei, L.; and Sun, Y. 2020. Should highly cited items be excluded in impact factor calculation? The effect of review articles on journal impact factor. *Scientometrics*, 122(3): 1697–1706.
- Leydesdorff, L. 2012. Alternatives to the journal impact factor: I3 and the top-10%(or top-25%?) of the most-highly cited papers. *Scientometrics*, 92(2): 355–365.
- Li, Y.; Hou, Q.; Zheng, Z.; Cheng, M.-M.; Yang, J.; and Li, X. 2023. Large selective kernel network for remote sensing object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 16794–16805.
- Liu, S.-Y.; Wang, C.-Y.; Yin, H.; Molchanov, P.; Wang, Y.-C. F.; Cheng, K.-T.; and Chen, M.-H. 2024. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09353*.
- M. Bran, A.; Cox, S.; Schilter, O.; Baldassari, C.; White, A. D.; and Schwaller, P. 2024. Augmenting large language models with chemistry tools. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1–11.
- Ma, A.; Liu, Y.; Xu, X.; and Dong, T. 2021. A deep-learning based citation count prediction model with paper metadata semantic features. *Scientometrics*, 126(8): 6803–6823.
- OpenAI. 2022. ChatGPT: optimizing language models for dialogue. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>. Accessed 25 December 2023.
- OpenAI. 2023. Generative Pre-trained Transformer 4 (GPT-4). <https://openai.com/gpt-4/>. Accessed 25 December 2023.
- Qiu, J.; and Han, X. 2024. An Early Evaluation of the Long-Term Influence of Academic Papers Based on Machine Learning Algorithms. *IEEE Access*, 12: 41773–41786.
- Ruan, X.; Zhu, Y.; Li, J.; and Cheng, Y. 2020. Predicting the citation counts of individual papers via a BP neural network. *Journal of Informetrics*, 14(3): 101039.
- San Francisco, D. 2018. San Francisco declaration on research assessment.
- Touvron, H.; Martin, L.; Stone, K.; Albert, P.; Almahairi, A.; Babaei, Y.; Bashlykov, N.; Batra, S.; Bhargava, P.; Bhosale, S.; et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and finetuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Turner, D. 2011. *Paleontology: a philosophical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vergoulis, T.; Kanellos, I.; Giannopoulos, G.; and Dalamagas, T. 2020. Simplifying Impact Prediction for Scientific Articles. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.15192.
- Wang, H.; Fu, T.; Du, Y.; Gao, W.; Huang, K.; Liu, Z.; Chandak, P.; Liu, S.; Van Katwyk, P.; Deac, A.; et al. 2023. Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 620(7972): 47–60.
- Wang, K.; Shi, W.; Bai, J.; Zhao, X.; and Zhang, L. 2021. Prediction and application of article potential citations based on nonlinear citation-forecasting combined model. *Scientometrics*, 126: 6533–6550.
- Wang, M.; Yu, G.; and Yu, D. 2011. Mining typical features for highly cited papers. *Scientometrics*, 87(3): 695–706.
- Xia, W.; Li, T.; and Li, C. 2023. A review of scientific impact prediction: tasks, features and methods. *Scientometrics*, 128(1): 543–585.
- Yujian, L.; and Bo, L. 2007. A normalized Levenshtein distance metric. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 29(6): 1091–1095.
- Zhang, F.; and Wu, S. 2024. Predicting citation impact of academic papers across research areas using multiple models and early citations. *Scientometrics*, 1–30.
- Zhao, P.; Zhang, X.; Cheng, M.-M.; Yang, J.; and Li, X. 2024. A Literature Review of Literature Reviews in Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12928*.
- Zhao, Q.; and Feng, X. 2022. Utilizing citation network structure to predict paper citation counts: A deep learning approach. *Journal of Informetrics*, 16(1): 101235.
- Zhao, W. X.; Zhou, K.; Li, J.; Tang, T.; Wang, X.; Hou, Y.; Min, Y.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, J.; Dong, Z.; et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*.