

List of Tables

1.1	A simple journal recommender system scenario. In order to recommend journals to Researcher-4, predictions of those missing entries corresponding to the row of Researcher-4 are computed first, then journals are recommended to Researcher-4 based on their predictions.	5
2.1	Comparison of research works on scholarly network analysis	30
2.2	Interpretation of centrality measures used in citation network [?]	35
2.3	Statistics of both CS and BIO papers (Subset of MAG)	47
3.1	Computation of C-score for papers in the citation network	65
3.2	Statistics of training and testing dataset in CS and BIO	76
3.3	Accuracy@k and MRR results comparison of FOS “CS”	80
3.4	Accuracy@k and MRR results comparison of FOS “BIO”	81
3.5	F-measure (F_1) analysis of FOS “CS”	82
3.6	F-measure (F_1) analysis of FOS “BIO”	82
3.7	Overall precision (P@k) results (CS)	87
3.8	Overall precision (P@k) results (BIO)	87
3.9	Overall nDCG@k results (CS)	91
3.10	Overall nDCG@k results (BIO)	91
3.11	Diversity (D) and Stability (MAS) of DISCOVER and other approaches	92
3.12	Ablation study on DISCOVER	93
3.13	MRR results of proposed DISCOVER and other approaches	96
3.14	Step-wise papers filtration of both CS and BIO	96
3.15	Issues involved in DISCOVER and other compared approaches	97
4.1	Type of vertices used in HIN	102

4.2	Type of edges used in HIN	104
4.3	Research topic distribution of venue v_i	118
4.4	Weighted score of topic distribution of venue v_i	118
4.5	Meta-paths used in VVPN model	119
4.6	Experimental parameter settings	128
4.7	Influence of vector dimension (k) on MRR	129
4.8	Influence of adjustment parameter (m) on MRR	130
4.9	Influence of restart probability on MRR	130
4.10	PPPN and VVPN recommendation performance in terms of accuracy and MRR	133
4.11	PPPN and VVPN performance in terms of precision	135
4.12	PPPN and VVPN performance in terms of nDCG	135
4.13	Accuracy and MRR results of CNAVER and other compared approaches .	138
4.14	Macro-average analysis in terms of F-measure (F1)	139
4.15	Precision of CNAVER and other compared approaches	141
4.16	nDCG of CNAVER and other approaches	141
4.17	H5-Index of CNAVER and other compared approaches	142
4.18	Diversity (D) and Stability (MAS) of CNAVER and other approaches . . .	143
4.19	Cold-start and other issues available in CNAVER and other approaches . .	144
5.1	Statistics of offline dataset	163
5.2	Statistics of online evaluation dataset	164
5.3	Statistics of online dataset	164
5.4	Accuracy and MRR results for CNN and other approaches	168
5.5	Precision results for CNN and other approaches	169
5.6	nDCG results for CNN and other approaches	170
5.7	Accuracy and MRR results for LSTM and other approaches	172
5.8	Precision results for LSTM and other approaches	173
5.9	nDCG results for LSTM and other approaches	173
5.10	Accuracy and MRR results of DeepRec and other compared approaches . .	174
5.11	Accuracy and MRR results of DeepRec and other compared approaches . .	176
5.12	Precision results for proposed DeepRec and other compared approaches . .	177
5.13	nDCG results for proposed DeepRec and other approaches	178

5.14	MRR results for DeepRec over new venue and new researcher	180
5.15	Cold-start and other issues available	182
5.16	Diversity and Stability of DeepRec and other approaches	182
6.1	Type of vertices used in SIN	189
6.2	Type of edges used in SIN	189
6.3	Research topic distribution of researcher r_i	195
6.4	Weighted score of topic distribution of researcher r_i	195
6.5	Meta-paths used in DRACoR model	197
6.6	Experimental parameter settings	216
6.7	Influence of adjustment parameter on MRR	217
6.8	Influence of restart probability on nDCG and MRR	219
6.9	F1-score results of DRACoR and other approaches (hep-th)	230
6.10	F1-score results of DRACoR and other approaches (DBLP)	231
6.11	MRR and nDCG results of DRACoR and other approaches (hep-th)	231
6.12	MRR and nDCG results of DRACoR and other approaches (DBLP)	232
7.1	Comparative study among all proposed venue recommender systems	241