

How well can machine learning predict demographics of social media users?

Nina Cesare (ninac2@uw.edu),¹ Christan Grant (cgrant@ou.edu),² Quynh Nguyen (quynh.ctn@gmail.com),³ Hedwig Lee (hedwig.lee@wustl.edu),⁴ Elaine O. Nsoesie (en22@uw.edu)^{1*}

1. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98121, USA
2. School of Computer Science, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA
3. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742, USA
4. Department of Sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

The wide use of social media sites and other digital technologies have resulted in an unprecedented availability of digital data that are being used to study human behavior across research domains. Although unsolicited opinions and sentiments are available on these platforms, demographic details are usually missing. Demographic information is pertinent in fields such as demography and public health, where significant differences can exist across sex, racial and socioeconomic groups. In an attempt to address this shortcoming, a number of academic studies have proposed methods for inferring the demographics of social media users using details such as names, usernames, and network characteristics. Gender is the easiest trait to accurately infer, with measures of accuracy higher than 90% in some studies. Race, ethnicity and age tend to be more challenging to predict for a variety of reasons including the novelty of social media to certain age groups and a lack of significant deviations in user details across racial/ethnic groups. Although the endeavor to predict user' demographics is plagued with ethical questions regarding privacy and data ownership, knowing the demographics in a data sample can aid in addressing issues of bias and population representation, so that existing societal inequalities are not exacerbated.

Keywords: social media; Twitter; blogs; demographics; population representation

INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms offer (near) real-time unsolicited information on users' thoughts, feelings and experiences, allowing researchers to track attitudes and behaviors as they emerge and over time. The individual and population scale of these data enables the study of the flow of information through complex networks that are difficult to assess using traditional means of data collection [1]. These data are also usually low-cost compared to traditional modes of data collection, such as surveys.

Researchers have used these data to study social processes across a wide domain, ranging from economics to public health. For example, posts on Facebook and Twitter have been used in real-time tracking of public opinion on political events and social issues [2–7]. In public health, these data have been used to study attitudes toward tobacco use [8–11], vaccinations [12, 13], sleep disorders [14], mental health [15, 16], patient-perceived quality of care in hospitals [17], food deserts [18], foodborne illness [19–22], trends in physical activity, weight loss, and diet [23–25], and the dynamics of infectious diseases (such as, influenza and dengue) [26–32].

Studies have also highlighted potential limitations and biases of using these data for public health [29, 33, 34]. One such limitation is a lack of demographic detail in many digital data sources which limits their applicability for research and practice in fields such as demography and public health, where it is pertinent. For example, demographic information can enable the study of health disparities between populations from different racial or ethnic backgrounds, sex, age and socioeconomic status to ensure that the use of these data in public health practice does not increase existing health inequalities. Knowledge of demographics can also allow for procedures to reweight the data to help adjust for over- and under-representation from certain groups. This lack of demographic details has led to the proposal of a range of methods for inferring the demographics of social media users based on their profile, postings, and network information. Studies typically assume that a user's color preference, name, username, network characteristics, language usage and other attributes can reveal demographic traits such as, age, gender and race or ethnicity. While targeted advertising and recommender systems on the Internet suggest that advanced demographic prediction methods exist, the massive troves of data used in these processes are usually not available to academicians.

Here, we perform a comprehensive review on the performance of approaches proposed to detect the gender, age, race and ethnicity of social media and blog users in the academic literature. We characterize trends in the literature, discuss how the methods and metadata used in these studies could impact predictions, and identify open areas for development.

Selection and Evaluation of Studies

We conducted an initial literature search in November 2016 and updated the search in November 2017. We queried combinations of the following term groups: “demographic, gender, age, or race”, “prediction, classification, or machine learning” and “social media, Twitter or blogs”. We searched three databases – Engineering Village, Microsoft Academic, and the ACM Digital Archives – since preliminary results indicated most of the papers were published in computer science conference proceedings. We supplemented these searches with findings from Google Scholar, which provides access to a broad scope of academic literature, including conference proceedings and pre-prints.

In total, we identified 160 potentially relevant articles based on their titles and summaries or abstracts. We focused on articles that aimed to infer or predict the demographics of social media and blog users from information provided within that context. We therefore excluded studies that predict demographic attributes based on other sources of digital data, such as browsing history or mobile phone messages. Additional exclusion criteria were applied to arrive at 91 articles fitting the focus of this review (see Figure 1). We discuss the methods, group and present studies based on the demographic trait predicted.




Figure 1: Literature identification and selection. We selected 160 potentially relevant articles based on title and abstract from three academic databases and Google scholar. After excluding irrelevant studies, we arrived at 91 articles that proposed methods for inferring the age, race, ethnicity or gender of social media users.

RESULTS

Summary of Methods Used in Prediction

The methods presented in the selected manuscripts included machine learning approaches, raw and adjusted data matching approaches, and human and automated facial recognition tools. Seventy-five (82.4%) studies used supervised machine learning approaches, while two studies used unsupervised learning. The most common machine learning methods considered included, support vector machines [35–56], naïve Bayes [57–62], variants of the winnow algorithm [63–66], k-nearest neighbors [37, 67, 68], naïve Bayes decision tree hybrid [69, 70], gradient boosted decision trees [71, 72], neural networks [73–75], random forests [76], entropy models [51, 61, 77], and standard and regularized linear, logistic or log-linear regression [78–92]. These methods were applied to data from various platforms (see Figure 2), with an overwhelming focus on Twitter (n=57, 62.6%), likely due to the availability and wide use of Twitter data for research.

Five (5.5%) studies inferred demographics based on facial evaluations from either paid human evaluators or facial recognition algorithms. The remaining 11 (12.1%) studies used raw or adjusted data matching, meaning they directly linked user data to information from sources such as the United States Census Bureau, or estimated the probability of belonging to particular demographic categories given a combination of known demographic information (e.g., prior data on the popularity of first names over time) and information from users' profiles.




Figure 2: Literature by year. Early predictions of user demographics focused on Blogs. However, research predicting the traits of Twitter users is most common.

In addition, the measures used to assess the performance of the proposed algorithms included, *accuracy* [(true positives + true negative)/total population], *precision* (also known as positive predictive value = true positives/predicted positive condition), *recall* (also known as sensitivity = [true positive/(true positives + false negatives)], *F1-score* (the harmonic mean of the precision and recall), and *area under the curve (AUC)* (plot representing sensitivity/specificity pairs corresponding to different decision thresholds; is a measure of how well a parameter can distinguish between two diagnostic categories). Specifically, 62 (87.3%), 37 (84.1%) and 12 (60.0%) of the gender, age and race/ethnicity prediction approaches respectively, reported

findings using a specific performance metric. Accuracy was the most commonly reported metric; reported in 74.6%, 47.7%, and 35.0% of studies on gender, age and race/ethnicity prediction studies respectively. The distribution of accuracy by trait is shown in Figure 3. Studies predicting gender had the highest median accuracy, with some studies reaching scores higher than 0.90. Although all studies on age prediction that report accuracy used the same methodological approach, the accuracy fell across a broad range (0.43, 0.95). In contrast, the prediction accuracy for race/ethnicity fell within a narrower range and had a median value of approximately 0.81.




Figure 3: Distribution of Predicted Accuracy by Trait. Methods predicting gender perform best. The median accuracy of methods used in inferring age is similar to that of gender, but the distribution varies widely. In contrast, the range of accuracies observed in the prediction of race and ethnicity is narrower.

Predicting Gender

Seventy-one (78.0%) studies focused on gender prediction [35, 37–40, 42–45, 47–49, 51–53, 57–70, 73, 74, 77–86, 91, 93–121]. Of these, 54.9% employed user postings, 25.3% used information from user profiles (such as, profile colors), and the remainder used a combination of postings, network and profile information.

Most studies proposing classification methods focused on linguistic patterns in names and posted text. Studies that employed users' names either linked first names to offline survey data or used these data to build models designed to improve predictive algorithms that incorporate other characteristics. Although some sites (e.g., Twitter) do not require users to provide a valid first and last name in their profile, this technique may still capture a large sample of users. For example, Mislove et al. [108] found that 64.2% of Twitter users elect to include a first name in their profile. However, approximately 71.8% of these Twitter users were male.

The performance metrics were consistently above 0.50. Of the studies that used accuracy (n=53, 74.6%) as the measure of evaluation, the average accuracy was 0.83 (range 0.65 to 0.99). Studies that reported precision also had high values, with an average of 0.84 (range 0.58 to 0.98). Reported F1-scores were also high, with an average value of 0.84 (range 0.68 to 0.98). We excluded the values reported by Miller et al. [59] because they reported results for females but not males. Overall, most of the proposed algorithms could reliably predict the gender of social media users.

Bamman et al. [101] suggest that gender is heavily embedded within individuals' identities. It may be equally embedded within social media users' online personas to the extent that unsupervised clustering techniques can differentiate between users with distinct gender identities. For example, Alowibdi et al. [69] found that profile colors alone can be effectively used to infer the gender of Twitter users'. They predicted the gender of Twitter users with 71.4% accuracy using only five quantized colors (i.e., compression via the reduction in the number of colors) from users' profile fields.

Another reason why gender lends itself well to profile-based prediction techniques is because a person's name can be a strong predictor of gender. For instance, Liu and Ruths [42] found that adding names data to a text-dependent gender prediction improved the accuracy of their method from 0.83 to 0.87. Both Fernandez et al. [74] and Karimi et al. [113] suggested inferring gender by combining user names with results from facial recognition software applied to profile photos. Mueller and Stumme [44] and Vicente et al. [105] found that even if a name is not directly

identifiable, it can either be *cleaned* in a way that renders the true name linkable with official census data (for example, converting “Hi I’m Kaylaaaaa” to “Kayla”), or it may contain extractable features that are gender dependent (e.g. a name that ends in a vowel is more likely to imply a female user than a male user). Furthermore, Cesare et al. [122] also developed a weighted ensemble model that used word and character n-grams from user names [65], the linguistic structure of names [44], and direct matches between user names and U.S. Social Security Administration (SSA) data to obtain an accuracy of 0.83, precision of 0.82, recall of 0.85, and F1-score of 0.84.

Studies that solely used profile metadata or combined it with users’ posts had higher accuracies than those that solely use information from users’ postings. This suggests that simple, subtle cues embedded within users’ profiles can be used to accurately detect gender. In addition, studies that used non-algorithmic methods (i.e. simple or adjusted data matching) also performed comparably well as studies that used machine learning algorithms (i.e., average accuracy of 0.81 and 0.82 for data matching and machine learning, respectively)

Predicting Age

We identified 44 (48.4%) studies that predicted age [35, 37, 49, 52, 53, 56, 58, 62–64, 73, 75, 76, 78–80, 83, 85, 87, 89–98, 104, 106, 110, 111, 117, 118, 120, 123–130]. The proposed algorithms were overwhelmingly text-dependent. These studies used text features and supervised learning methods to predict exact numeric age, age category (adolescent/adult/senior) and life stage (e.g., student, employed, retired). Most studies capped predicted age between 30 and 40, perhaps due to the fact that social media users tend to be younger. The reported average F1-scores of studies that capped predicted age in the 40s was comparable to that of studies that capped predicted age in the 30s (F1=0.74 and F1=0.71, respectively).

Several studies suggested that profile photos may also be used to assess age. McCormick et al. [110] found that human coders are highly reliable when assessing a user’s age range. When shown 1,000 Twitter user profile images, at least two out of three workers on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk could identify the numeric age range of 96.6% and the life stage of 97.9% of users. An and Weber [93] used Face++, a free facial recognition service that can estimate a

user's age within a 10-year span and observed that 49% of the 346,050 Twitter users in their dataset had a detectable face, which is low. When comparing the predicted age of the user and the age extracted from their profile description, they found that 25% of the predictions were within a three-year difference and 75% of predictions were within an 11-year difference of the user's extracted age. However, these studies did not compare estimates to ground truth data (i.e., true demographic information about the users sampled). Rather, estimates were compared to population values or data not drawn from the population studied. Further work is needed to assess the reliability, and best applications of facial recognition by human and automated coders.

Simple approaches – such as identifying mentions of age within a user's profile or matching first names to trends in popularity over times – could be useful but not widely employed within existing literature beyond the development of a training dataset. For the former, the available data might be limited to teenagers or milestone years, and the latter may provide reliable predictions for popular names only.

The reported high accuracy observed in age prediction suggests that clues from users' postings - such as, the sociolinguistic indicators or topics discussed - provide valuable information about the age of the user. The accuracy and F1-scores of age prediction studies that relied exclusively on information from users' postings were slightly higher than those of studies that combined data from users' postings with profile or network information (accuracy=0.76, 0.72, respectively; F1-score=0.80, 0.74, respectively). Thus, using additional data besides profiles posts did not significantly improve prediction of age.

These studies indicate that age prediction is more difficult with additional categories. In general, the performance of prediction algorithms decreased as the number of predicted categories increased. The average F1-scores of studies that predicted binary age categories (e.g. under/over 20 years old), three age categories (e.g. under 20, 20-40, above 40), and four age categories (e.g. 10-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40+) were 0.91, 0.73 and 0.71, respectively. The few studies that predicted numeric age, reported an average correlation of 0.73. While prediction of numeric age is challenging, it is most beneficial since the results can be binned into different categories as needed.

Predicting Race and Ethnicity

Twenty (21.9%) of the selected studies addressed the prediction of race or ethnicity [48, 49, 54, 71, 72, 78, 79, 82, 85, 86, 91, 93, 107–111, 126, 131, 132]. The earliest studies were from 2010, compared to 2006 for age and gender, likely due to the challenge of predicting this demographic trait. Thirteen of these studies reported an average accuracy of 0.82 and twelve studies reported an average F1-score of 0.70. Eight studies did not report a performance metric.

Nine (45.0%) race/ethnicity prediction studies solely relied on users' postings or combined users' postings with profile and network metadata to infer race. The performance of these studies suggests that posted text provides valuable insight into the race or ethnicity of the user, but that performance improves considerably when these data are analyzed with the added context of profile or network metadata. The average accuracy and F1-scores of text-only methods was 0.76 and 0.51, respectively, while the average accuracy and F1-scores of methods that combined text with additional metadata was 0.81 and 0.73, respectively.

Six studies solely used profile metadata to predict race. In McCormick et al. [110], human analysts labeled race based on profile photos. At least two out of three human coders agreed on the race of 95.5% of 1,000 user photos. Chen et al. [49] applied n-grams and Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) to data on Twitter users' neighbors' descriptions to predict race with 78.8% accuracy (F1=0.75).

Additionally, last name was a common feature used in studies that employed profile data alone or in conjunction with other metadata. Longley et al. [111] used the Onomap system – an online index of names linked to geographic information developed by Mateos and colleagues [133] – to infer the ethnicity of Twitter users in London. Similarly, Hofstra et al. [107] used last names to determine whether Dutch Facebook users were Dutch, Moroccan or Caribbean. Neither Longley et al. [111] or Hofstra et al. [107], however, reported performance metrics given ground truth data. Rao et al. [109] illustrated that last names provide valuable information that can be used solely or in conjunction with user postings to predict the ethnicity of Nigerian Facebook users with an accuracy of approximately 0.81. Similar to the use of first names for age prediction, ethnicity is commonly tied to last name making it traceable and useful for prediction.

Similarly, Chang et al. [131] and Mislove et al. [108] applied a method for inferring the race of U.S. Twitter users based on last names and the aggregate racial distribution of the population from which the user is drawn. However, they failed to assess their prediction against individual ground truth data. Additional work is needed to rigorously assess the potential of this prediction technique.

DISCUSSION

We performed a comprehensive review of studies that propose methods for inferring the age, race, ethnicity and gender of social media and blog users. We examined trends in the literature by trait and assessed the performance of the proposed methods.

We note that gender was the easiest trait to infer using a variety of methods and features. In contrast, in the prediction of age, methods that relied on data from users' postings reported higher accuracies than methods that did not use data from users' postings or combined these data with other features. Also, the performance of age prediction algorithms generally decreased as the number of categories predicted increased. However, trends in the literature suggest that multi-category or numeric age predictions may improve as more advanced algorithms are used. Likewise, in the prediction of race, user postings provided valuable information about the user but is best if considered in conjunction with other user metadata. Also, similar to the use of first names as a gender prediction feature, last name appears to be a strong predictor of user ethnicity. The improvement in race and ethnicity prediction based on additional data from users' networks and posting could be attributed to within-network segregation by race or ethnicity.

Measures of Performance

Several of the studies included in this review did not evaluate prediction performance. Nine gender prediction approaches reviewed provided no performance metrics, and all of these used profile metadata to generate predictive features. Similarly, only one of the seven age prediction approaches and none of the six race/ethnicity prediction approaches that relied only on profile metadata reported performance metrics. Furthermore, of the studies reporting a performance metric, most used accuracy. However, accuracy is not always a good measure of performance,

particularly for studies with a class imbalance because the model may be over-trained to recognize the majority group, and the overall accuracy may be excessively weighted by classification performance specific to this group [134, 135]. To assess how well these prediction methods are performing, accuracy needs to be reported alongside other measures of performance such as, precision, recall, F1-score, or AUC.

Data Limitations

While further work is needed to explore the potential value of profile-based prediction features (such as, user description and user names), findings from this review suggest that users' postings contain valuable information for predicting users' age and race/ethnicity. This has important implications for the scalability of this work. While sites such as Twitter and Instagram allow researchers to collect information via public Application Programming Interfaces (APIs), these applications are typically rate limited and may limit the scalability of a particular method [69]. For instance, when gathering timelines, the Twitter API can only make 900 calls per 15-minute window. After reaching a rate limit, the API requires 15 minutes to reset. Although these rate limits may not be a problem when gathering data for several thousand users, gathering data on hundreds of thousands or millions of users would be time consuming. For researchers studying time-sensitive topics – such as infectious disease outbreaks – this delay may be prohibitive. Furthermore, collecting, storing and processing hundreds of tweets or ties per user for very large samples is computationally intensive and may not be accessible to applied researchers with limited resources.

Further, several studies did not use individual ground truth data in the evaluation of their methods. The manner in which the test and training data used are collected may impact the results of proposed prediction methods. The studies evaluated engaged in a variety of techniques for measuring users' 'true' age, race and gender. Some relied on self-reported information contained within the user's postings – for instance, by collecting recent tweets in which a user mentions their current age [76], states that it is their birthday [56, 92, 96], or describes their racial or ethnic identity [54, 72]. Some studies use hand-coded evaluations of users' profiles and/or other online presences [85, 87, 89] to assess demographics, and some use facial recognition software such as Face++ [115] or crowdsourcing platforms such as Amazon's

Mechanical Turk [78] to generate ground truth measures. While some studies (e.g., Bergsma and colleagues [48]) address the effect of differently collected training datasets, further work is needed to assess these potential biases. Ground truth data on social media and blog users, while difficult to obtain, is important for assessing the validity of a proposed approach.

Ethical Considerations

We acknowledge that detection of user demographics poses unique ethical questions for researchers. First, users who provide data for the development and application of classification methods are not treated as “human subjects” in a traditional sense. According to the Belmont Report and Common Rule, social researchers are supposed to exercise justice (i.e., ensuring fair distribution of benefits and risks of research, as well as fair selection of research subjects), beneficence (i.e., an obligation to maximize benefits and minimize harm toward research subjects) and informed consent (i.e., disclosure of objectives and possible consequences of the research toward the subject and society at large)[136]. However, implementing procedures such as informed consent is difficult when working with tens or hundreds of thousands of respondents. Additionally, standards regarding data ownership and publishing typically dictate how researchers may use data from digital sources. Further work is need to determine how to preserve human subjects research standards when working with large, digitally generated datasets [137–139].

Ethical concerns regarding the automatic detection of user characteristics extend beyond the individual. The term ‘group privacy’ refers to demographic de-anonymization, or the placement of users within specific demographic categories [140–142]. While ethical standards regarding the protection of research subjects typically assume that individual protection leads to group protection [142], research suggests that disclosed affiliation with a particular demographic group may lead to unfair targeting by marketing agencies, political campaigns, and more. For instance, Zwitter [140] notes that political campaigns have used bot accounts to target and engage in fabricated grassroots debates with Twitter users who fit the demographic profile of a particular party’s constituency – a practice sometimes referred to as “astroturfing”. Researchers seeking to predict user demographics not explicitly shared through their profiles should be aware of the

risks that disclosure of group status may generate prior to using this inferred data for analysis or intervention.

CONCLUSIONS

We found that gender is heavily embedded within users' online presence, and that features extracted from users' profiles – such as first names – may be used to accurately predict this trait. Other demographic traits such as, age and race/ethnicity are more challenging to predict. Furthermore, there is a need to assess approaches relying exclusively on profile metadata with the same rigor as approaches that use information from networks or users' postings. Future work in this area should be mindful of the scalability of proposed methods, as well as the implications of these methods for individual and group privacy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (grant #73362).

REFERENCES

1. Prier KW, Smith MS, Giraud-Carrier C, Hanson CL (2011) Identifying health-related topics on twitter. In: International Conference on Social Computing, Behavioral-Cultural Modeling, and Prediction. Springer, pp 18–25
2. Wang W, Rothschild D, Goel S, Gelman A (2015) Forecasting elections with non-representative polls. *Int J Forecast* 31:980–991 . doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2014.06.001
3. O'Connor B, Balasubramanyan R, Routledge BR, Smith NA (2010) From tweets to polls: Linking text sentiment to public opinion time series. *ICWSM* 11:1–2
4. McCombs M (2014) *Setting the Agenda: Mass Media and Public Opinion*. John Wiley & Sons
5. Anstead N, O'Loughlin B (2015) Social Media Analysis and Public Opinion: The 2010 UK General Election. *J Comput-Mediat Commun* 20:204–220 . doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12102
6. Ruths D, Pfeffer J (2014) Social media for large studies of behavior. *Science* 346:1063–1064 . doi: 10.1126/science.346.6213.1063
7. Rossini PGC, Hemsley J, Tanupabrungrun S, et al (2017) Social Media, U.S. Presidential Campaigns, and Public Opinion Polls: Disentangling Effects. In: *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Social Media & Society*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp 56:1–56:5

8. Duke JC, Hansen H, Kim AE, et al (2014) The use of social media by state tobacco control programs to promote smoking cessation: a cross-sectional study. *J Med Internet Res* 16:e169 . doi: 10.2196/jmir.3430
9. Huang J, Kornfield R, Szczypka G, Emery SL (2014) A cross-sectional examination of marketing of electronic cigarettes on Twitter. *Tob Control* 23:iii26–iii30 . doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051551
10. Myslín M, Zhu S-H, Chapman W, Conway M (2013) Using Twitter to Examine Smoking Behavior and Perceptions of Emerging Tobacco Products. *J Med Internet Res* 15:e174 . doi: 10.2196/jmir.2534
11. Prochaska JJ, Pechmann C, Kim R, Leonhardt JM (2011) Twitter=quitter? An analysis of Twitter quit smoking social networks. *Tob Control* tc.2010.042507 . doi: 10.1136/tc.2010.042507
12. Bahk CY, Cumming M, Paushter L, et al (2016) Publicly Available Online Tool Facilitates Real-Time Monitoring Of Vaccine Conversations And Sentiments. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 35:341–347 . doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2015.1092
13. Salathé M, Khandelwal S (2011) Assessing Vaccination Sentiments with Online Social Media: Implications for Infectious Disease Dynamics and Control. *PLOS Comput Biol* 7:e1002199 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002199
14. McIver DJ, Hawkins JB, Chunara R, et al (2015) Characterizing Sleep Issues Using Twitter. *J Med Internet Res* 17:e140 . doi: 10.2196/jmir.4476
15. De Choudhury M, Counts S, Horvitz E (2013) Predicting postpartum changes in emotion and behavior via social media. In: *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, pp 3267–3276
16. Sueki H (2015) The association of suicide-related Twitter use with suicidal behaviour: A cross-sectional study of young internet users in Japan. *J Affect Disord* 170:155–160 . doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2014.08.047
17. Hawkins JB, Brownstein JS, Tuli G, et al (2016) Measuring patient-perceived quality of care in US hospitals using Twitter. *BMJ Qual Saf* 25:404–413 . doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004309
18. De Choudhury M, Sharma S, Kiciman E (2016) Characterizing Dietary Choices, Nutrition, and Language in Food Deserts via Social Media. In: *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*. ACM Press, San Francisco, California, pp 1155–1168
19. Harris JK, Mansour R, Choucair B, et al (2014) Health Department Use of Social Media to Identify Foodborne Illness — Chicago, Illinois, 2013–2014. *Center for Disease Control*

20. Nsoesie EO, Kluberg SA, Brownstein JS (2014) Online reports of foodborne illness capture foods implicated in official foodborne outbreak reports. *Prev Med* 67:264–269 . doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.08.003
21. Harrison C, Jorder M, Stern H, et al (2014) Using online reviews by restaurant patrons to identify unreported cases of foodborne illness—New York City, 2012–2013. *MMWR* 63:441–445
22. Harris JK, Hawkins JB, Nguyen L, et al (2017) Using Twitter to Identify and Respond to Food Poisoning: The Food Safety STL Project. *J Public Health Manag Pract JPHMP* 23:577–580 . doi: 10.1097/PHH.0000000000000516
23. Nguyen QC, Li D, Meng H-W, et al (2016) Building a National Neighborhood Dataset From Geotagged Twitter Data for Indicators of Happiness, Diet, and Physical Activity. *JMIR Public Health Surveill* 2:e158 . doi: 10.2196/publichealth.5869
24. Pagoto S, Schneider KL, Evans M, et al (2014) Tweeting it off: characteristics of adults who tweet about a weight loss attempt. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 21:1032–1037 . doi: 10.1136/amiajnl-2014-002652
25. Griffin GP, Jiao J (2015) Where does bicycling for health happen? Analysing volunteered geographic information through place and plexus. *J Transp Health* 2:238–247 . doi: 10.1016/j.jth.2014.12.001
26. Corley CD, Cook DJ, Mikler AR, Singh KP (2010) Text and Structural Data Mining of Influenza Mentions in Web and Social Media. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 7:596–615 . doi: 10.3390/ijerph7020596
27. Gomide J, Veloso A, Meira W Jr, et al (2011) Dengue Surveillance Based on a Computational Model of Spatio-temporal Locality of Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd International Web Science Conference*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp 3:1–3:8
28. Nsoesie EO, Brownstein JS (2015) Computational Approaches to Influenza Surveillance: Beyond Timeliness. *Cell Host Microbe* 17:275–278 . doi: 10.1016/j.chom.2015.02.004
29. Nsoesie EO, Flor L, Hawkins J, et al (2016) Social Media as a Sentinel for Disease Surveillance: What Does Sociodemographic Status Have to Do with It? *PLOS Curr Outbreaks*. doi: 10.1371/currents.outbreaks.cc09a42586e16dc7dd62813b7ee5d6b6
30. Salathé M, Freifeld CC, Mearu SR, et al (2013) Influenza A (H7N9) and the Importance of Digital Epidemiology. *N Engl J Med* 369:401–404 . doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1307752
31. Chew C, Eysenbach G (2010) Pandemics in the Age of Twitter: Content Analysis of Tweets during the 2009 H1N1 Outbreak. *PLOS ONE* 5:e14118 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0014118

32. Santillana M, Nguyen AT, Dredze M, et al (2015) Combining Search, Social Media, and Traditional Data Sources to Improve Influenza Surveillance. *PLOS Comput Biol* 11:e1004513 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004513
33. Scarpino SV, Scott JG, Eggo R, et al (2016) Data Blindspots: High-Tech Disease Surveillance Misses the Poor. *Online J Public Health Inform* 8: . doi: 10.5210/ojphi.v8i1.6451
34. Henly S, Tuli G, Kluberg SA, et al (2017) Disparities in digital reporting of illness: A demographic and socioeconomic assessment. *Prev Med* 101:18–22 . doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.05.009
35. Asoh, Hideki, Ikeda, Kazushi, Ono, Chihiro (2012) A Fast and Simple Method for Profiling a Population of Twitter Users. In: *The Third International Workshop on Mining Ubiquitous and Social Environment*. Bristol, UK, pp 19–26
36. Al Zamal F, Liu W, Ruths D Homophily and Latent Attribute Inference: Inferring Latent Attributes of Twitter Users from Neighbors. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. Dublin, Ireland, pp 387–390
37. Santosh K, Joshi A, Gupta M, Varma V (2014) Exploiting Wikipedia Categorization for Predicting Age and Gender of Blog Authors. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Aalborg, Denmark
38. Benton A, Raman A, Dredze M (2016) Learning Multiview Embeddings of Twitter Users. In: *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. ACM, Berlin, Germany, pp 14–19
39. You Q, Bhatia S, Sun T, Luo J (2014) The Eyes of the Beholder: Gender prediction using images posted in online social networks. In: *2014 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW)*. IEEE, Shenzhen, China, pp 1026–1030
40. Nowson S, Oberlander J (2006) The Identity of Bloggers: Openness and Gender in Personal Weblogs. In: *AAAI spring symposium: Computational approaches to analyzing weblogs*. Palo Alto, CA, pp 163–167
41. Fink C, Kopecky J, Morawski M Inferring Gender from the Content of Tweets: A Region Specific Example. In: *Proceedings of the Six International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. pp 459–463
42. Liu W, Ruths D Using first names as features for gender inference in Twitter
43. Ludu PS (2014) Inferring gender of a Twitter user using celebrities it follows. *ArXiv Prepr ArXiv14056667*
44. Mueller J, Stumme G (2016) Gender Inference using Statistical Name Characteristics in Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the The 3rd Multidisciplinary International Social Networks Conference on SocialInformatics*. ACM Press, Albany, NY, pp 1–8

45. Mukherjee A, Liu B (2010) Improving Gender Classification of Blog Authors. In: Proceedings of the 2010 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, pp 207–217
46. Rao D, Yarowsky D, Shreevats A, Gupta M (2010) Classifying Latent User Attributes in Twitter. In: Proceedings of the 2nd international workshop on Search and mining user-generated contents. ACM, Toronto, Canada, pp 37–44
47. Zhang C, Zhang P (2010) Predicting gender from blog posts. Technical Report. University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA
48. Bergsma S, Dredze M, Van Durme B, et al (2013) Broadly Improving User Classification via Communication-Based Name and Location Clustering on Twitter. In: HLT-NAACL. Atlanta, Georgia, pp 1010–1019
49. Chen X, Wang Y, Agichtein E, Wang F (2015) A comparative study of demographic attribute inference in twitter. In: Proceedings of the Ninth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media. Palo Alto, CA, pp 590–593
50. Bhatnagar VS, Sanket NJ, Barathi SK “Honey, We Shrunk the Weights” Gender Prediction using Twitter Feeds and Profile Images
51. Kokkos A, Tzouramanis T (2014) A robust gender inference model for online social networks and its application to LinkedIn and Twitter. First Monday 19: . doi: 10.5210/fm.v19i9.5216
52. Yatam SS, Reddy TR (2014) Author profiling: Predicting gender and age from blogs, reviews & social media. Int J Eng Res Technol 3:631–633
53. Rao D, Yarowsky D (2010) Detecting Latent User Properties in Social Media. In: Proceedings of the NIPS MLSN Workshop. Citeseer
54. Xu S, Markson C, Costello KL, et al (2016) Leveraging Social Media to Promote Public Health Knowledge: Example of Cancer Awareness via Twitter. JMIR Public Health Surveill 2: . doi: 10.2196/publichealth.5205
55. Siswanto E, Khodra ML (2013) Predicting latent attributes of Twitter user by employing lexical features. In: 2013 International Conference on Information Technology and Electrical Engineering (ICITEE). Krabi, Thailand, pp 176–180
56. Tuli, Gaurav (2015) Modeling and Twitter-based Surveillance of Smoking Contagion. Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
57. Yan X, Yan L (2006) Gender Classification of Weblog Authors. In: Proceedings of the AAAI Spring Symposia on Computational Approaches. AAAI, Palo Alto, CA, pp 27–29
58. Rustagi M, Prasath RR, Goswami S, Sarkar S (2009) Learning Age and Gender of Blogger from Stylistic Variation. In: Pattern Recognition and Machine Intelligence. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 205–212

59. Miller Z, Dickinson B, Hu W (2012) Gender Prediction on Twitter Using Stream Algorithms with N-Gram Character Features. *Int J Intell Sci* 02:143–148 . doi: 10.4236/ijis.2012.224019
60. Wang P, Gao M, Sinnott RO (2016) Enhanced Gender Identification through Social Media Analytics on the Cloud. In: 2016 IEEE 18th International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications; IEEE 14th International Conference on Smart City; IEEE 2nd International Conference on Data Science and Systems (HPCC/SmartCity/DSS). pp 1426–1433
61. Mukherjee S, Bala PK (2017) Gender classification of microblog text based on authorial style. *Inf Syst E-Bus Manag* 15:117–138 . doi: 10.1007/s10257-016-0312-0
62. Goswami S, Sarkar S, Rustagi M (2009) Stylometric analysis of bloggers' age and gender. In: *Proceedings of the Third International ICWSM Conference*
63. Argamon S, Koppel M, Pennebaker JW, Schler J (2007) Mining the Blogosphere: Age, gender and the varieties of self-expression. *First Monday* 12:
64. Schler J, Koppel M, Argamon S, Pennebaker JW (2005) Effects of Age and Gender on Blogging. In: *AAAI spring symposium: Computational approaches to analyzing weblogs*. Palo Alto, CA, pp 199–205
65. Burger JD, Henderson J, Kim G, Zarrella G (2011) Discriminating gender on Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, pp 1301–1309
66. Deitrick W, Miller Z, Valyou B, et al (2012) Gender Identification on Twitter Using the Modified Balanced Winnow. *Commun Netw* 04:189–195 . doi: 10.4236/cn.2012.43023
67. Cheung M, She J (2017) An Analytic System for User Gender Identification Through User Shared Images. *ACM Trans Multimed Comput Commun Appl* 13:30:1–30:20 . doi: 10.1145/3095077
68. Chen J, Xiao T, Sheng J, Teredesai A (2017) Gender prediction on a real life blog data set using LSI and KNN. In: *2017 IEEE 7th Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC)*. pp 1–6
69. Alowibdi JS, Buy UA, Yu P (2013) Language independent gender classification on Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*. IEEE, Calgary, Canada, pp 739–743
70. Alowibdi JS, Buy UA, Yu P (2013) Empirical Evaluation of Profile Characteristics for Gender Classification on Twitter. In: *2013 12th International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications*. pp 365–369

71. Pennacchiotti M, Popescu A-M (2011) A Machine Learning Approach to Twitter User Classification. In: Proceedings of the Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media. Menlo Park, CA, pp 281–288
72. Pennacchiotti M, Popescu A-M (2011) Democrats, Republicans and Starbucks Aficionados: User Classification in Twitter. In: Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining. ACM, San Diego, CA, pp 430–438
73. Kim SM, Xu Q, Qu L, et al (2017) Demographic Inference on Twitter using Recursive Neural Networks. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Short Papers). Association for Computational Linguistics, Quebec, Canada, pp 471–477
74. Fernández D, Moctezuma D, Siordia OS (2016) Features combination for gender recognition on Twitter users. In: 2016 IEEE International Autumn Meeting on Power, Electronics and Computing (ROPEC). pp 1–6
75. Guimarães RG, Rosa RL, Gaetano DD, et al (2017) Age Groups Classification in Social Network Using Deep Learning. IEEE Access 5:10805–10816 . doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2706674
76. Simaki V, Mporas I, Megalooikonomou V (2016) Age Identification of Twitter Users: Classification Methods and Sociolinguistic Analysis. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Intelligent Text Processing and Computational Linguistics (CICLing). Montreal, Canada
77. Filippova K (2012) User demographics and language in an implicit social network. In: Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, pp 1478–1488
78. Volkova S, Bachrach Y, Armstrong M, Sharma V (2015) Inferring Latent User Properties from Texts Published in Social Media. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Austin, TX, pp 4296–4297
79. Kosinski M, Stillwell D, Graepel T (2013) Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior. Proc Natl Acad Sci 110:5802–5805 . doi: 10.1073/pnas.1218772110
80. Sap, Maarten, Eichstaedt, Johannes, Kern, Margaret L., et al (2014) Developing Age and Gender Predictive Lexica over Social Media. In: Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). Doha, Qatar, pp 1146–1151
81. Reddy S, Marina del Rey CA (2016) Obfuscating gender in social media writing. In: Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Computational Social Science. Austin, TX, pp 17–26

82. Montasser O, Kifer D (2017) Predicting Demographics of High-Resolution Geographies with Geotagged Tweets. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. AAAI Press, Vancouver, Canada, pp 1460–1466
83. Volkova S, Bachrach Y, Durme BV (2016) Mining User Interests to Predict Perceived Psycho-Demographic Traits on Twitter. In: IEEE Second International Conference on Big Data Computing Service and Applications. IEEE, pp 36–43
84. Otterbacher J (2010) Inferring gender of movie reviewers: exploiting writing style, content and metadata. In: Proceedings of the 19th ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management. ACM, pp 369–378
85. Culotta A, Kumar NR, Cutler J (2015) Predicting the Demographics of Twitter Users from Website Traffic Data. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. AAAI, Austin, Texas, pp 72–78
86. Culotta A, Kumar NR, Cutler J (2016) Predicting Twitter User Demographics using Distant Supervision from Website Traffic Data. *J Artif Intell Res* 55:389–408
87. Nguyen D-P, Gravel R, Trieschnigg RB, Meder T (2013) “ How old do you think I am?” A study of language and age in Twitter. In: Proceedings of the Seventh International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media. Palo Alto, CA, pp 439–448
88. Rosenthal S, McKeown K (2011) Age Prediction in Blogs: A Study of Style, Content, and Online Behavior in Pre- and Post-social Media Generations. In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies - Volume 1. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, pp 763–772
89. Nguyen D, Gravel R, Trieschnigg D, Meder T (2013) TweetGenie: automatic age prediction from tweets. *ACM SIGWEB Newsl* 1–6 . doi: 10.1145/2528272.2528276
90. Nguyen D, Smith NA, Rosé CP (2011) Author age prediction from text using linear regression. In: Proceedings of the 5th ACL-HLT Workshop on Language Technology for Cultural Heritage, Social Sciences, and Humanities. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, pp 115–123
91. Barberá P (2016) Less is more? How demographic sample weights can improve public opinion estimates based on Twitter data. Working Paper for NYU
92. Morgan-Lopez AA, Kim AE, Chew RF, Ruddle P (2017) Predicting age groups of Twitter users based on language and metadata features. *PLOS ONE* 12:e0183537 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0183537
93. An J, Weber I (2016) # greysanatomy vs.# yankees: Demographics and Hashtag Use on Twitter. ArXiv Prepr ArXiv160301973

94. Al Zamal F, Liu W, Ruths D (2012) Homophily and Latent Attribute Inference: Inferring Latent Attributes of Twitter Users from Neighbors. ICWSM 270:
95. Argamon S, Koppel M, Pennebaker JW, Schler J (2009) Automatically Profiling the Author of an Anonymous Text. *ACM Commun* 52:119–123 . doi: 10.1145/1461928.1461959
96. Beretta V, Maccagnola D, Cribbin T, Messina E (2015) An Interactive Method for Inferring Demographic Attributes in Twitter. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM Conference on Hypertext & Social Media*. ACM Press, Guzelyurt, Northern Cyprus, pp 113–122
97. Ikeda D, Takamura H, Okumura M (2008) Semi-Supervised Learning for Blog Classification. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Chicago, Illinois, pp 1156–1161
98. Zagheni E, Garimella VRK, Weber I, State B (2014) Inferring international and internal migration patterns from Twitter data. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web Pages*. ACM Press, Seoul, Korea, pp 439–444
99. Sloan L, Morgan J, Housley W, et al (2013) Knowing the Tweeters: Deriving sociologically relevant demographics from Twitter. *Sociol Res Online* 18: doi [10.5153/sro.3001](https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.3001)
100. Smith J (2014) Gender prediction in social media. *ArXiv Prepr ArXiv14072147*
101. Bamman D, Eisenstein J, Schnoebelen T (2014) Gender Identity and Lexical Variation in Social Media. *J Socioling* 18:135–160
102. Fink C, Kopecky J, Morawski M (2017) Inferring Gender from the Content of Tweets: A Region Specific Example. In: *Proceedings of the Six International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. pp 459–463
103. Mandel B, Culotta A, Boulahanis J, et al (2012) A demographic Analysis of Online Sentiment During Hurricane Irene. In: *NAACL-HLT*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Montreal, Canada, pp 27–36
104. Rao D, Yarowsky D, Shreevats A, Gupta M (2010) Classifying latent user attributes in twitter. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd international workshop on Search and mining user-generated contents*. ACM, pp 37–44
105. Vicente M, Batista F, Carvalho JP (2015) Twitter gender classification using user unstructured information. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE)*. IEEE, Istanbul, Turkey, pp 1–7
106. Wang Y, Xiao Y, Ma C, Xiao Z (2016) Improving Users' Demographic Prediction via the Videos They Talk about. In: *Proc. of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP16)*. Austin, TX, pp 1359–1368

107. Hofstra B, Corten R, van Tubergen F, Ellison NB (2017) Sources of Segregation in Social Networks: A Novel Approach Using Facebook. *Am Sociol Rev* 0003122417705656 . doi: 10.1177/0003122417705656
108. Mislove A, Lehmann S, Ahn Y-Y, et al (2011) Understanding the Demographics of Twitter Users. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. Menlo Park, CA, pp 554–557
109. Rao D, Paul MJ, Fink C, et al (2011) Hierarchical Bayesian Models for Latent Attribute Detection in Social Media. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. ACM, Menlo Park, CA, pp 598–601
110. McCormick TH, Lee H, Cesare N, et al (2015) Using Twitter for Demographic and Social Science Research: Tools for Data Collection and Processing. *Sociol Methods Res*. doi: 10.1177/0049124115605339
111. Longley PA, Adnan M, Lansley G (2015) The geotemporal demographics of Twitter usage. *Environ Plan A* 47:465–484 . doi: 10.1068/a130122p
112. Hosseini M, Tammimy Z (2016) Recognizing users gender in social media using linguistic features. *Comput Hum Behav* 56:192–197 . doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.049
113. Karimi F, Wagner C, Lemmerich F, et al (2016) Inferring Gender from Names on the Web: A Comparative Evaluation of Gender Detection Methods. *ArXiv160304322 Cs* 53–54 . doi: 10.1145/2872518.2889385
114. Grbovic M, Radosavljevic, Vladan, Djuric (2015) Leveraging Blogging Activity on Tumblr to Infer Demographics and Interests of Users for Advertising Purposes. In: *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Making Sense of Microposts*. ACM, New York, NY
115. Merler M, Cao L, Smith JR (2015) You are what you tweet...pic! gender prediction based on semantic analysis of social media images. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. pp 1–6
116. Ludu PS (2015) Inferring Latent Attributes of an Indian Twitter User Using Celebrities and Class Influencers. In: *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Workshop on Social Media World Sensors*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp 9–15
117. Zhong Y, Yuan NJ, Zhong W, et al (2015) You Are Where You Go: Inferring Demographic Attributes from Location Check-ins. *ACM Press*, pp 295–304
118. Vijayaraghavan P, Vosoughi S, Roy D (2017) Twitter Demographic Classification Using Deep Multi-modal Multi-task Learning. *Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp 478–483
119. Bhatnagar VS, Sanket NJ, Barathi SK (2016) “Honey, We Shrunk the Weights” Gender Prediction using Twitter Feeds and Profile Images

120. Claude F, Konow R, Ladra S (2016) Fast Compressed-based Strategies for Author Profiling of Social Media Texts. In: Proceedings of the 4th Spanish Conference on Information Retrieval. ACM, New York, NY, USA, pp 14:1–14:6
121. Zhang Y, Dang Y, Chen H (2011) Gender Classification for Web Forums. *IEEE Trans Syst Man Cybern - Part Syst Hum* 41:668–677 . doi: 10.1109/TSMCA.2010.2093886
122. Cesare N, Grant C, Hawkins JB, et al (2017) Demographics in Social Media Data for Public Health Research: Does it matter? *ArXiv Prepr ArXiv171011048*
123. Rosenthal S, McKeown K (2011) Age prediction in blogs: A study of style, content, and online behavior in pre-and post-social media generations. In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies-Volume 1. Association for Computational Linguistics, Stroudsburg, PA, pp 763–772
124. Sloan L, Morgan J, Burnap P, Williams M (2015) Who Tweets? Deriving the Demographic Characteristics of Age, Occupation and Social Class from Twitter User Meta-Data. *PLOS ONE* 10:e0115545 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0115545
125. Nguyen T, Phung D, Adams B, Venkatesh S (2011) Prediction of Age, Sentiment, and Connectivity from Social Media Text. In: *Web Information System Engineering – WISE 2011*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Sydney, Australia, pp 227–240
126. Oktay H, Firat A, Ertem Z (2014) Demographic breakdown of twitter users: An analysis based on names. *Acad Sci Eng* 1–12
127. Chen J, Li S, Dai B, Zhou G (2016) Active Learning for Age Regression in Social Media. In: *China National Conference on Chinese Computational Linguistics*. Springer, pp 351–362
128. Chamberlain BP, Humby C, Deisenroth MP (2016) Probabilistic Inference of Twitter Users' Age based on What They Follow. *ArXiv Prepr ArXiv160104621*
129. Wang C, Xiao B, Li X, et al (2013) Predicting Users' Age Range in Micro-blog Network. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web Information Systems Engineering (WISE 2013)*. Nanjing, China, pp 516–521
130. Zheng L, Yang K, Yu Y, Jin P (2013) Predicting Age Range of Users over Microblog Dataset. *Int J Database Theory Appl* 6:85–94 . doi: 10.14257/ijta.2013.6.6.08
131. Chang J, Rosenn I, Backstrom L, Marlow C (2010) ePluribus: Ethnicity on Social Networks. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*. Washington DC, pp 18–25
132. Mohammady, Ehsan, Culotta, Aron (2014) Using County Demographics to Infer Attributes of Twitter Users. Baltimore, Maryland, pp 7–16

133. Mateos P, Longley PA, O'Sullivan D (2011) Ethnicity and Population Structure in Personal Naming Networks. *PLOS ONE* 6:e22943 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0022943
134. Brownlee J (2014) Classification Accuracy is Not Enough: More Performance Measures You Can Use. In: *Mach. Learn. Mastery*. <http://machinelearningmastery.com/classification-accuracy-is-not-enough-more-performance-measures-you-can-use/>. Accessed 28 Jan 2017
135. Han J, Pei J, Kamber M (2011) *Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques*. Elsevier
136. (2009) Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects ('Common Rule. In: *HHS.gov*. <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/index.html>. Accessed 26 Nov 2017
137. boyd danah, Crawford K (2012) Critical Questions for Big Data. *Inf Commun Soc* 15:662–679 . doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878
138. Rivers CM, Lewis BL (2014) Ethical research standards in a world of big data. *F1000Research*. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.3-38.v2
139. Vayena E, Salathé M, Madoff LC, Brownstein JS (2015) Ethical Challenges of Big Data in Public Health. *PLOS Comput Biol* 11:e1003904 . doi: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003904
140. Zwitter A (2014) Big Data ethics. *Big Data Soc* 1:2053951714559253 . doi: 10.1177/2053951714559253
141. Ohm P (2012) Broken Promises of Privacy: Responding to the Surprising Failure of Anonymization. *UCLA Law Rev* 57:1701–1777
142. Floridi L (2014) Open Data, Data Protection, and Group Privacy. *Philos Technol* 27:1–3 . doi: 10.1007/s13347-014-0157-8