1 Motivation

Mental disorders have been alarmingly increasing in the worldwide population [1], characterized by a combination of abnormal thoughts, emotions, and behavior. One of the most common mental disorder is depression, globally estimated as more than 300 million cases [1]. Particularly, Brazil has the highest prevalence of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) among South American countries, with nearly 5.8% [1]. This is not only true to the general population but has also been progressively observed in the academic environment, where graduate students are more than six times likely to experience depression and anxiety, compared to the general population [2].

However, before an individual with depression can be treated, this disorder must be detected. Besides the statistics showing that roughly only 50% of the cases are detected [3], some individuals might not have money, knowledge, or may have fear of the social stigma to look out for help [4]. Because of that, the disorder may remain undiagnosed, which may further aggravate its symptoms. Thus, although the most reliable way to screen for depression is the clinical diagnosis, it is important to enhance other passive diagnosis methods beyond the ones based in active consultation.

Another common way of detecting MDD is relying on questionnaires, such as the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) [5]. It evaluates the severity of depression through a final score obtained from the answers given into the questionnaire. Notwithstanding, given that these questionnaires should also be handled by professionals and the individual with MDD may not always have access to them, one question that arises is if we could use the data generated by the individuals themselves to detect depression. Furthermore, the questionnaire-based criteria have been defined years ago. As the world develops and evolves, the criteria to detect MDD should also change to go along with the new technologies that impact everyday routine and behavior. This is especially the case of online environments, where the individual may express depression symptoms in a way different from the established criteria.

Along these lines, social media such as microblogs and social networking sites poses as a promising environment to investigate depressive symptoms and behavior. Several previous studies have already investigated social media features to characterize a user with a depressive behavior [6,7,8,9,10]. To accomplish the detection task enriched with the features from either these paths, the vast majority of works benefit from Machine Learning techniques. However, those previous work focused on either text or image features separately, or engineering metadata to fed ML systems. The question that arises is if modern deep learning techniques have the mechanisms to generate classifiers directly from the user-generated data, in a end-to-end fashion [11,12]. Thus, in this work, we use the data shared by students through Instagram to induce MDD patterns directly from the user-provided content using deep learning methods. We show that our deep multimodal classifier performs better than the unimodal architectures for our dataset at the task of screening depression.

1In this work, we use MDD and depression interchangeably.

2 Methodology and Results

To create the dataset, we posted invitations through several official social media pages, and email lists of University XX[2], Brazil. Students, then, voluntarily answered the questionnaire within the invitation, resulting in a total of 416 answers, in which 221 provided access to their personal Instagram profiles[3] where we downloaded a total of 8188 posts (images and captions). Furthermore, to estimate the impact of observation period in the classification accuracy, we evaluate the dataset for three observation periods: 60, 212 or 365 days back from the answer to the questionnaire, as have been done in previous work [7, 9]. Thus, for each observation period, we generated 10 different stratified datasets, each divided in training, development and test sets.

For textual representation, we use bag-of-words (BoW) as baseline, FastText [13] and ELMo [14], with pre-trained weights on a dump of the Portuguese Wikipedia. To obtain a single caption representation, we use ResNets [16] of different sizes with pre-trained weights on ImageNet, and ResNeXt WSL with pre-trained weights on Instagram pictures [17]. The fusion architecture follows an early fusion where we project both visual and textual embeddings to the same dimensional space, followed by a Hadamard product and a final linear classification layer. We use simple average for the textual representation when using fusion. All models perform a binary classification problem — high severity (59% of examples) vs. low severity of depressive symptoms. The final result targets the student prediction obtained from the average of every post probability belonging to the high severity class.

Figure 1 presents the obtained results using an NVIDIA DGX-1. Four fusion models achieved the best scores, all with an observation period of 212 days. The best model has a F1 score of 0.778 (ELMo + ResNet-18), while the best textual and visual models have 0.746 (ELMo + avg), and 0.708 (ResNeXt), both for 212 days. Furthermore, from the 10 best F1 scores, only one was unimodal: ELMo + avg. ELMo also consistently performed better as the textual representation.

3 Final remarks

Detecting depression from self-generated content in social media is a challenging task, with natural benefits to the society as a whole. Here, we show that we can improve detection scores using a deep multimodal classifier compared to using unimodality by a maximum of 7% in F1 score. We also demonstrate insight on how different observation periods impact on model accuracy, showing that using 212 or 365 days results in better model performance compared to 60 days. In the future we intend to invest on the particularities of the students sample and on explanation methods to help on elucidating this aggravating disorder.

Figure 1: Metrics for prediction of our positive class using our proposed models with different observation periods. All results are for students predictions, not posts, over 10 different datasets
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2 Omitted to respect the double blind process.
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