

# From Human Annotation to Automation: LLM-in-the-Loop Active Learning for Arabic Sentiment Analysis

Dania Refai<sup>a,\*</sup>, Alaa Dalaq<sup>a</sup>, Doaa Dalaq<sup>a</sup>, Irfan Ahmad<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Information and Computer Science Department, KFUPM, Dhahran 31261, Saudi Arabia*

---

## Abstract

Natural language processing (NLP), particularly sentiment analysis, plays a vital role in areas like marketing, customer service, and social media monitoring by providing insights into user opinions and emotions. However, progress in Arabic sentiment analysis remains limited due to the lack of large, high-quality labeled datasets. While active learning has proven effective in reducing annotation efforts in other languages, few studies have explored it in Arabic sentiment tasks. Likewise, the use of large language models (LLMs) for assisting annotation and comparing their performance to human labeling is still largely unexplored in the Arabic context. In this paper, we propose an active learning framework for Arabic sentiment analysis designed to reduce annotation costs while maintaining high performance. We evaluate multiple deep learning architectures: Specifically, long short-term memory (LSTM), gated recurrent units (GRU), and recurrent neural networks (RNN), across three benchmark datasets: Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC, encompassing both modern standard Arabic and dialectal variations. Additionally,

---

\*Corresponding author: Dania Refai (E-mail: Dania.Refai@hotmail.com)

two annotation strategies are compared: Human labeling and LLM-assisted labeling. Five LLMs are evaluated as annotators: GPT-4o, Claude 3 Sonnet, Gemini 2.5 Pro, DeepSeek Chat, and LLaMA 3 70B Instruct. For each dataset, the best-performing LLM was used: GPT-4o for Hunger Station, Claude 3 Sonnet for AJGT, and DeepSeek Chat for MASAC. Our results show that LLM-assisted active learning achieves competitive or superior performance compared to human labeling. For example, on the Hunger Station dataset, the LSTM model achieved 93% accuracy with only 450 labeled samples using GPT-4o-generated labels, while on the MASAC dataset, DeepSeek Chat reached 82% accuracy with 650 labeled samples, matching the accuracy obtained through human labeling.

*Keywords:* Arabic, natural language processing, active learning, sentiment analysis, low-resource data, large language models

---

## 1. Introduction

Sentiment analysis is a fundamental task in natural language processing (NLP), aiming to determine the polarity of opinions provided in text: Positive, negative, or neutral. With the continuous growth of digital communication across social media, news platforms, and online forums, sentiment analysis has become an indispensable tool for understanding public opinion. Within this context, Arabic sentiment analysis is gaining increasing importance due to the rapid expansion of Arabic digital content and its socio-economic relevance across the Arab world [1].

Despite this growing importance, progress in Arabic sentiment analysis remains limited compared to high-resource languages such as English, pri-

marily due to the scarcity of large, high-quality labeled datasets [2]. The rich morphological complexity of Arabic and its diverse dialects further increases annotation costs and reduces the effectiveness of traditional supervised learning methods [3].

To address these limitations, active learning has emerged as a promising paradigm. By iteratively selecting the most informative samples for annotation, active learning reduces labeling effort while maintaining model performance [4], making it particularly well suited for resource-scarce settings such as Arabic.

Recent literature in Arabic sentiment analysis has explored curated datasets, lexicon-based methods, and traditional machine learning models such as support vector machine (SVM) and naive bayes (NB) [5, 6]. More recently, transformer-based approaches, including AraBERT and its variants, have achieved state-of-the-art results [7, 8], while aspect-based sentiment analysis and multi-task learning have further extended the scope of research [9, 10]. Complementary to these efforts, active learning studies have proposed ensemble-based, uncertainty-driven, and voting-based strategies [11], though only a few works have applied them in Arabic contexts, such as Moroccan dialect sentiment classification [12]. In parallel, the rise of large language models (LLMs) has introduced new opportunities, with frameworks like ActiveLLM and demonstration selection highlighting their potential in annotation and data acquisition [13, 14], alongside Bayesian, causal, and preference-based strategies [15, 16, 17].

Despite these advancements, important gaps remain at the intersection of active learning and Arabic sentiment analysis. In particular, active learning

has seen limited adoption in Arabic contexts, and there is a lack of systematic comparisons between human annotation and LLM-assisted labeling within active learning frameworks.

In this paper, we address these gaps by introducing an active learning framework for Arabic sentiment analysis designed to reduce annotation costs while preserving high model performance. Our evaluation considers three deep learning architectures: Long short-term memory (LSTM), gated recurrent units (GRU), and recurrent neural networks (RNN), applied to three benchmark datasets (Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC), which together capture both modern standard Arabic and diverse dialectal variations. In addition, we examine the effectiveness of five LLMs: GPT-4o, Claude 3 Sonnet, Gemini 2.5 Pro, DeepSeek Chat, and LLaMA 3 70B Instruct, as annotation assistants, selecting the best-performing model for each dataset.

### *Main Contributions*

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose an active learning framework for Arabic sentiment analysis that leverages large language models (GPT-4o, Claude 3 Sonnet, Gemini 2.5 Pro, DeepSeek Chat, and LLaMA 3 70B Instruct) as cost-efficient annotation assistants, demonstrating that annotation costs can be reduced without sacrificing model performance while identifying the most effective model for each dataset.
- We conducted experiments on three benchmark datasets (Hunger Station, AJGT, MASAC) covering both modern standard Arabic and mul-

multiple dialects, ensuring that the evaluation reflects the linguistic diversity of real-world Arabic usage.

- We provide a systematic comparison between human annotations and LLM-generated labels, offering insights into the feasibility of LLMs as alternative annotators.

### *Paper Organization*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present a comprehensive literature review. Our proposed methodology is explained in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the experiments conducted to assess the robustness of the proposed approach along with their results and discussion. Finally, Section 5 summarizes our conclusions and outlines potential directions for future research.

## **2. Literature Review**

This section reviews recent research on active learning and significant contributions to Arabic sentiment analysis. The first part examines the application of active learning in both Arabic and non-Arabic contexts. The second part focuses on the state-of-the-art approaches in Arabic sentiment analysis, covering models, datasets, and domain-specific challenges. The discussion highlights key methodologies, learning strategies (supervised, weakly supervised, and active learning), feature representations, and sentiment granularity levels, including binary, multi-class, and aspect-based sentiment analysis.

### 2.1. Active Learning

Active learning is a machine learning paradigm that aims to maximize model performance while minimizing the cost of data annotation. Unlike conventional supervised learning, which relies on large volumes of labeled data, active learning selectively queries the most informative samples for annotation, thereby reducing labeling requirements and associated expenses. This strategy is particularly valuable in domains where manual annotation is costly, time-consuming, or requires specialized expertise, as it enables the development of high-performing models with significantly fewer labeled instances [18].

Salama *et al.* [11], introduce a novel enhanced weighted voting ensemble model (EWWAM) based on active learning. This model performs better than conventional methods, showcasing enhanced classification accuracy of 94.5% and reduced training costs across various domains. In another study by Matrane *et al.* [12], present an automatic annotation methodology designed explicitly for sentiment analysis within the Moroccan dialect. By leveraging advanced neural network models and employing techniques such as augmented stacking with weighted voting, the study achieved an accuracy of 95.18% in sentiment analysis tasks for Moroccan dialect text.

Moreover, Bayer *et al.* [13] propose ActiveLLM, a new approach in which LLMs (such as GPT-4, LLaMA 3) score and select examples for few-shot learners, while the few-shot learners do not receive any in-loop training. They show that ActiveLLM mitigates the cold-start problem and results in a substantial improvement for BERT classifiers in few-shot scenarios. They achieved an F1-score of 0.7329 using ActiveGPT4 with Prompt C2 (Class 2)

on the CTI (Cyber threat intelligence) dataset. Margatina *et al.* [14] cast in-context demonstration selection as a one-shot, pool-based AL task over GPT and OPT models. They contrast uncertainty, diversity, and similarity sampling on 24 classification and multi-choice benchmarks, achieving an F1-score of 70% using GPT-NeoX 20B on 15 classification datasets. Additionally, Muldrew *et al.* [15] introduce active preference learning (APL) for direct preference optimization (DPO), and suggest a novel acquisition function that leverages predictive entropy and preference-model certainty. APL refines the model with DPO by repeatedly selecting prompt-completion pairs, querying their labels, and fine-tuning the model. They report an average accuracy of 76.1% across 5 classification datasets.

Furthermore, Melo *et al.* [17] introduce BAL-PM, a Bayesian active learner to optimize epistemic uncertainty that maximizes the entropy of prompt distribution in the quickBATCH feature space. The batch nature of BAL-PM’s (Balanced active learning with prompt-based method) learning strategy also reduces redundancy and promotes diversity. Distill (Knowledge distillation) + TopK strategy on the MMLU (Massive multitask language understanding) benchmark achieved an average accuracy of 63.9%. In addition, a framework CAL (Causal-guided AL) developed by *et al.* [16], which makes use of LLMs to automatically detect when the dataset biases do not abide by causal invariance. CAL selects the most informative biased examples and induces explainable bias patterns, without the need for manual curation. They reported an average accuracy of 69.3% on 14 classification datasets using GPT-J (6B).

In contrast, Hassan *et al.* [19] propose a clustering-based AL framework for generative tasks that incorporates clustering of the unlabeled outputs,

in addition to LLM-guided knowledge distillation. Their loop loops between instance selection and refinement with a teacher LLM that has been trained with human-labeled distilled labels, achieving an accuracy of 63.9% on the GSM8K (Math word problems) dataset using Active-Prompt-CoT. On the other hand, Hübötter *et al.* [20] present SIFT for test-time fine-tuning of LLMs, an acquisition algorithm that addresses the issue of information duplication and aims to achieve maximum information gain. SIFT (Scale-invariant feature transform) bridges retrieval and active learning, preventing redundant selection of nearest neighbors and prioritizing diverse relevant data. They reported an accuracy of 75.8% using the FLAN-T5 model. Additionally, Xiao *et al.* [21] introduce FreeAL, a human-free collaborative AL setting, where there is an LLM as an annotator and a small LRL (Low-resource language) model to filter the noisy labels. The LLM produces fuzzy in-context annotations, and the student SLM (Small language model) iteratively distills informative samples for label sharpening. They reported 0.557 bits per byte (bpb) using LLaMA-3.2 (3B).

## 2.2. Arabic Sentiment Analysis

Arabic sentiment analysis focuses on detecting and interpreting opinions expressed in Arabic text, addressing unique linguistic challenges such as complex morphology, dialectal variations, and limited annotated resources. Research in this area has advanced through the development of specialized models, curated datasets, and preprocessing techniques tailored to the Arabic language [22].

Mhamedi *et al.* [7] develop RMuBERT by pretraining, then fine-tuning, a pretrained transformer model on two newly collected semi-supervised news

post datasets, (Arabic news posts) ANP5 and (Arabic news posts semi-supervised learning) ANPS2, which were built through selective loss functions and pseudolabeling. They compare Regional Multi-dialect BERT (RMuBERT) with Arabic BERT (AraBERT) and (Multi-dialect Arabic BERT) MARBERT, and obtain an accuracy of 95.43% on AJGT (Arabic Jordanian general tweets) dataset [23] using AraBERTv2. Moreover, Ali and Manal [5] apply the (National Research Council of Canada) NRC emotion lexicon with SVM, NB, and (K-nearest neighbor) KNN classifiers to 5,798 Arabic tweets about online learning in COVID-19. Using an SVM, they achieved an accuracy of 89.6% on the D2 dataset (Arabic tweets about online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic). Ishac *et al.* [6] study Arabic tweets for the 2022 FIFA world cup by leveraging their lexicon-based scoring classification models, SVM, and random forest, to analyze the temporal shifting trends of fandom sentiment. They construct a temporally matched collection of tweets related to a match and label them with polarity. Their method obtains more than 85% accuracy in recognizing positive versus negative engagement concerning the key game events.

Alshaikh *et al.* [9] introduce a BERT-based pipeline to process open-ended survey responses in Arabic, using attention to aspect embeddings to account for detailed feedback. They aggregate and annotate survey data from a customer satisfaction survey and further fine-tune BERT with an aspect-aware classification head. They achieve an F1-score of 0.86 using FAST-LCF-ATEPC (Fine-grained Aspect-based sentiment classification with Transformers – local context focus – aspect term extraction and polarity classification) (multilingual) on task 2 (aspect polarity classification).

Additionally, Fadel *et al.* [10] present (Multi-task learning -AraBERT) MTL-AraBERT, a multi-task learning model, which simultaneously trains on the task of aspect extraction and sentiment classification on Arabic reviews based on shared encoder layers. They create a benchmark dataset across restaurants and e-commerce, and train their model with task-specific output heads. The AraBERT v0.2-large leads to a Macro-F1 Score of 0.9656 on the aspect category sentiment classification (ACSC) Task.

Alosaimi *et al.* [8] inject ArabBERT contextual embeddings into an LSTM classifier (ArabBERT-LSTM) for generic social and news Arabic sentiment analysis. They use standard tokenization and fine-tune the integrated model on balanced and imbalanced corpora. They achieved an accuracy of 94.23% on tweet sentiment classification.

Alotaibi *et al.* [24] present a weakly supervised paradigm with Snorkel to create labels from GPT-3.5, MarBERT, and XLM-RoBERTa (Cross-lingual model – RoBERTa) results of Arabic tweets related to Saudi educational reforms. They then fine-tune AraBERT on this weakly-labeled data, reaching 83% precision, 76% recall, and 85% F1 in a three-way sentiment classification. Baniata and Kang [25] proposed a switch-transformer model using a mixture-of-experts (MoE) encoder for the multitask sentiment analysis of Arabic dialects. They handle both five- and three-polarity tasks by separating input–output relations, through MoE and shared encoder layers. Tested on HARD (Hotel Arabic reviews dataset), BRAD (Book review Arabic dataset), and LABR (Large-scale Arabic Book reviews dataset) datasets, the model provides 84.02%, 67.89%, and 83.91% accuracy, respectively.

Alhumoud *et al.* [26] introduce ASAVACT, the biggest human-annotated

Arabic COVID-19 vaccine tweet corpus (32,476 tweets) with seven expert annotations. They also compare SGRU (Stacked gated recurrent unit), Sbi-GRU (Stacked bidirectional gated recurrent unit), and an ensemble with AraBERT for pro vs. anti-vaccine classification. The MARBERT model achieved the best accuracy of 88.9% on the ASTD (Arabic sentiment tweets dataset). More importantly, Mustafa *et al.* [27] investigate Food Delivery Service Reviews in the Arabic Language by employing CNN, BiLSTM, and LSTM-CNN hybrid models along with different stemmers and embeddings. They are trained on a hand-annotated Talabat dataset of modern standard Arabic and dialectal Arabic. Their performance reaches 84% multiclass and 92.5% binary classification accuracy for their best model.

Mohammed and Kora [28] collect a 40,000-tweet Arabic corpus and evaluate CNN, LSTM, and RCNN deep-learning models using word embeddings. The best accuracy is obtained by LSTM, 81.31%, which can be improved to 89.61% using data augmentation. In addition, Dandash and Asadpour [29] present “AraPers” a dataset of 3,250 Arabic Twitter users put together from users who posted 16Personalities test scores, and extract linguistic, profile, and metadata features. They apply varying degrees of models, from NB to BERT, and achieve an accuracy of 74.86% for personality prediction. Khalil *et al.* [30] train a BiLSTM-based multi-label emotion analysis model, which is built on top of Aravec (Arabic word embeddings) and ARLSTEM (Arabic light stemmer) embeddings for Arabic tweets. They address the SemEval 2018 task 1 E-c multi-emotion classification task. Their model achieves the state-of-the-art F1 score of 96.6%.

Sabri *et al.* [31] propose ATCF-IDF, a term-weighting variant that is

based on TF-IDF but incorporates the category-specific term frequency for Arabic text classification. They test ATCF-IDF with DT (Decision Tree), NB, and SVM on Khaleej-2004 and CNN-Arabic datasets. SVM with ATCF-IDF achieves 98.26% accuracy, outperforming traditional weighting techniques. Jannani *et al.* [32] mix LDA (Latent dirichlet allocation) with Bi-GRU (Bidirectional gated recurrent unit) sentiment analysis of AraBERT and ASAFAYA embeddings on Moroccan news headlines. They collected likes and dislikes to tag sentiment and create a social well-being scoring and monitoring system. They reported state-of-the-art sentiment accuracy of 90.23% and topic classification accuracy of 94.74% using their Bi-GRU model with ASAFAYA.

An overview of the key models, datasets, and sentiment classification tasks reported in prior studies is presented in Table 1. This compilation highlights the diversity of approaches employed in sentiment analysis, ranging from classical machine learning methods to advanced deep learning and transformer-based architectures. To provide a clearer conceptual structure, Fig. 1 illustrates a taxonomy of state-of-the-art techniques, categorizing them by learning strategy (Supervised, weakly supervised, and active learning), feature representation, and sentiment granularity (Binary, multi-class, and aspect-based analysis). This taxonomy serves as a reference framework for understanding the methodological landscape and the positioning of various approaches within the field.

Table 1: Summary of existing studies on Arabic sentiment analysis and related tasks, including the models used, datasets, and corresponding tasks.

<b>Authors</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Task</b>
[7]	RMuBERT	ANP5, ANPS2	Sentiment analysis
[5]	NRC + ML classifiers	COVID-19 tweets	Sentiment analysis
[6]	Lexicon + SVM / Random forest	FIFA tweets	Sentiment tracking
[9]	BERT + Aspect attention	Survey responses	Aspect-aware sentiment analysis
[10]	MTL-AraBERT	Restaurant & E-commerce reviews	Aspect & Sentiment classification
[8]	ArabBERT-LSTM	Multiple Arabic corpora	Sentiment analysis
[24]	Snorkel + AraBERT	Saudi reform tweets	Sentiment classification
[25]	Switch-transformer + MoE	HARD, BRAD, LABR	Multi-task sentiment Analysis
[26]	Ensemble with AraBERT	ASAVACT	Vaccine Sentiment Analysis
[27]	CNN, BiLSTM, Hybrid	Talabat dataset	Food delivery sentiment
[33]	TF-IDF + Voting	Coffee tweets	Sentiment analysis
[28]	CNN, LSTM, RCNN	40K Arabic tweets	Sentiment analysis
[29]	AraPers + ML / DL	3,250 Personality tweets	Personality prediction
[30]	CNN-LSTM Hybrid	ATD dataset	Arabic sentiment classification
[31]	ATCF-IDF + ML	Khaleej-2004, CNN-Arabic	Text classification
[32]	LDA + Bi-GRU	Moroccan news	Sentiment & Topic classification
[11]	Ensemble + AL	Multiple sources	Classification
[12]	Stacking + Voting	Moroccan dialect	Sentiment annotation
[13]	ActiveLLM	Few-shot benchmarks	Few-shot selection
[14]	Pool-based AL	24 Benchmarks	In-context selection
[15]	APL + DPO	Preference datasets	Preference optimization
[17]	BAL-PM	Preference data	Prompt selection
[16]	CAL	Biased datasets	Bias detection
[19]	Clustering + LLM	Generative outputs	Generative selection
[20]	SIFT	Pile	Test-time tuning
[21]	FreeAL	LLM + SLM	Noisy label filtering

Although sentiment analysis and active learning have been extensively studied for high-resource languages such as English, research on Arabic remains limited. Existing studies suffer from three main shortcomings. First, there is a scarcity of labeled Arabic datasets covering diverse dialects, as most existing work focuses on modern standard Arabic or a single dialect, limiting model generalizability to real-world Arabic usage. Second, active




Figure 1: Taxonomy of Arabic sentiment classification approaches.

learning, despite its potential to reduce annotation costs, has received little attention in the context of Arabic sentiment analysis. Third, to the best of our knowledge, no prior study has employed LLMs as annotators for Arabic sentiment analysis, and no work has systematically compared human annotations with LLM-generated annotations within an active learning framework, nor contrasted these results with scenarios that do not employ active learning. Addressing these gaps, this study investigates multiple deep learning models and a range of LLMs across diverse Arabic sentiment datasets to provide a comprehensive evaluation and advance the development of scalable, resource-efficient Arabic sentiment analysis systems.

### 3. Methodology

This section presents a structured four-phase methodology for Arabic sentiment analysis that combines both non-active and active learning strategies. The primary objective of this framework is to reduce annotation effort through active learning while achieving performance levels comparable to those obtained with non-active learning approaches. Additionally, the methodology investigates the effectiveness of using LLMs as automated labelers compared to human annotators in the active learning setting.

In the first phase, we analyze the characteristics of the selected sentiment datasets and apply essential preprocessing steps, including text normalization, tokenization, and cleaning. The second phase involves evaluating the predictive performance of five prominent LLMs: GPT-4o, Claude, Gemini, DeepSeek, and LLaMA on the preprocessed datasets. For each dataset, the model that achieves the highest predictive accuracy will be selected to carry out the labeling task in subsequent stages. The third phase focuses on training three deep learning models: RNN, LSTM, and GRU on fully labeled datasets to establish performance baselines. The fourth and final phase introduces active learning, wherein the model iteratively selects the most uncertain samples from an unlabeled data pool (Constructed based on the splits from phase two) for labeling and retraining. This cycle is repeated until the model reaches accuracy comparable to the baselines established in phase three. To evaluate labeling efficiency, we conduct two active learning scenarios: One using human-annotated labels and the other using labels generated by the best-performing LLM identified earlier in phase two.

An overview of the proposed active learning methodology is shown in Fig.

2, and each phase is described in detail in the following sections.




Figure 2: The proposed active learning framework for Arabic sentiment analysis begins with data preprocessing and splitting, followed by the selection of a labeling source, either an LLM or human annotators, before entering the active learning loop. Within the loop, the model is first trained, then iteratively selects the most uncertain samples for labeling by the chosen source, and retrains until a predefined threshold is met.

### 3.1. Phase 1: Datasets and Preprocessing

#### 3.1.1. Datasets

This study employs three distinct Arabic sentiment analysis datasets: A custom dataset collected from the Hunger Station mobile application [34] and

two publicly available benchmark datasets, AJGT [23] and MASAC [35].

The Hunger Station dataset, contains 51,409 user-written reviews in both modern standard Arabic and various local dialects. Although these reviews came with star ratings from 1 to 5, they did not include specific sentiment labels. To address this, we manually labeled a representative subset of 5,036 reviews based on their sentiment. This resulted in 2,399 positive, 2,506 negative, and 131 neutral reviews. The labeled data mainly includes reviews from the year 2023, although the full dataset spans five years. This annotated subset was then used for the experiments in this study.

To compare model performance and support generalization, we also used the well-known Arabic Jordanian general tweets (AJGT) dataset. This dataset includes 1,800 manually labeled tweets, split equally between positive and negative classes, with no neutral examples. The tweets are written in a mix of Jordanian dialect and modern standard Arabic and were labeled by native Arabic speakers to ensure accuracy. Because it comes from social media, the dataset reflects the informal, dialect-rich, and often noisy language found in real-life user content. This makes it a strong benchmark for testing sentiment models in realistic, low-resource environments.

Finally, the multi-domain Arabic sentiment corpus (MASAC) complements the other two datasets by providing a larger and more structured collection of Arabic texts. MASAC contains over 8,000 sentences from various domains, such as education, politics, health, and technology. Each sentence is labeled as either positive, negative, or neutral. Unlike AJGT, this dataset mostly uses formal modern standard Arabic and is grouped by topic, making it especially useful for testing models on more structured and grammatically

correct texts from different fields.

All relevant details and statistics for the three datasets used in this study are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Description of the Arabic sentiment analysis datasets considered for experimentation.

No.	Dataset	Description	Size	Classes
1	Hunger Station [34]	User reviews in Arabic from the HungerStation app, annotated for sentiment polarity and reflecting real-world opinions on services and products.	4,500	Negative, Neutral, Positive
2	AJGT [23]	Arabic tweets focused on the Jordanian dialect, labeled for binary sentiment classification (positive or negative).	1,800	Negative, Positive
3	MASAC [35]	Multi-dialectal Arabic corpus including both Modern Standard Arabic and dialects, annotated for three sentiment classes. Suitable for multiclass classification.	2,000	Negative, Neutral, Positive

### 3.1.2. Datasets Preprocessing

To prepare the data for sentiment analysis, we applied a structured and unified preprocessing pipeline to all three datasets: Hunger Station (4,500 samples), AJGT (1,800 samples), and MASAC (2,000 samples). The goal was to clean the text, reduce noise, and handle the linguistic diversity of Arabic, ensuring that the data was consistent and meaningful for model training.

This pipeline included several steps, such as cleaning, normalization, tokenization, and linguistic filtering, and was applied uniformly across all datasets. Notably, we did not remove any samples during preprocessing. Instead, we focused on cleaning the internal content of each review or tweet. This ensured that the full set of annotated data was preserved and fully utilized throughout the experiments.

The detailed preprocessing steps are described below:

1. **Removal of numerical characters:** All numerical digits were removed from the samples. Since the study focuses solely on textual sentiment, numeric values were considered irrelevant and potentially misleading for the classification task.
2. **Elimination of non-Arabic text and emojis:** All non-Arabic characters, including Latin script, special symbols, and emojis, were filtered out. Emojis, while sometimes indicative of sentiment, were excluded in this study to maintain consistency and focus on linguistic signals within Arabic text. This step ensures that only native Arabic content is retained across all samples.
3. **Punctuation removal:** A comprehensive set of punctuation marks, including both general and Arabic-specific symbols, was removed to simplify the text and minimize syntactic noise.
4. **Text normalization:** Normalization was applied to reduce inconsistencies and standardize the text. Three specific sub-steps were performed:
  - **Diacritics removal:** Arabic diacritical marks were removed, as they are often omitted in user-generated content and can introduce unnecessary variation.
  - **Elongation (tatweel) removal:** Stylistic character extensions were normalized to their standard forms to reduce feature sparsity.
  - **Emoji normalization and removal:** Emojis were not only removed but also normalized during earlier cleaning stages to ensure consistent treatment across the dataset.

Notably, we avoided normalization techniques that could alter word meaning or degrade the semantic integrity of the text.

5. **Tokenization:** The normalized text was tokenized into individual words using the Arabic tokenizer provided by the NLTK library. Tokenization enables further processing and feature extraction by structuring the text into discrete units.
6. **Stop-word removal:** High-frequency Arabic stop-words, were removed using NLTK’s built-in stop word list. These words typically carry low discriminative power for sentiment classification and can obscure relevant signals.
7. **Stemming:** To further reduce dimensionality and unify the morphological variants, stemming was performed using the Arabic stemmer from NLTK. This process transforms words to their base or root forms while preserving their core meaning.
8. **Duplicate word removal:** Repetitive words within the same review were eliminated to prevent artificially inflated term frequencies and reduce redundancy in the input space.

### *3.2. Phase 2: Selecting the best LLM for each dataset*

In this phase, our objective is to identify the most effective LLM for each of the datasets introduced in Phase 3.1. To accomplish this, we evaluated five state-of-the-art multilingual LLMs, accessed via the OpenRouter API, on their ability to perform sentiment classification in Arabic. For each dataset, we randomly sample 200 Arabic reviews and provide them as input to each model. The models are instructed to predict a sentiment label for each review, and the predicted labels are then compared against the ground-truth

annotations to compute classification accuracy. The model with the highest accuracy in each dataset is selected to serve as the automated labeling agent in the active learning process carried out in Phase 3.4.

The evaluated models span both closed-source and open-source paradigms. Closed models include GPT-4o (OpenAI), Claude 3 Sonnet (Anthropic), and Gemini 2.5 Pro (Google), all of which are known for their strong performance on general-purpose multilingual tasks, including Arabic sentiment classification. On the open-source side, we evaluate DeepSeek Chat (DeepSeek) and LLaMA 3 70B Instruct (Meta), which have demonstrated competitive instruction follow-up capabilities and growing effectiveness in Arabic natural language processing.

To ensure consistent and deterministic results across all models, we configure the decoding parameters by setting the temperature to 0 and limiting the maximum response length to 15 tokens. Each model is prompted using a standardized instruction designed to constrain the output to a single predefined sentiment label, thereby avoiding variation in format and reducing ambiguity. The prompt is shown below:

**Sentiment Classification Prompt**

You will be given an Arabic review. Classify its sentiment as one of the following: [LABELS]. Respond with **ONLY ONE** label from this list. No explanation is needed.

**Review:** "..."

The key characteristics and configuration details of the evaluated models are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of model details and configurations

<b>Model</b>	<b>Max Tokens</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Language</b>
GPT-4o	15	Closed	Multilingual
Claude 3 Sonnet	15	Closed	Multilingual
Gemini 2.5 Pro	15	Closed	Multilingual
DeepSeek Chat	15	Open	Multilingual
LLaMA 3 70B Instruct	15	Open	Multilingual

### *3.3. Phase 3: Model Training with RNN, LSTM, and GRU Architectures*

This phase focuses on training and evaluating three deep learning models: RNN, LSTM, and GRU using the labeled dataset prepared in phase 3.1. The datasets are divided into training, validation, and testing subsets with a 60%-20%-20% split. Each model is trained until the validation loss stops improving for several consecutive epochs. The best performing model of each architecture is saved, and the corresponding test set scores are recorded for use in the subsequent active learning phase.

#### *3.3.1. Data preparation*

Prior to training, the labeled data is tokenized using the Tokenizer class with a vocabulary size limit of 2,000 words. All sequences are padded to a fixed maximum length of 100 tokens. Sentiment labels are numerically encoded through label encoding. The dataset is then partitioned into training (60%), validation (20%), and testing (20%) sets.

#### *3.3.2. RNN model training*

Recurrent neural networks are designed to process sequential data by maintaining the memory of previous inputs. Their ability to retain context

over time makes them suitable for tasks such as natural language processing and sentiment classification.

**Model architecture:** The RNN model is implemented using the TensorFlow Keras sequential API. It begins with an embedding layer configured with an input length of 100, input dimension of 2,000, and an output dimension of 32, transforming text into dense vector representations. This is followed by two simpleRNN layers, each with 32 units and dropout/recurrent dropout rates set to 0.2 to mitigate overfitting. Batch normalization layers are added after each simpleRNN to stabilize and accelerate training. A final dense layer with a sigmoid activation function outputs the binary sentiment prediction.

**Training procedure:** The model is trained using the Adam optimizer and binary cross-entropy loss, with a batch size of 32 over 20 epochs. The performance of the model is monitored using the validation set, and the best model is selected based on the minimum validation loss. Table 4 summarizes the RNN configuration.

Table 4: Key parameters of the RNN model.

Parameter	Value
Embedding input dim	2000
Embedding output dim	32
Embedding input length	100
SimpleRNN units	32
Dropout rate	0.2
Recurrent dropout rate	0.2
Activation function	Sigmoid
Optimizer	Adam
Loss function	Binary Cross-Entropy
Number of epochs	20
Batch size	32

### 3.3.3. LSTM model training

Long short-term memory networks are an advanced variant of RNNs, specifically designed to capture long-range dependencies through gated memory cells. Their architecture is well-suited for tasks involving sequential patterns, such as text classification.

**Model architecture:** The LSTM model is constructed using the sequential API. It includes an embedding layer with input dimension 2,000, output dimension 32, and input length 100. This is followed by a single LSTM layer with 32 units and a dropout rate of 0.5. A final dense layer with sigmoid activation is used for binary classification.

**Training procedure:** The model is trained using the Adam optimizer and binary cross-entropy loss for 20 epochs with a batch size of 32. Validation loss is used to track performance, and the best model is retained. Key

configuration details are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Key parameters of the LSTM model.

Parameter	Value
Input dimension	2000
Output dimension	32
Input length	100
LSTM units	32
Dropout rate	0.5
Recurrent dropout	0.5
Activation function	Sigmoid
Optimizer	Adam
Loss function	Binary Cross-Entropy
Number of epochs	20
Batch size	32

#### 3.3.4. GRU model training

Gated recurrent units are a streamlined variant of LSTM networks designed to mitigate the problem of vanishing gradients in RNNs. They are capable of learning long-term dependencies while being computationally efficient.

**Model architecture:** The GRU model follows a similar sequential architecture, beginning with an embedding layer (input dimension of 2000, output dimension of 32, and input length of 100). This is followed by a GRU layer with 16 units and a dropout rate of 0.5, after which batch normalization is applied. The final output layer is a dense layer with a sigmoid activation function, enabling binary classification.

**Training procedure:** The GRU model is trained using the Adam op-

optimizer with binary cross-entropy loss over 100 epochs and a batch size of 32. Early stopping with a patience of 5 epochs is applied to restore the best weights based on validation loss. The detailed GRU configuration is presented in Table 6.

### 3.3.5. Evaluation metrics

To evaluate the performance of the RNN, LSTM, and GRU models, we calculate several metrics on the training, validation, and test sets, including accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score. These metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of classification performance.

Table 6: Key parameters of the GRU model.

Parameter	Value
Input dimension	2000
Output dimension	32
Input length	100
GRU units	16
Dropout rate	0.5
Recurrent dropout	0.5
Activation function	Sigmoid
Optimizer	Adam
Loss function	Binary Cross-Entropy
Number of epochs	100
Batch size	32

### 3.4. Phase 4: Active Learning Framework

In this phase, we implement an active learning framework to iteratively improve model performance by selectively labeling the most uncertain sam-

ples from an unlabeled data pool. The objective is to achieve test accuracy comparable to that obtained with non-active learning (As established in Phase 3.3), while significantly reducing the number of manually labeled samples. This process is applied independently to each dataset.

To evaluate the efficiency of different annotation strategies, the active learning process is conducted twice for each dataset: Once using manual human labeling and once using automated labeling by the best performing LLM identified in Phase 3.2. The results of both settings are compared based on test set accuracy and the number of cycles required to reach the target performance.

The active learning framework proceeds through the following steps:

1. **Dataset initialization:** For each dataset, the preprocessed data is divided into training, validation, and testing subsets. An *unlabeled data pool* is then constructed from the training portion, consisting of samples without sentiment labels.
2. **Active learning cycles:** The model is iteratively trained through a sequence of active learning cycles. In each cycle, uncertain samples are selected for annotation, incorporated into the labeled set, and used for retraining. We set a threshold of 25 active learning cycles, after which the labeling process stops. The test accuracy results across these cycles are then examined, and the labeling outcome corresponding to the first occurrence of test accuracy matching the best performance achieved without active learning in Phase 3.3 is selected. Each cycle involves the following stages:
  - (a) **Model training:** In the first cycle, the deep learning model that

achieves the highest performance in the baseline (Non-active learning) phase is selected for use in the active learning experiments. This model is initially trained on a small set of 50 labeled samples. In subsequent cycles, it is retrained using the progressively expanded labeled set. Training is terminated when the validation loss fails to improve for several consecutive epochs.

- (b) **Uncertainty estimation:** An entropy-based uncertainty metric is applied to rank unlabeled samples according to prediction confidence, with priority given to those exhibiting the highest uncertainty.
- (c) **Sample selection and labeling:** In each cycle, a fixed number of the most uncertain samples (e.g., 50) are selected for annotation. For every dataset, the active learning process is conducted twice:
  - *Human annotation:* Samples are labeled by human annotators.
  - *LLM annotation:* Samples are labeled by the best-performing LLM from Phase 3.2.
- (d) **Model update:** The newly labeled samples are incorporated into the training data, and the model is retrained.
- (e) **Performance evaluation:** After each cycle, the model is evaluated on the fixed test set, and the test accuracy is recorded. Upon reaching the threshold of 25 active learning cycles, the first cycle in which the model’s test accuracy matches the best accuracy obtained without active learning in Phase 3.3 is identified. The labeling results from that cycle are then selected for analysis.

## 4. Experimental Results and Discussion

### 4.1. *Experimental Environment and Hardware*

The experimental setup was implemented using Python 3.8.10. All stages of the workflow, including development, implementation, execution, and analysis, were carried out on a DELL Inspiron 15 5000 laptop. This system is equipped with an Intel Core i7 processor, 16GB of RAM, an NVIDIA GeForce MX230 GPU, and Intel Iris Plus integrated graphics. The machine runs on Windows 10 Pro.

### 4.2. *LLMs Evaluation Results for Sentiment Labeling Across Different Datasets*

In this experiment, we evaluated the predictive performance of five LLMs: GPT-4o, Claude 3 Sonnet, Gemini 2.5 Pro, DeepSeek Chat, and LLaMA 3 70B Instruct on three Arabic sentiment datasets: HungerStation, AJGT, and MASAC. The primary objective was to determine, for each dataset individually, which model demonstrates the highest accuracy and should therefore be used to perform automated labeling during the active learning phase.

To ensure consistency and fairness in the evaluation, we randomly sampled 200 reviews from each dataset and applied the same test samples across all models. Each model was queried using a standardized prompt format, which constrained the output to one of the predefined sentiment labels. Table 7 and Fig. 3 reports the accuracy of each model on all datasets.

Table 7: Accuracy (%) of LLMs across Arabic sentiment datasets.

Model	HungerStation	AJGT	MASAC
GPT-4o	<b>93.0</b>	78.5	<b>88.5</b>
Claude 3 Sonnet	89.0	<b>86.0</b>	80.0
Gemini 2.5 Pro	91.5	84.5	83.5
DeepSeek Chat	89.5	78.5	82.0
LLaMA 3 70B Instruct	86.0	79.0	80.5




Figure 3: LLMs accuracy (%) across all sentiment datasets

The results reveal distinct differences in model performance across the sentiment datasets. Claude 3 Sonnet achieved the highest accuracy on the AJGT dataset, while GPT-4o outperformed all other models on both the

HungerStation and MASAC datasets. Accordingly, we adopt a dataset-specific model selection strategy, whereby the model with the highest accuracy for a given dataset is employed for automated labeling in the active learning phase. This tailored approach ensures that the labeling process capitalizes on the strengths of the most effective model while accommodating the unique linguistic and contextual characteristics of each dataset.

#### *4.3. Performance of Deep Learning Models in the Non-Active Learning Setting*

To establish a baseline for subsequent experiments, we evaluated three deep learning architectures: LSTM, GRU, and RNN, on three Arabic sentiment analysis datasets: Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC. Each dataset is partitioned into 60% training, 20% validation, and 20% testing splits, resulting in 2,700 samples for Hunger Station, 1,200 for AJGT, and 1,080 for MASAC.

The results, summarized in Table 8, represent the classification performance without incorporating any active learning strategies. For the Hunger Station dataset, LSTM attains the highest performance, marginally surpassing GRU and RNN. On the AJGT dataset, LSTM again achieves superior results, outperforming both GRU and RNN. A similar trend is observed for the MASAC dataset, where LSTM consistently yields the best performance.

Given its consistent superiority across all datasets, LSTM is selected as the benchmark model for the subsequent active learning phase, where its performance will be compared under various active learning strategies.

Table 8: Sentiment classification results without active learning across Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC datasets.

Model	Dataset	# Samples	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
LSTM	Hunger Station	2700	0.93	0.93	0.87	0.90
	AJGT	1200	0.83	0.85	0.83	0.84
	MASAC	1080	0.82	0.82	0.81	0.82
RNN	Hunger Station	2700	0.92	0.89	0.87	0.88
	AJGT	1200	0.52	0.55	0.58	0.56
	MASAC	1080	0.50	0.61	0.50	0.55
GRU	Hunger Station	2700	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.89
	AJGT	1200	0.81	0.88	0.76	0.81
	MASAC	1080	0.75	0.82	0.72	0.77

#### 4.4. Active Learning Performance Evaluation

This section presents the evaluation of the active learning framework applied to the LSTM model across the HungerStation, AJGT, and MASAC datasets. The LSTM architecture was selected for this phase based on its consistently superior performance in the baseline (Non-active learning) experiments. Two independent experiments are conducted: one using human-labeled data and the other using LLM-generated labels. The following subsections report the results of each experiment separately, covering active learning with human-labeled data and active learning with LLM-labeled data.

##### 4.4.1. Active Learning Using Human-Labeled Data

In this experiment, active learning is applied to all three datasets: Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC, using the LSTM model. In each cycle, a human annotator labels the newly selected samples, which are then added to the

labeled set for model retraining. This process is repeated until all active learning cycles are completed.

For the Hunger Station dataset (Table 9), the model’s accuracy improves substantially as labeled samples are progressively added. While the first cycle begins with an accuracy of 0.35, performance increases steadily thereafter. By the ninth cycle, accuracy reaches 0.87, and by the fourteenth cycle, with only 700 labeled samples, it attains 0.93, matching the baseline accuracy of 0.93 achieved in the non-active learning setting using the full 2,700 labeled samples. This shows that active learning can achieve baseline accuracy with far fewer labeled samples.

Table 9: Sentiment classification results for LSTM model with active learning on the Hunger Station dataset (Human labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.35	0.34	0.77	0.51
2	100	0.59	0.45	0.67	0.33
3	150	0.34	0.34	0.77	0.51
4	200	0.55	0.23	0.60	0.55
5	250	0.35	0.35	0.77	0.51
6	300	0.52	0.44	0.55	0.50
7	350	0.57	0.42	0.58	0.48
8	400	0.80	0.68	0.81	0.74
9	450	0.87	0.82	0.83	0.82
10	500	0.89	0.84	0.87	0.86
11	550	0.91	0.88	0.87	0.88
12	600	0.91	0.87	0.88	0.87
13	650	0.92	0.89	0.88	0.89
14	700	0.93	0.92	0.87	0.89

On the AJGT dataset (Table 10), the model shows consistent improvement as more labeled data is added. Beginning with only 50 labeled instances, it achieves an initial accuracy of 0.54, which rises steadily across cycles. By the ninth cycle (450 samples), accuracy reaches 0.77, and by the final cycle

with 700 labeled samples, it attains 0.83, closely matching the baseline accuracy of 0.83 obtained in the non-active learning setting with the full 1,200 labeled samples. These results confirm the efficiency of active learning in achieving competitive accuracy with significantly fewer annotations.

Table 10: Sentiment classification results for the LSTM model with active learning on the AJGT dataset (Human labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.54	0.54	0.98	0.67
2	100	0.54	0.54	1.00	0.70
3	150	0.54	0.54	1.00	0.69
4	200	0.61	0.60	0.90	0.71
5	250	0.67	0.65	0.83	0.73
6	300	0.68	0.65	0.87	0.74
7	350	0.72	0.70	0.88	0.77
8	400	0.74	0.73	0.81	0.77
9	450	0.77	0.75	0.86	0.80
10	500	0.78	0.78	0.83	0.80
11	550	0.79	0.81	0.80	0.80
12	600	0.81	0.81	0.84	0.83
13	650	0.81	0.86	0.78	0.82
14	700	0.83	0.84	0.84	0.84

For the MASAC dataset (Table 11), the model starts with an accuracy of 0.49 in the early cycles. As additional labeled samples are incorporated, accuracy improves steadily, reaching 0.82 by the fifteenth cycle with only 750 labeled instances. This matches the baseline accuracy of 0.82 achieved in the non-active learning setting using the full 1,080 labeled samples. These results demonstrate that active learning can reach baseline-level accuracy with considerably fewer annotations.

Table 11: Sentiment classification results for the LSTM model with active learning on the MASAC dataset (Human labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.49	0.49	1.00	0.66
2	100	0.49	0.49	1.00	0.66
3	150	0.49	0.49	1.00	0.66
4	200	0.52	0.50	0.95	0.66
5	250	0.58	0.54	0.94	0.69
6	300	0.57	0.54	0.95	0.69
7	350	0.58	0.54	0.93	0.68
8	400	0.65	0.60	0.86	0.71
9	450	0.70	0.65	0.84	0.73
10	500	0.74	0.70	0.80	0.75
11	550	0.73	0.71	0.77	0.74
12	600	0.77	0.75	0.80	0.77
13	650	0.81	0.80	0.81	0.81
14	700	0.81	0.79	0.84	0.82
15	750	0.82	0.80	0.84	0.82

Overall, across all three datasets, active learning with human annotators achieves accuracy equivalent to that obtained in the baseline (Non-active learning) setting while requiring substantially fewer labeled samples. This confirms its effectiveness in reducing annotation demands without compromising model performance.

#### 4.4.2. Active Learning Using LLM-Labeled Data

In this experiment, active learning is applied to the Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC datasets using the LSTM model, with annotations provided by the best-performing LLM selected for each dataset in the previous experiment. In each cycle, the newly selected samples are labeled by the corresponding LLM and added to the training set for model retraining. This process continues until all active learning cycles are completed.

For the Hunger Station dataset (Table 12), the model begins with an

accuracy of 0.78 in the first cycle and improves steadily, reaching 0.90 by the eighth cycle with only 400 labeled samples. This performance is maintained in the final cycle (450 samples), which is close to the baseline non-active learning accuracy of 0.93 obtained with 2,700 labeled samples.

Table 12: Sentiment classification results for the LSTM model with active learning on the Hunger Station dataset (LLM labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.78	0.64	0.83	0.72
2	100	0.86	0.80	0.78	0.79
3	150	0.74	0.95	0.26	0.41
4	200	0.88	0.86	0.77	0.81
5	250	0.87	0.87	0.73	0.80
6	300	0.88	0.95	0.68	0.79
7	350	0.89	0.92	0.75	0.83
8	400	0.90	0.91	0.80	0.85
9	450	0.93	0.92	0.80	0.85

On the AJGT dataset (Table 13), the model starts with an accuracy of 0.54 using 50 labeled samples. Accuracy increases gradually across cycles, reaching 0.73 by the fourth cycle (200 samples) and stabilizing at 0.75 in the final cycle (550 samples). Although this remains below the baseline accuracy of 0.83 achieved with 1,200 labeled samples, it still demonstrates meaningful gains with fewer annotations.

Table 13: Sentiment classification results for the LSTM model with active learning on the AJGT dataset (LLM labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.54	0.54	1.00	0.70
2	100	0.64	0.72	0.55	0.62
3	150	0.59	0.71	0.39	0.51
4	200	0.73	0.79	0.69	0.74
5	250	0.71	0.82	0.59	0.69
6	300	0.70	0.74	0.67	0.70
7	350	0.72	0.84	0.61	0.71
8	400	0.74	0.80	0.59	0.69
9	450	0.74	0.86	0.61	0.72
10	500	0.72	0.83	0.60	0.69
11	550	0.75	0.84	0.65	0.73

For the MASAC dataset (Table 14), the model begins with an accuracy of 0.59 in the first cycle and reaches 0.71 by the fifth cycle (250 samples). By the final cycle (650 samples), it attains 0.82, matching the baseline accuracy of 0.82 obtained with 1,080 labeled samples in the non-active learning setting.

Table 14: Sentiment classification results for the LSTM model with active learning on the MASAC dataset (LLM labeling).

Cycle	Label Count	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1 Score
1	50	0.59	0.81	0.25	0.38
2	100	0.66	0.60	0.75	0.69
3	150	0.70	0.72	0.64	0.68
4	200	0.69	0.73	0.61	0.65
5	250	0.71	0.72	0.67	0.70
6	300	0.73	0.76	0.66	0.71
7	350	0.74	0.75	0.69	0.71
8	400	0.74	0.74	0.63	0.70
9	450	0.75	0.82	0.64	0.72
10	500	0.75	0.76	0.71	0.74
11	550	0.75	0.82	0.68	0.74
12	600	0.75	0.80	0.66	0.72
13	650	0.82	0.80	0.73	0.76

Overall, across all three datasets, active learning with LLM-generated labels achieves accuracy comparable to the baseline (Non-active learning) results while requiring substantially fewer labeled samples. These findings demonstrate the potential of LLM-based annotation to reduce manual labeling costs without compromising model performance.

#### *4.5. Overall Findings and Comparative Analysis*


This study provides a comprehensive evaluation of active learning applied to sentiment classification across different datasets, while comparing human annotation with LLM-based labeling. The analysis quantifies the reduction in annotation effort enabled by active learning and assesses the viability of LLM-generated labels as an alternative to traditional human annotation.

Our findings establish two central contributions. First, we demonstrate that active learning can consistently achieve baseline-level performance, comparable to that obtained with fully labeled datasets, while requiring only a fraction of the labeling effort. This performance consistency holds across datasets and annotation sources, underscoring active learning’s robustness and efficiency in reducing the volume of labeled data without sacrificing accuracy. Second, we show that LLM-generated labels, when integrated into active learning pipelines, can closely match the effectiveness of human annotation, in some cases reaching equivalent accuracy in fewer labeling cycles.


The performance trends are illustrated in Fig. 4. For the Hunger Station dataset, human annotation reached the baseline accuracy of 0.93 after 14 cycles with 700 labeled samples, while LLM labeling achieved the same performance in just 9 cycles with 450 samples. Early cycles by human annotation fluctuated heavily between 0.4–0.6 accuracy, whereas LLMs maintained sta-

ble performance above 0.8 throughout, showing clear efficiency gains. In the AJGT dataset, human annotation ultimately outperformed LLMs, reaching 0.83 in 14 cycles (700 samples), compared to 0.75 with 11 cycles (550 samples) for LLMs. However, LLM-assisted labeling provided faster early improvements, highlighting its sample efficiency even if humans achieved slightly higher final accuracy. For the MASAC dataset, both strategies converged to comparable performance (0.82), but LLM labeling reached this level with 650 samples versus 750 for human annotation, and its accuracy curve showed smoother, more consistent gains.


Overall, this research contributes in two significant ways. First, it empirically confirms that active learning can substantially reduce the amount of labeled data required to achieve high classification accuracy, thereby enhancing the efficiency of sentiment analysis. Second, it shows that LLMs can serve as an effective replacement for human annotation when combined with active learning. This approach accelerates the labeling process, optimizes resource allocation, and enables the development of more scalable sentiment analysis systems.



(a) Hunger Station dataset.



(b) AJGT dataset.



(c) MASAC dataset.

Figure 4: Accuracy comparison across Hunger Station, AJGT, and MASAC datasets under different labeling strategies. LLM-assisted labeling achieves higher accuracy with fewer samples than human labeling and consistently outperforms the non-active learning baseline.

## 5. Conclusions and Future Research

Arabic sentiment analysis is increasingly important for understanding public opinion on digital platforms. However, its advancement is hindered by the limited availability of annotated datasets and the linguistic complexity of Arabic, particularly its diverse dialects and rich morphology. While manual annotation is accurate, it is both time-consuming and resource-intensive, posing scalability challenges. Active learning emerges as a promising alternative by strategically minimizing labeling effort, yet its application to Arabic sentiment analysis has remained underexplored.

This study addresses this by integrating active learning into Arabic sentiment classification and evaluating its performance across three benchmark datasets that include both modern standard Arabic and dialectal content. Multiple deep learning models were employed under two annotation paradigms: Traditional human labeling and LLM-assisted annotation. Several state-of-the-art large language models were examined for their potential to accelerate the annotation process

The results demonstrate that active learning can significantly reduce annotation requirements without compromising classification accuracy. Moreover, LLM-assisted labeling proved to be an efficient and cost-effective complement to manual annotation, enhancing the overall scalability of sentiment analysis pipelines. These findings highlight the strong potential of combining active learning with LLM-driven annotation strategies to support sentiment analysis in low-resource languages such as Arabic.

Future work can proceed along three directions. First, extending experiments on additional datasets that span diverse Arabic dialects and do-

mains (e.g., news, healthcare, education) would strengthen evidence of the framework’s generalizability. Second, employing LLMs fine-tuned on Arabic data for the labeling process could further improve annotation quality and adaptation to linguistic nuances. Third, exploring alternative sample selection strategies within the active learning loop, such as uncertainty-based, disagreement-based, or committee-based methods, and systematically comparing their effectiveness would provide deeper insights into optimizing labeling efficiency.

## References

- [1] H. ElSahar, S. R. El-Beltagy, Building large arabic multi-domain resources for sentiment analysis, in: Proceedings of the EMNLP Workshop on Arabic Natural Language Processing (WANLP), 2015, pp. 28–35.
- [2] J. Wei, K. Zou, EDA: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks, in: *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, 2019, pp. 6382–6388.
- [3] W. Zaghouani, Critical survey of the freely available arabic corpora, in: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC), 2014, pp. 2902–2909.
- [4] B. Settles, Active learning literature survey, Tech. Rep. 1648, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Computer Sciences Department (2009).

- [5] M. M. Ali, Arabic sentiment analysis about online learning to mitigate covid-19, *Journal of Intelligent Systems* 30 (2021) 524–540. doi:10.1515/jisys-2020-0115.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/jisys-2020-0115>
- [6] W. Ishac, V. Javani, D. Youssef, Leveraging sentiment analysis of arabic tweets for the 2022 fifa world cup insights, incorporating the gulf region, *Managing Sport and Leisure* Published online 30 April 2024 (2024). doi:10.1080/23750472.2024.2342258.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2024.2342258>
- [7] M. Mhamed, R. Sutcliffe, J. Feng, Benchmark arabic news posts and analyzes arabic sentiment through rmubert and ssl with amcfl technique, *Egyptian Informatics Journal* 29 (2025) 100601. doi:10.1016/j.eij.2024.100601.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eij.2024.100601>
- [8] W. Alosaimi, H. Saleh, A. A. Hamzah, N. El-Rashidy, A. Alharb, A. Elaraby, S. Mostafa, Arabbert-lstm: improving arabic sentiment analysis based on transformer model and long short-term memory, *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 7 (2024) 1408845. doi:10.3389/frai.2024.1408845.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2024.1408845>
- [9] K. A. Alshaikh, O. A. Almatrafi, Y. B. Abushark, Bert-based model for aspect-based sentiment analysis for analyzing arabic open-ended survey responses: A case study, *IEEE Access* 12, published 29 December 2023; current version 5 January 2024 (2024). doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.

3348342.

URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3348342>

- [10] A. Fadel, M. Saleh, R. Salama, O. Abulnaja, Mtl-arabert: An enhanced multi-task learning model for arabic aspect-based sentiment analysis, *Computers* 13 (4) (2024) 98. doi:10.3390/computers13040098.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers13040098>
- [11] M. Salama, H. Abdelkader, A. Abdelwahab, A novel ensemble approach for heterogeneous data with active learning, *International Journal of Engineering Business Management* 14 (2022) 18479790221082605.
- [12] Y. Matrane, F. Benabbou, Z. Banou, Wevote: A weighted voting technique for automatic sentiment annotation of moroccan dialect comments, *IEEE Access* (January 2024).
- [13] M. Bayer, J. Lutz, C. Reuter, Activellm: Large language model-based active learning for textual few-shot scenarios, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10808 (2025).  
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.10808>
- [14] K. Margatina, T. Schick, N. Aletras, J. Dwivedi-Yu, Active learning principles for in-context learning with large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14264 (2023).  
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14264>
- [15] W. Muldrew, P. Hayes, M. Zhang, D. Barber, Active preference learning for large language models, in: Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), Vol. 235 of Proceedings of

Machine Learning Research, 2024, pp. 36577–36590.

URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.08114>

- [16] Z. Sun, L. Du, X. Ding, Y. Ma, Y. Zhao, K. Qiu, T. Liu, B. Qin, Causal-guided active learning for debiasing large language models, in: Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024, pp. 14455–14469.
- [17] L. C. Melo, P. Tigas, A. Abate, Y. Gal, Deep bayesian active learning for preference modeling in large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10023 (2024).  
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.10023>
- [18] A. Kaseb, M. Farouk, Active learning for Arabic sentiment analysis, Alexandria Engineering Journal 77 (22) (2023) 177–187. doi:10.1016/j.aej.2023.06.082.
- [19] S. Hassan, A. Sicilia, M. Alikhani, An active learning framework for inclusive generation by large language models, in: Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025, pp. 5403–5414.
- [20] J. Hübötter, S. Bongni, I. Hakimi, A. Krause, Efficiently learning at test-time: Active fine-tuning of llms, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08020 (2024).  
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08020>

- [21] R. Xiao, Y. Dong, J. Zhao, R. Wu, M. Lin, G. Chen, H. Wang, Freeal: Towards human-free active learning in the era of large language models, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15614<https://github.com/Justherozen/FreeAL> (2023).
- [22] N. Al-Twairesh, M. N. Al-Kabi, M. Al-Razgan, R. Al-Shalabi, Sentiment analysis of arabic tweets: Feature engineering and a hybrid approach, *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 9 (11) (2018) 355–363. doi:10.14569/IJACSA.2018.091139.
- [23] K. M. Alomari, H. M. ElSherif, K. Shaalan, Arabic jordanian general tweets (ajgt) corpus, Available via Hugging Face and GitHub, consists of 1,800 tweets (900 positive, 900 negative) in Modern Standard Arabic and Jordanian dialect (2017).  
URL [https://huggingface.co/datasets/komari6/ajgt\\_twitter\\_ar](https://huggingface.co/datasets/komari6/ajgt_twitter_ar)
- [24] A. Alotaibi, F. Nadeem, M. Hamdy, Weakly supervised deep learning for arabic tweet sentiment analysis on education reforms: Leveraging pre-trained models and llms with snorkel, *IEEE Access* 13 (2025) 30523–30541. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3541154.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3541154>
- [25] L. H. Baniata, S. Kang, Switch-transformer sentiment analysis model for arabic dialects that utilizes a mixture of experts mechanism, *Mathematics* 12 (2) (2024) 242. doi:10.3390/math12020242.
- [26] S. Alhumoud, A. Al Wazrah, L. Alhussain, L. Alrushud, A. Aldosari,

- R. N. Altammami, N. Almukirsh, H. Alharbi, W. Alshahrani, Asavact: Arabic sentiment analysis for vaccine-related covid-19 tweets using deep learning, PeerJ Computer Science 9 (2023) e1507. doi:10.7717/peerj-cs.1507.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1507>
- [27] D. Mustafa, S. M. Khabour, M. Al-kfairy, A. Shatnawi, Leveraging sentiment analysis of food delivery services reviews using deep learning and word embedding, PeerJ Computer Science 11 (2025) e2669. doi:10.7717/peerj-cs.2669.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2669>
- [28] A. Mohammed, R. Kora, Deep learning approaches for arabic sentiment analysis, Social Network Analysis and Mining 9 (1) (2019) 52. doi:10.1007/s13278-019-0596-4.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-019-0596-4>
- [29] M. Dandash, M. Asadpour, Personality analysis for social media users using arabic language and its effect on sentiment analysis, Social Network Analysis and Mining 15 (2025) 6. doi:10.1007/s13278-025-01413-2.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-025-01413-2>
- [30] E. A. H. Khalil, E. M. F. E. Houbay, H. K. Mohamed, Deep learning for emotion analysis in arabic tweets, Journal of Big Data 8 (2021) 136. doi:10.1186/s40537-021-00523-w.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-021-00523-w>

- [31] T. Sabri, S. Bahassine, O. E. Beggar, M. Kissi, Improving the efficiency of arabic text classification with new term weighting scheme, *Scientific AfricanPreprint* (2024).  
URL <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5135639>
- [32] A. Jannani, S. Bouhsissin, N. Sael, F. Benabbou, Topic modeling and sentiment analysis of arabic news headlines for a societal well-being scoring and monitoring system: Moroccan use case, *IEEE Access* 13 (2025) 26345–26360. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3538888.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3538888>
- [33] O. Alsemaree, A. S. Alam, S. S. Gill, S. Uhlig, Sentiment analysis of arabic social media texts: A machine learning approach to deciphering customer perceptions, *Heliyon* 10 (2024) e27863. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27863.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27863>
- [34] Hungerstation, *HungerStation Saudi Arabia*, <https://hungerstation.com/sa-ar>, retrieved April 24, 2024 (n.d.).
- [35] M. Bedi, S. Kumar, M. Akhtar, T. Chakraborty, Multi-modal sarcasm detection and humor classification in code-mixed conversations, *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* Introduces the MaSaC dataset: a Hindi–English code-mixed multi-modal corpus for sarcasm and humor detection (2021). doi:10.1109/TAFFC.2021.3083522.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAFFC.2021.3083522>