Introduction

- Recommendation task:
  - Suggest items of interest to users
    - Items: movies, books, articles, humans
    - Users: humans
Is it worth our attention?

- Recommendation is the next search
- Search finds items (given a query)
- Recommendation finds items of interest
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- Recommendation is the next search
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Google

stock prices
stock prices
stock price history
stock price calculator
stock prices live
They are responsible for 4% of US marriages (from 2005 to 2012)

And lower divorce rates
Machine Learning for Recommender Systems

- Task: Suggest items of interest to users
- From data how do you determine what denotes interest?
  - Item-specific signal (supervised learning)
    1. Score: rating, bid
    2. Consumption: click, buy, watch, bookmark
- Imagine
  - The data are user ratings
  - Task: Recommend items the user will like

- How do we set it up as a machine learning problem?
• Imagine
  • The data are user ratings
  • Task: Recommend items the user will like

• How do we set it up as a machine learning problem?

Task: What do we learn? What do we predict? What is the model?
Performance measure: How do we evaluate the results?
Experience: How does our model interact with data?
Framework for recommendation problems

Data
- User preferences
- User/Item features

Representation of user preferences

Recommendations
- E.g. Top-N recommendations
• Task:
  
  • How we we set it up?
    1. Regression (Classification)
    2. Ranking
Ranking vs. Regression

A. Ranking models

- Computationally more expensive

- E.g., Have to consider a group of items (listwise)

\[ f : (u, i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_m) \rightarrow (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m) \]

  user u's unseen items  rank of each item

B. Score models

- For each user:

  1. Predict scores of all unseen items  \[ f : (u, i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \]

  2. Rank items (show top-K)
Framework for recommendation problems

Data

- User preferences
  🌟🌟🌟🌟🌟
- User/Item features

Representation of user preferences

Model

Predict Missing Ratings
Score Prediction as regression

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}_{\text{users} \times \text{items}} \xrightarrow{f} \begin{bmatrix}
3 & 2 & \cdots & 0 \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 3 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Train: Black \( S^o \)
Test : Red \( S^u \)
Modelling?

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}_{\text{users} \times \text{items}} \quad f \quad \begin{bmatrix}
3 & 2 & \cdots & 0 \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 3 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\
0 & 2 & \cdots & 2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

- How do we set this up as a learning problem?

\[S^u = f(S^o)\]
Collaborative Filtering (CF)

- Assumption:
  - Users with past similar preferences will have similar future preferences

- Work horse used in many recommender systems
CF- Neighbourhood approaches

1. For each user, find other users with similar past preferences

2. Predict that user's missing preferences as the weighted combination of its neighbours' preferences

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

 users x items
CF- Neighbourhood

1. Find similarity between every pair of users (or items)

$$\text{Sim}(u, u') = \frac{(s_u^0) \top s_{u'}^0}{\|s_u^0\| \|s_{u'}^0\|}$$

2. Predict missing scores using a user's neighbours

$$\hat{s}_{uj} = \sum_{u'} \text{Sim}(u, u') s_{u'j}^0,$$

\(\forall u'\) that have rated j
CF- Neighbourhood approaches

- Non-parametric approach
- A user is represented by a weighted combination of its neighbours
- New users can change one's recommendations
- Different distance functions to capture different effects
- Ratings vs. clicks
- Could consider additional information
- Works well empirically
- Building similarity matrix can be slow (offline)
- Not probabilistic
CF - Matrix factorization

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}
\approx
\begin{bmatrix}
k \\
\theta \\
k \\
\beta \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

- Assumption: the observation matrix is low-rank
- Estimates user and item representations
- \( k \) is a hyperparameter
  \( k \ll \min(\text{|Users|, |Items|}) \)

Model. \( S_{ui} := \theta_u^T \beta_i \)

Parameters. \( \theta_u \forall u, \beta_i \forall i \)

Objective. \( \sum_u \sum_i (S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2 \)

[Salakhutdinov, Mnih, '08]

Model. \( S_{ui} := \theta_u^T \beta_i \)

Imagine that \( \theta_u \)'s are features of users

The model is then a linear regression for each item:

\[
S_{ui} = \theta_u^T \beta_i \\
= \sum_k \theta_{uk} \beta_{ik} \\
= \sum_k \theta_{u1} \beta_{i1} + \theta_{u2} \beta_{i2} + \ldots + \theta_{up} \beta_{ip}
\]

Since the model is symmetric in \( \theta \) and \( \beta \), \( \beta_i \)'s can be seen as features of items
Model fitting

Objective. $\sum_u \sum_i (S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2$
Model fitting
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- Joint parameter optimization
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Model fitting

Objective. \( \sum_u \sum_i (S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2 \)

- Joint parameter optimization

- Gradient descent: \( (\nabla \theta, \nabla \beta) \)

- Alternate optimization

1. Fix \( \theta \), update \( \beta \)
2. Fix \( \beta \), update \( \theta \)

- Each step is a (regularized) least-squares problem

- This procedure is known as alternating least squares (ALS)
Matrix Factorization

$S^o$ →

User's highly rated movies

E.T. the Extra-Terrestrial (Children's, Drama)
Full Metal Jacket (Action, Drama, War)
Three Colors: Red (Drama)
Breaker Morant (Drama, War)
Shakespeare in Love (Comedy, Romance)
Shadowlands (Drama, Romance)
Rob Roy (Drama, Romance, War)
The Verdict (Drama)
A Little Princess (Children's, Drama)
Leaving Las Vegas (Drama, Romance)

User's weights for 100 components

Top movies recommended for the user

Casablanca (Drama, Romance, War)
Breakfast at Tiffany's (Drama, Romance)
Amadeus (Drama)
When Harry Met Sally... (Comedy, Romance)
American Beauty (Comedy, Drama)
Fargo (Crime, Drama, Thriller)
The Right Stuff (Drama)
Gandhi (Drama)
Apocalypse Now (Drama, War)
Toy Story (Children's, Comedy, Animation)
Model Exploration

\[ \text{argsort}_i \beta_{ik} \]

### MovieLens

- **6K Users**
- **4K Movies**
- **1M Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Movies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Netflix

- **480K Users**
- **17.7K Movies**
- **100M Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Movies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Literary films&quot;</td>
<td>Pride and Prejudice, Sense and Sensibility, Elizabeth, Emma, Sense and Sensibility, Mansfield Park, Much Ado About Nothing, The Importance of Being Earnest, Anne of Green Gables, Shakespeare in Love</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mendeleys

- **80K Users**
- **260K Sci. articles**
- **100M Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Articles and Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sociology&quot;</td>
<td>Social Capital: Its Origins, Institutions and Economic... Institutions and Economic... Increasing Returns and Path Dependence... Diplomacy &amp; Domestic Politics... Comparative Polities and the Comparative... Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War... Historical Institutionalism in Comparative... Case studies and theory development in social... The Politics, Power, Pathologies... End of the Transition Paradigm...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Wireless sensor networks&quot;</td>
<td>Wireless sensor network survey, An energy-efficient MAC protocol, A survey of routing protocols for Wireless sensor networks for habitat, Cognitive radio brain-empowered wireless, A survey on wireless multimedia sensor networks, Next generation dynamic spectrum, Routing techniques in wireless sensor, Social network analysis...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Distributed behavior&quot;</td>
<td>Flocks, herds and schools, Flocking for multi-agent... Markov-Based multirobot... Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous... Behavior-based formation control for multi robot teams... A formal analysis and taxonomy of task allocation... A survey of consensus problem in multi-agent coordination... Modeling, swarm robotic systems... Cooperative mobile robotics: A case study... The u-puck, a robot designed for education in engineering...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[GoPalanEl et al.'15]
Probabilistic matrix factorization

**Gaussian Matrix Factorization**  
[Salakhutdinov et al. '08]

\[
\begin{align*}
\|\beta_i\|_2 & \\
\|\theta_u\|_2 & \\
(S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2 & \\
\end{align*}
\]

- \(\theta_u \sim \mathcal{N}(a, b)\)
- \(\beta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(c, d)\)
- \(S_{ui} \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta_u^T \beta_i, \sigma)\)

Minimizing mean squared error is equivalent to maximizing likelihood under Gaussian noise

**Poisson Matrix Factorization**  
[Gopalan et al. '15]

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_u & \sim \text{Gamma}(a, b) \\
\beta_i & \sim \text{Gamma}(c, d) \\
S_{ui} & \sim \text{Poisson}(\theta_u^T \beta_i) \\
\end{align*}
\]

- Poisson factorization is correct
- Gaussian factorization is incorrect
- In practice MF typically gives better performance than PF

---

Laurent Charlin — 80-629
Towards CF with deep learning

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & \cdots & \cdot
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Towards CF with deep learning

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & \cdots & \cdots \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(User 1, Item 1, 3)
(User 1, Item 2, 0)
(User 2, Item 2, 0)
(User n, Item 1, 2)
Towards CF with deep learning

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables.

(3 - - - 0)  (User 1, Item 1, 3)
(- 0 - - -)  (User 1, Item 2, 0)
( - - - -)  (User 2 Item 2, 0)
(2 - - - -)  (User n, Item 1, 2)
Towards CF with deep learning

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(Users, Items, Ratings)

(User 1, Item 1, 3)
(User 1, Item 2, 0)
(User 2, Item 2, 0)
(User n, Item 1, 2)

(1 0 \ldots 0, 1 0 \ldots 0, 3)
(1 0 \ldots 0, 0 0 \ldots 1, 0)
(0 1 \ldots 0, 0 1 \ldots 1, 0)
(0 0 \ldots 1, 1 0 \ldots 0, 2)
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Towards CF with deep learning

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & - \\
\end{bmatrix}
\rightarrow
\begin{cases}
(\text{User 1, Item 1, 3}) \\
(\text{User 1, Item 2, 0}) \\
(\text{User 2 Item 2, 0}) \\
(\text{User n, Item 1, 2})
\end{cases}
\]

\[
y = (x_1^T \theta)^T (x_2^T \beta)
\]
Towards CF with deep learning

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables:

(User 1, Item 1, 3)
(User 1, Item 2, 0)
(User 2, Item 2, 0)
(User n, Item 1, 2)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} 3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\ - & 0 & \cdots & - \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 2 & - & \cdots & - \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ y = (x_1^T \theta)^T (x_2^T \beta) \]
Towards CF with deep learning

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & - & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots & - \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
2 & - & \cdots & -
\end{bmatrix}

\Rightarrow

(\text{User 1, Item 1, 3})
(\text{User 1, Item 2, 0})
(\text{User 2 Item 2, 0})
(\text{User n, Item 1, 2})

$$

\begin{align*}
(10\ldots0, 10\ldots0, 3) \\
(10\ldots0, 00\ldots1, 0) \\
(01\ldots0, 01\ldots1, 0) \\
(00\ldots1, 10\ldots0, 2)
\end{align*}

$$

\text{Embedding Layer}

\begin{align*}
x_1 & \xrightarrow{\theta} \ y = (x_1^T \theta)^T (x_2^T \beta) \\
x_2 & \xrightarrow{\beta} \ y
\end{align*}
A version of Deep Matrix Factorization

- Can do more complicated user and item combinations (beyond dot product)

\[ \theta \quad \theta \quad \theta \quad \theta \]

\[ x_1 \quad x_2 \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad \ldots \quad y \]

\[ \beta \quad \beta \quad \beta \quad \beta \]

\[ Xue et al.'17 \]
Autoencoders

- Popular neural-network model often used in unsupervised learning (e.g., dim reduction)
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Autoencoders

• Popular neural-network model often used in unsupervised learning (e.g., dim reduction)

• Non-linear PCA

• Intuition: let’s learn to copy the data

\[ x' = f(x) \]

• We force a “bottleneck”

\[ z = f_1(x) \]
\[ x' = f_2(z) \]
\[ \text{dim}(z) < \text{dim}(x) \]
Autoencoders

\[ z = f_1(x) \]
\[ x' = f_2(z) \]
\[ \text{dim}(z) < \text{dim}(x) \]
Autoencoders for CF

- **X**: Either a row or a column of the ratings matrix
  
  - Missing entries:
    - Set to 0 in the input
    - Not considered in the output
    - Many versions using denoising-autoencoders (DAEs), VAEs, different likelihoods (etc.)

[From wikipedia]
MF vs. AE for CF

- AE are more “naturally” non-linear
- AE are asymmetric
  - must choose whether to model users or items
- Versions of AEs are close to the state-of-the-art today
How to choose the right model?

- Search for papers that compare different models

- Keep a healthy does of scepticism
  - i.e., results in papers is not necessarily ground truth

- Try it out on your data

- Compare performance on held-out data

- Can it handle: your data size, service speed, updating schedule, other desiderata (fairness, uncertainty estimates) ...
Are deep models better?

• 2014: No

• 2018: Yes

• 2019: Maybe not … *

  • “Embarrassingly Shallow Autoencoders for Sparse Data”, Steck’19

  • “On the Difficulty of Evaluating Baselines: A Study on Recommender Systems”, Rendle et al.’19:

    • “With a careful setup of a vanilla matrix factorization baseline, we are not only able to improve upon the reported results for this baseline but even outperform the reported results of any newly proposed method.”

(* This is not considering possibly available covariates)
Explicit vs. Implicit data
Explicit vs. Implicit data

- Up to now we assumed ratings

- Ratings are explicit data:
  - “Users explicitly provide their preferences”
  - A high rating means the user liked the item
  - A low rating means the user disliked the item
Explicit vs. Implicit data

- Up to now we assumed ratings

- Ratings are explicit data:
  - “Users explicitly provide their preferences”
  - A high rating means the user liked the item
  - A low rating means the user disliked the item

- In practice implicit data is much more common:
  - click, buy, watch, listen
Challenge with Implicit Data

• Consuming an item usually implies a positive preference

• Not Consuming an item may either indicate:
  
  A. A negative preference
  
  B. Something else: e.g., lack of exposure or time
Challenge with Implicit Data

- The preference matrix is “full” (as opposed to sparse)
  - ‘1’ indicates a consumed item
  - ‘0’ indicates an unconsumed item

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

- You must take both 0s and 1s into account
- In practice many models can be adapted to implicit case
Common strategy for implicit data

- Model the 0s as being “less certain” than the 1s

$$\text{Objective MF: } \frac{1}{|\text{users}|} \sum_u \sum_i (S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2$$

$$\text{Objective WMF: } \frac{1}{|\text{users}|} \sum_u \sum_i c_{ui}(S_{ui})(S_{ui} - \hat{S}_{ui})^2$$

$$c_{ui}(0) < c_{ui}(1)$$

- Weighted Matrix Factorization [Hu et al.’08]

- Learn the weight of each zero

- Exposure Matrix Factorization [Liang et al.’15]
User/Item features (I)

- Often additional information exists
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• Often additional information exists
  • Users: demographic information, social networks
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  • Users & items:
User/Item features (I)

- Often additional information exists
  - Users: demographic information, social networks
  - Items: content (e.g., movie genre/trailer, book text)
  - Users & items:
    - timestamps, session information
User/item features (II)

- Allow for content-based recommendations
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- Allow for content-based recommendations
- Good to combat the cold-start problem
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- More difficult in some domains than others (e.g., movies)
- A practical approach is to bootstrap with content-based to gather preference data and then switch to CF
User/item features (II)

- Allow for content-based recommendations
- Good to combat the cold-start problem
- Assume that features are predictive of preferences
  - More difficult in some domains than others (e.g., movies)
- A practical approach is to bootstrap with content-based to gather preference data and then switch to CF
- In the next slides we explore hybrid models for these data
Modelling Strategy

1. Generic models
   - Easily extend to many different use cases

2. Tailored modelling for specific features
   - This is where neural nets shine (images, text, networks)
Factorization Machines (FM) [generic model]

- Model “all” additional information

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & \cdots & 0 \\
- & 0 & \cdots \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\
2 & \cdots & \cdots \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

[Rendle’10]
Factorization Machines (FM)  
[generic model]

- Model “all” additional information

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

User  Item
(1 0 ... 0, 1 0 ... 0, 3)
(1 0 ... 0, 0 0 ... 1, 0)
(0 1 ... 0, 0 1 ... 1, 0)
(0 0 ... 1, 1 0 ... 0, 2)

[Rendle’10]
Factorization Machines (FM)
[generic model]

- Model “all” additional information

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

User, Item

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
3 & \cdots & 0 \\
-0 & \cdots & - \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
2 & \cdots & - \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Add features as columns

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
10\ldots0,10\ldots0,3 \\
10\ldots0,00\ldots1,0 \\
01\ldots0,01\ldots1,0 \\
00\ldots1,10\ldots0,2 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

User, Item, Age

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
10\ldots0,10\ldots0,25,3 \\
10\ldots0,00\ldots1,22,0 \\
01\ldots0,01\ldots1,55,0 \\
00\ldots1,10\ldots0,60,2 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]
Factorization Machines (FM) [generic model]

- Model “all” additional information

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

Model. $S_{ui} := w_0 + \sum_{i}^{p} w_i x_i$  
per-feature regression

$+ \sum_{j=0}^{p} \sum_{j'=j+1}^{p} \theta_j^\top \theta x_j x_{j'}$  
per-pair regression

User | Item | Age
--- | --- | ---
(1 0 ... 0, 1 0 ... 0, 25, 3)  
(1 0 ... 0, 0 0 ... 1, 22, 0)  
(0 1 ... 0, 0 1 ... 1, 55, 0)  
(0 0 ... 1, 1 0 ... 0, 60, 2)
Factorization Machines (FM) [generic model]

- Model “all” additional information

\[ \begin{bmatrix} 3 & - & \ldots & 0 \\ - & 0 & \ldots & - \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 2 & - & \ldots & - \end{bmatrix} \]

Encode each categorical variable using a series of indicator variables

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{User} & : (1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 3) \\
\text{Item} & : (1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 1) \\
\text{Age} & : (0 \ 1 \ \ldots \ 0, 0 \ \ldots \ 1, 0) \\
\end{aligned}
\]

Add features as columns

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{User} & : (1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 25, 3) \\
\text{Item} & : (1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 0 \ \ldots \ 0, 1, 22, 0) \\
\text{Age} & : (0 \ 1 \ \ldots \ 1, 0 \ \ldots \ 1, 55, 0) \\
\text{Age} & : (0 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 1, 1 \ \ldots \ 0, 0, 60, 2) \\
\end{aligned}
\]

Model. \( S_{ui} := w_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p} W_i x_i + \sum_{j=0}^{p} \sum_{j'=j+1}^{p} \theta_{j}^{T} x_j x_{j'} \)

- Features added to the data (extra columns) are “automatically” used in the model
- Modelling extra information implies adding the feature

[Rendle’10]
A. Social network

- Data: user ratings and users’ friends

- Assume:
  1. Friends influence your preferences
  2. Different levels of trusts for different friends

Model. \( S_{ui} := \theta_u^T \beta_i + \sum_{u' \in N(u)} \tau_{un} S_{u'i} \)
A. Social network

- Data: user ratings and users’ friends

- Assume:
  1. Friends influence your preferences
  2. Different levels of trusts for different friends

Model. $S_{ui} := \theta_u^T \beta_i + \sum_{u' \in N(u)} \tau_{un} S_{u'i}$

[Chaney et al. '15]
A. Social network

- Data: user ratings and users’ friends

- Assume:
  1. Friends influence your preferences
  2. Different levels of trusts for different friends

Model. \[ S_{ui} := \theta_u^T \beta_i + \sum_{u' \in N(u)} \tau_{un} S_{u'i} \]

How much u “trusts” u’

The rating of u’ on item i

[Chaney et al. '15]
A. Social network

- Recent models use Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs)
- Powerful model for graph data
A. Social network

- Recent models use Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs)
  - Powerful model for graph data
B. Item content

- Data: user ratings and item text/image/...

Model. \( S_{ui} := \theta_u^T (\beta_i + \gamma_i) \)
B. Item content

- Data: user ratings and item text/image/...

\[ S_{ui} := \theta_u^T (\beta_i + \gamma_i) \]

Content features

[Wang et al. '14]
Questions?
C. Dynamic Modelling

- Data: user ratings with timestamps

- Assume:
  - User tastes change over time
  - Item popularity change over time

- Model. \( S_{ui}^t := \theta_u^t \beta_i^t \)
  \[
  \theta^t = \theta^{t-1} + \epsilon
  \]
C.1 Session-Based Modelling

- Data: user ratings with timestamps

- Assume: Users consume related items over short periods of time
  - Domains: Music playlist, exercises, short videos

- Model. Sequential models like RNNs.
Session-based + Social Networks

Figure 2: A schematic view of our proposed model for dynamic social recommendation.

[Song et al. 2019]
An example from Youtube

[Covington et al., '16]
Evaluation

• Evaluate performance on held-out data (standard)

• Splitting data into train/validation/test:
  
  • Split by user to give equal “weight” to each user
  
  • Ensure that each user has enough data (no cold-start)
Evaluation metrics

1. Score prediction (explicit data only)
   - Mean squared error: \[ \frac{1}{\text{users}} \sum_u \sum_i (s_{ui} - \hat{s}_{ui})^2 \]
Evaluation metrics

1. Score prediction (explicit data only)
   - Mean squared error: \[ \frac{1}{|\text{users}|} \sum_u \sum_i (s_{ui} - \hat{s}_{ui})^2 \]

2. Information retrieval
   - Precision, Recall
   - Average rank, Mean average precision
   - Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG)
     - Compares the ranking of your system with the optimal ranking
     - (Exponentially) Discounts items lower ranked items
Precision/Recall

Precision = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false positives}}

Recall = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\text{true positives} + \text{false negatives}}

[From wikipedia]
Precision/Recall

- For implicit data recall is more appropriate

\[
\text{Recall} := \frac{TP}{TP + FN}
\]
Precision/Recall

• For implicit data recall is more appropriate

\[
\text{Recall} := \frac{TP}{TP + FN}
\]

• Consider only the top items (Recall@K)

[From wikipedia]
Other topics

- Lots of other possible signals
- Search queries, engagement (time spent on page)
- Structured recommendations
  - E.g., Recommend a trip, a curriculum of courses
Concluding Remarks (I)

- Type of models we have discussed are useful for:
  - Domains with large number of items (and users for CF)
  - Subjective preferences over attributes (features)
    - E.g., movies and not plane tickets
  - Items can be consumed relatively fast
    - E.g., restaurants/movies and not cars/houses
Concluding Remarks (II)

- CF models “work well” especially in large-data regimes
  - Commercial systems are reasonably good
  - There is evidence that companies derive value from them
- Much progress remains to be done
  - Modelling preferences is a very active research topic
  - Good preference models gave rise to other questions
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