**Form 2:**

**Literature Documents**

**1.Team No: 7.**

**2. Project Title: ChatBot Music Recommendation System.**

**Comparison of Existing Methods**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sl.no** | **Author (s)** | **Method** | **Advantages** | **Disadvantages** |
| 1 | J. B. Schafer, D. Frankowski, J. Herlocker, and S. Sen | “Collaborative filtering recommender systems,”  The Adaptive Web: Methods and Strategies of Web Personalization | User-Based CF Approach and Item-based CF Approach | Data Sparsity, Cold-star. |
| 2 | M. J. Pazzani and D. Billsus | “Contentbased recommendation systems,” TheAdaptive Web: Methods  and Strategies ofWeb Personalization | Based oncontext,Proposed system contains modules such as Intention Module, Mood Module and Recommendation  Module each of which provide a unique functionality. | As the content increase trafficking of data increases leading to false adaptations. |
| 3 | W. Hsu, and C. J. Lin. | “A comparison of methods for multiclass support vector machines,”IEEE Tran.  Neural Networks. | Multiple SVM combining each binary classification and all at once easily. | Computationally expensive when the dataset is large. |
| 4 | R. E. Fan, K. W. Chang, C. J. Hsieh, X. R. Wang, and C. J. Lin. | “LIBLINEAR: a library for large linear classification,” J. Machine Learning Research. | LIBLINEAR as an easy-to-use tool to deal with most promising learning techniques for large sparse data with a huge number of instances and features. | Has problems with saddle points and can't be parallelized over multiple processor cores. |

Accordingly we have taken a project which recommends music based on emotions and conversation of a user with a chatbot and named as “**ChatBot Music Recommendation System”.**
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