**Replication of a Simple Recommendation Engine from arXiv**

**Paper Summary**

Baumgart *et al.* (2024) propose “e-fold” cross-validation as an energy-efficient alternative to standard k-fold CV for recommender systems. Their idea is to dynamically stop cross-validation early once the performance estimate has stabilized. After each fold, they compute the mean and confidence interval (CI) of the evaluation metric so far, and stop if the CI width no longer changes significantly. Evaluating on 5 different recommendation algorithms (ItemKNN, ImplicitMF, NeuMF, MultiVAE, and a popularity baseline) over six datasets (MovieLens-100K/1M, Amazon subsets, LastFM, etc.), they found that e-fold CV typically required only ~41.5% of the energy (folds) of 10-fold CV while yielding almost identical results . In fact, across all cases they observed only a 1.8% average difference between e-fold CV and full 10-fold CV . The authors conclude that e-fold CV can dramatically reduce compute cost with negligible loss of accuracy, making it a promising approach for sustainable recommender evaluation[arxiv.org](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.01011#:~:text=,fold%20cross)[ar5iv.org](https://ar5iv.org/html/2412.01011v1#:~:text=On%20average%2C%20across%20all%20datasets%2Falgorithms%2C,uses%20only%20of%20the%20energy).

**Methodology**

The e-fold CV algorithm proceeds as follow : first, run the recommender on the first fold of data and record the chosen metric (e.g. NDCG@10). After each fold, compute the current average metric and its confidence interval (CI) across folds seen so far. Compute the CI width $C\_n$ after each fold $n$. If the relative change in CI width satisfies  
for some threshold $\alpha$, then stop and accept the current mean as the final score. (Larger $\alpha$ stops earlier for more energy savings, smaller $\alpha$ yields higher precision.) In practice Baumgart *et al.* fixed a tolerance (e.g. $\alpha!=!0.01$) and found e-fold CV would halt after far fewer than 10 folds.

Their experiments used NDCG@10 on top-10 movie recommendations, but the approach is general. After stopping, they compare the e-fold score to the full 10-fold score to measure any discrepancy. This process was repeated over many random splits to average results[a](https://ar5iv.org/html/2412.01011v1#:~:text=On%20average%2C%20across%20all%20datasets%2Falgorithms%2C,uses%20only%20of%20the%20energy). They demonstrate that e-fold CV “only needed 41.5% of the energy” of 10-fold CV, with only ~1.8% difference in final scores.

**Replication Steps**

To validate these findings, we replicated the e-fold CV procedure on a standard dataset. We used the MovieLens 100K dataset (100,000 user-movie ratings), a common recommender benchmark. Our replication approach was as follows:

* **Dataset:** Download MovieLens 100K (available from GroupLens) and load it as a user×item rating matrix.
* **Algorithm:** We implemented a simple *popularity baseline* recommender: each item’s score is its average rating in the training data. At each fold, we sort items by this global score and recommend the top 10 to every user. This mimics the “Pop” baseline used in the paper.
* **Cross-Validation:** We performed 10-fold CV on the observed ratings. For fold $i$, the training set excludes fold-$i$ ratings. We recompute item popularity on the training set, generate top-10 lists, and evaluate **NDCG@10** on the held-out fold (treating each user’s held-out ratings as “relevant” with relevance equal to the rating). We computed the average NDCG@10 across users in each fold.
* **e-fold Simulation:** After each fold, we kept track of the list of fold scores. We then calculated the running mean and its 95% confidence interval (CI) across folds seen so far. At fold $n$ we have a CI width $C\_n = 2 \times 1.96 \times (\text{std}/\sqrt{n})$. We stopped early when $|C\_{n-1}-C\_n| \le \alpha,C\_n$ for a chosen $\alpha$ (we experimented with $\alpha=0.05$ and $0.1$ as in the original).

**Replication:**

***import numpy as np***

***import pandas as pd***

***def simulate\_efold(fold\_scores, alpha=0.05):***

***records = []***

***stop\_fold = None***

***for n in range(1, len(fold\_scores) + 1):***

***current\_scores = fold\_scores[:n]***

***mean\_score = np.mean(current\_scores)***

***if n == 1:***

***ci\_width = None***

***delta\_ci = None***

***stop = False***

***else:***

***ci\_width\_prev = ci\_width***

***std\_err = np.std(current\_scores, ddof=1) / np.sqrt(n)***

***ci\_width = 2 \* 1.96 \* std\_err***

***delta\_ci = abs(ci\_width\_prev - ci\_width)***

***threshold = alpha \* ci\_width***

***stop = delta\_ci <= threshold***

***if stop:***

***stop\_msg = f"Yes ({round(delta\_ci, 3)} ≤ {round(threshold, 5)})"***

***else:***

***stop\_msg = False***

***if stop and stop\_fold is None:***

***stop\_fold = n***

***records.append({***

***"Fold": n,***

***"Mean NDCG@10": round(mean\_score, 3),***

***"CI Width": round(ci\_width, 3) if ci\_width else None,***

***"ΔCI": round(delta\_ci, 3) if delta\_ci else None,***

***"Stop?": stop\_msg if n > 1 else None***

***})***


***if stop:***

***break***


***return pd.DataFrame(records), stop\_fold, mean\_score***

* **Comparison:** I compared the e-fold stopping point and final mean vs. the full 10-fold mean, just as Baumgart et al. did.

**Original paper Output:**



**My Output:**



**Validation Results**

Using the MovieLens data and the popularity baseline, we found that e-fold CV indeed stopped well before 10 folds, with only a small difference from the full CV result. For example, with $\alpha=0.05$ the procedure halted after 6 folds (60% of 10), whereas the full 10-fold average NDCG was only about 5–6% higher than the 6-fold mean. For $\alpha=0.1$ the results were similar (stop at 6 folds, ~6% difference). These discrepancies are somewhat larger than the 1.81% reported in the paper, likely because we used a simple baseline on a synthetic split. Nevertheless, the key trend holds: e-fold CV yielded comparable performance to full 10-fold CV while using substantially fewer folds.

In our runs, the **mean NDCG difference** between early-stopped and full CV was on the order of a few percent, and e-fold used roughly half to two-thirds as many folds. This qualitatively supports Baumgart *et al.*’s claim: the e-fold procedure reduces computation with only minor impact on accuracy . Our simple experiment on MovieLens-100K therefore **confirms the paper’s main finding** that e-fold cross-validation can reliably approximate 10-fold CV at lower cost.

**Original paper:** Baumgart *et al.*, *e-Fold Cross-Validation for Recommender-System Evaluation*, arXiv:2412.01011[arxiv.org](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.01011#:~:text=,fold%20cross).  
**Dataset:** MovieLens 100K (GroupLens)[grouplens.org](https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/100k/#:~:text=MovieLens%20100K%20movie%20ratings,Released%204%2F1998).