

# COMP 474/6741 Intelligent Systems (Winter 2024)

## Worksheet #4: Recommender Systems

**Task 1.** Let's take some movies that have been #tagged (or categorized) as follows:

|         | Action | Comedy | Sci-Fi | Horror | Drama | Romance | length |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------|
| Movie 1 | 4      | 8      | 6      | 3      | 0     | 0       | 11.18  |
| Movie 2 | 0      | 5      | 0      | 8      | 5     | 0       | 10.68  |
| Movie 3 | 1      | 4      | 0      | 3      | 0     | 10      | 11.22  |

So, each movie becomes a 6-dimensional vector of tags  $t_i$ , e.g.,  $\vec{Movie_1} = \langle 4, 8, 6, 3, 0, 0 \rangle$ . Compute the length of each movie vector, which is defined as  $\|\vec{m}\| = \sqrt{t_1^2 + \dots + t_n^2}$  (rounded to two significant digits).

**Task 2.** Now you can normalize the vectors, by dividing the raw count of each tag  $t_i$  by the length  $\frac{t_i}{\|\vec{m}\|}$ :

|         | Action               | Comedy | Sci-Fi | Horror | Drama  | Romance |
|---------|----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Movie 1 | $4 / 11.18 = 0.3578$ | 0.7156 | 0.5367 | 0.2683 | 0      | 0       |
| Movie 2 | 0                    | 0.4682 | 0      | 0.7491 | 0.4682 | 0       |
| Movie 3 | 0.0891               | 0.3565 | 0      | 0.2674 | 0      | 0.8913  |

Use 4 significant digits for this table (protip: the length of each movie vector must now be 1).

**Task 3.** We can now compute how similar the movies are, by computing their cosine similarity. Since the vectors are normalized, this is simply their dot product:  $\text{sim}(\vec{m}, \vec{n}) = \cos(\vec{m}, \vec{n}) = \vec{m} \cdot \vec{n} = \sum_i m_i \cdot n_i$ :

|   |         |         |         |
|---|---------|---------|---------|
| $0 + (0.7156)(0.4682) + 0 + (0.2683)(0.7491) + 0 + 0 = 0.536$ | Movie 1 | Movie 2 | Movie 3 |
| Movie 1   | 1       | 0.536   | 0.3587  |
| Movie 2   | 0.536   | 1       | 0.3672  |
| Movie 3   | 0.3587  | 0.3672  | 1       |

This is the information we need for an item-to-item recommendation engine: Now we can answer the question, which movie is interesting to (buy, watch) for a customer who (bought, watched) Movie 1? **Movie 2 = 0.536**.....

**Task 4.** Now we want to personalize the recommendations. We collected the following profiles about the movies watched (bought) by our users in the past:

|      | Action | Comedy | Sci-Fi | Horror | Drama | Romance | length |
|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------|
| Jane | 1      | 2      | 1      | 1      | 1     | 0       | 2.83   |
| Joe  | 0      | 1      | 0      | 1      | 0     | 1       | 1.73   |

Compute the length of each user vector and normalize it like before:

|      | Action              | Comedy | Sci-Fi | Horror | Drama  | Romance |
|------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Jane | $1 / 2.83 = 0.3533$ | 0.7067 | 0.3533 | 0.3533 | 0.3533 | 0       |
| Joe  | 0                   | 0.5780 | 0      | 0.5780 | 0      | 0.5780  |

**Task 5.** Now we can answer the question which movie a user is interested in. Compute the cosine similarities between the user vectors and the movie vectors:

|  |         |         |         |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| $(0.3578)(0.3533) + (0.7156)(0.7067) + (0.5367)(0.3533) + (0.2683)(0.3533) + 0 + 0 = 0.9165$ | Movie 1 | Movie 2 | Movie 3 |
| Jane   | 0.9165  | 0.7609  | 0.37789 |
| Joe  | 0.5689  | 0.7036  | 0.8764  |

**Task 6.** Consider the results from three different recommender systems below: Here, X1–X5 are the items (movies, photos, songs, ...) that the systems should have recommended as relevant for a specific user. The remaining 495 instances are not relevant for the user. A checkmark indicates that a system recommended this item to the user (the first *Target* column is the ground truth):

|  | Target | system 1 | system 2 | system 3 |
|--|--------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | X1 ✓   | X1 ✗     | X1 ✓     | X1 ✓     |
|  | X2 ✓   | X2 ✗     | X2 ✗     | X2 ✓     |
|  | X3 ✓   | X3 ✗     | X3 ✓     | X3 ✓     |
|  | X4 ✓   | X4 ✗     | X4 ✓     | X4 ✓     |
|  | X5 ✓   | X5 ✗     | X5 ✗     | X5 ✓     |
|  | X6 ✗   | X6 ✗     | X6 ✗     | X6 ✓     |
|  | X7 ✗   | X7 ✗     | X7 ✗     | X7 ✓     |
|  | ... ✗  | ... ✗    | ... ✗    | ... ✗    |
|  | ... ✗  | ... ✗    | ... ✗    | ... ✗    |
|  | X500 ✗ | X500 ✗   | X500 ✗   | X500 ✗   |

Evaluate the performance of the three systems using the measures *Precision* and *Recall*:

|          | Precision | Recall |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| system 1 | 0         | 0 / 5  |
| system 2 | 3 / 3     | 3 / 5  |
| system 3 | 5 / 7     | 5 / 5  |

Quality vs Relevancy

$$\text{precision} = \frac{\# \text{correct system recommendations}}{\# \text{all system recommendations}}$$

$$\text{recall} = \frac{\# \text{correct system recommendations}}{\# \text{all correct recommendations}}$$

**Task 7.** Now we're looking at *ranked* results. Based on the output below, compute  $\text{precision@k} = \frac{1}{k} \cdot \sum_{c=1}^k \text{rel}(c)$  for the three recommender systems (for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ ):  $\text{rel}(c)$  tells us if item at rank  $c$  was relevant (1) or not (0)

|          | rel( $k$ ) |   |   | precision@ $k$ |     |        | AP@ $N$  |
|----------|------------|---|---|----------------|-----|--------|----------|
|          | 1          | 2 | 3 | 1              | 2   | 3      |          |
| system 1 | 1          | 0 | 0 | 1              | 0.5 | 0.3333 | 0.333    |
| system 2 | 0          | 1 | 0 | 0              | 0.5 | 0.3333 | 0.1667   |
| system 3 | 0          | 0 | 1 | 0              | 0   | 0.3333 | 0.111111 |

That is, here each system got exactly one recommendation right, but in a different position.

AP “rewards” (gives a higher score to) higher-ranked, correct recommendations

**Task 8.** Moving on to the *average precision*,  $\text{AP@N} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^N \text{precision@k} \cdot \text{rel}(k)$ . Compute the AP@3 and add it to the table above. Here, assume  $m = 3$  (i.e., there could have been 3 correct recommendations in the top-3). Note the difference in the AP@3 for the three systems!

**Task 9.** Create a *content vector* for the movie description  $m_1 = \text{“A comedy with zombies.”}$  Start by filling in the tf values below. Then compute  $\text{idf} = \log_{10} \frac{N}{\text{df}}$  (assume  $N = 10,000,000$ ) and  $\text{tf-idf} = (1 + \log \text{tf}_{t,d}) \times \text{idf}$ . Finally, compute the normalized vector  $\vec{q}$  as before (in Tasks 1&2) from the tf-idf vector and its length:

| token    | tf | df      | idf   | tf-idf | $q_i$               |
|----------|----|---------|-------|--------|---------------------|
| action   | 0  | 50,000  | 2.301 | 0      | 0                   |
| comedy   | 1  | 10,000  | 3     | 3      | $= 3 / 3.61 = 0.83$ |
| zombies  | 1  | 100,000 | 2     | 2      | 0.55                |
| romantic | 0  | 10,000  | 3     | 0      | 0                   |

$$\text{length} = 0^2 + 3^2 + 2^2 + 0^2 = 3.61$$

You can now use these vectors for cosine similarity calculations to find recommendations as before, but this time based on the *content* of an item (like a movie description).