

COMPUTER ENGINEERING

CMPE 297-02 FINAL PROJECT - FALL 2022

Collaborative filtering using optimized data structures on Spark

Kin Wo Chang 013783848

supervised by Professor Gheorghi Guzun

Contents

| 1 | Data | a pre-processing and other approaches | 3 |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| | 1.1 | Basic Statistics | 3 |
| | 1.2 | Data Transformation | 3 |
| | 1.3 | Train/Validation Split | 4 |
| 2 | User-based LSH with Nearest Neighbor Search | | |
| | 2.1 | Prediction Algorithm | 4 |
| | 2.2 | Validation Algorithm | 5 |
| 3 | 3 Latent Factor using Matrix Decomposition | | 6 |
| 4 | Resi | ult | 7 |
| | 4.1 | RMSE score | 7 |
| | 4.2 | Training Time | 7 |
| | 4.3 | Prediction Time | 7 |
| 5 | Refe | erences | 8 |

1 Data pre-processing and other approaches

1.1 Basic Statistics

First, as shown below, I use pandas's library function to read the raw dat file. With header names "uid", "iid", "ratings", "ts" in the dataframe, it makes examining the data easy.

```
train_raw = pd.read_csv('train.dat', header=None, names=["uid", "iid", "rating",
    "ts"], sep='\t', engine='python')
```

After simple inspection, we have a total of **85724** rating data, with **943** number of unique users and **1659** number of unique items. Ratings are integer values ranging from 1 to 5. Timestamps are given in Unix epoch time.

1.2 Data Transformation

To use our dataset in training the LSH or Matrix Decomposition model, we need to represent each user as a feature factor. That is, the item rating history of that specific user. For this purpose, I chose to transform the above dataframe into a dictionary of key userid to a dictionary of key itemid to rating. Code shown below.

```
1 u2irmap = {}
2 i2umap = {}
3 for _, r in train_raw.iterrows():
4     uid, iid = int(r.uid), int(r.iid)
5     if uid not in u2irmap:
6         u2irmap[uid] = {}
7     u2irmap[uid][iid] = int(r.rating)
8     if iid not in i2umap:
9         i2umap[iid] = set()
10     i2umap[iid].add(uid)
```

To save this transformed dataset for easy and efficient access in training our model, I save it in .json format. Both the saving and retrieval code are shown below. Note that the str->int conversion when loading, because json requires string as key.

```
# Saving
with open("all.json", "w") as outfile:

json.dump(u2irmap, outfile)
# Loading
```

```
with open("all.json", "r") as content:
all = json.load(content)
u2irmap = {int(k): {int(mk): int(mv) for mk, mv in v.items()} for k, v in all.
items()}
```

1.3 Train/Validation Split

We split the training data into train / validation set for cross-validation. This is done on a user level and is only used in the LSH-NN model. 90: 10 split is done, and the resulting training set has 858 and testing set 85. The main function used in this split from sklearn is shown below.

```
from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split

s = pd.Series(u2irmap)

train_set, valid_set = [i.to_dict() for i in train_test_split(s, test_size=0.1)]

train_set = {int(k): {int(mk): int(mv) for mk, mv in v.items()} for k, v in train_set.items()}

valid_set = {int(k): {int(mk): int(mv) for mk, mv in v.items()} for k, v in valid_set.items()}
```

Code from this section can be found in preprocess.ipynb on Github.

2 User-based LSH with Nearest Neighbor Search

2.1 Prediction Algorithm

I chose user-based LSH over item-based because it is more straight forward. First, the LSH model is built using users feature factors to approximate nearest neighbor search. Then, given a user, user-history of item rating, and a new item, we search the closest neighbors using LSH that has rated this item before, and take the average of neighbors' ratings as the predicted for this user. The above overview may look simple, but there are a lot of nuances in the algorithm. For example, how do we condition the closest neighbors search returned by LSH has to have rating on the predicting item? Based on my research, I have not found a library function that provide this kind of condition on NN search. Hence, there are only two options, 1) pre-process the pool of neighbors so that they all have rated the predicting item, or 2) post-process the returned closest neighbors from LSH and only pick those that have rated the predicting item. Option 2

first seemed most plausible but soon I was bothered by the idea of picking the hyper-parameter numNeighbors. What if the it is set to 10, but the first 10 closest neighbors to user all haven't rated the predicting item?

The above concern regarding option 2 drives me to go with the first options. Therefore, an item to [user] map is created to filter out neighbors before passing it into the main spark MinHashLSH approxNearestNeighbors function (line 8 and 13). Normal spark operations are also used such as Vectors.sparse() and spark.createDataFrame(). The referenced predict_rating function is shown below.

```
from pyspark.ml.linalg import Vectors
<sup>2</sup> from pyspark.ml.feature import MinHashLSH
3 # expect to have:
4 # maxiid, u2irmap (user-to-item-ratings map), and i2umap (item-to-users map)
5 def predict rating (itemid, userhistory, num neighbors=10, num hash tables=20,
      max iid=1699):
      if itemid not in i2umap or len (userhistory) == 0: # no rating has given for
      this item, can't predict
          return None
      userDs = [(int(uid), Vectors.sparse(max iid+1, u2irmap[uid])) for uid in
      u2irmap if uid in i2umap[itemid]]
      dfUsers = spark.createDataFrame(userDs, ["uid", "features"])
      mh = MinHashLSH(inputCol="features", outputCol="hashes", numHashTables=
10
      num_hash_tables)
      model = mh. fit (dfUsers)
11
      key = Vectors.sparse(max iid+1, userhistory) # item history expect to be a
12
      dict {<item>: rating}
      rows = model.approxNearestNeighbors(dfUsers, key, num neighbors)
13
      ratings = []
14
      for r in rows.collect():
15
          ratings.append(u2irmap[r["uid"]][itemid])
      return int(round(sum(ratings) / len(ratings))) if ratings else None
```

2.2 Validation Algorithm

Another big question I had is how do I evaluate my model performance, that is, how do I pass the validation set into the model to get error metrics? The solution I came up with is, for each user's feature vector (items to rating history map), manually hold out one entry from that map. The hold out rating will be the truth rating, and passing this user and its held-out feature vector into our model will give us the predicted rating. Iterating through holding out each item and associate rating from the history map for this user will give us the error metrics for this user. The error metrics algorithm and the core idea of "holding out rating" is implemented in the function get_user_history_without_item() shown below in line 3-6.

```
import time
2 from math import sqrt
  def get user history without item (user history, itemid):
      user history without item = user history.copy()
      user_history_without_item.pop(itemid)
      return user_history_without_item
7 \text{ rmse total} = []
8 start time = time.time()
  for index , uid in enumerate(list(vu2irmap.keys())):
      print(f"Processing user {uid}, {index+1}/{len(vu2irmap)}")
      user history = vu2irmap[uid]
11
      rmse user = []
12
      for iid in user history:
13
          expected = user_history[iid]
14
          uh = get user history without item (user history, iid)
          predicted = predict rating(iid, uh)
16
           if predicted:
17
               rmse user.append((expected - predicted)**2)
18
               print(f"No predicted for user: {uid}, item: {iid}")
20
      if rmse user:
21
          rmse_total.append(sqrt(sum(rmse_user) / len(rmse_user)))
      else:
23
          print(f"no rmse user for user {uid}")
25 print("—— %s seconds ——" % (time.time() - start_time))
```

3 Latent Factor using Matrix Decomposition

Latent factors are factors that can only be indirectly inferred from other observable variables. For our use case, these factors can be the type, cost, quality of items that affects the rating given by users, which isn't exactly obvious when looking at our dataset. Extracting these latent factors can help us predict new item ratings for users. A common method for extracting latent factors is Matrix Decomposition. The broad idea is to split the adjacency matrix (in our case

the user-item-rating table) into User feature matrix and Item feature matrix. This is achieved by using Stochastic Gradient Decent on minimizing the error of historic item ratings for each user (not the un-rated items). Combining these two matrix back will automatically predicts all missing / unknown item ratings stored in the resulting predicted adjacency matrix.

Despite tireless effort, I couldn't get the SVD algorithm from Spark to work. For the interest of time, an algorithm in simple Python is used for this algorithm. Work on both ends can be found in latent factor.ipynb on Github.

4 Results

4.1 RMSE score

Submitted on the CLP, the RMSE score for the LSH model is 1.0617 with hashTables=20 and nearNeigbhors=10, while the Latent Factor model scores a 1.0037, with steps=300, alpha=0.0002, and beta=0.02. The Latent Factor model seems to be doing better based on my limited testing. However, it is very hard to say which one is better after proper hyper-parameter tuning, such as numNeighbors and numHashTables in LSH model or iteration, learning rate, and regularization params in the Latent Factor model.

Moreover, the validation method mentioned in sec 2.2 yields a RMSE score of 1.021, with same settings as above.

4.2 Training Time

Using the simple time.time() in Python, building the LSH model (model.fit) takes only 0.039 seconds; while running the matrix decomposition with 300 steps take a whooping 704 seconds to complete. This huge gap in training time difference could be because of the naive implementation of matrix decomposition without any optimization. I believe the training time will be greatly improve if I could get computeSVD from Spark to work.

4.3 Prediction Time

In contrast to the short training time, the LSH-NN model takes 230 seconds to predict all 2154 entries from the test set. Moreover, in contrast to the long training time, the latent factor model takes a mere 0.033 seconds to predict all 2154 entries, mainly because all the items are pre-computed and prediction only takes a matrix look-up. The big contrast of time in both

algorithm reflects a trade off between training and prediction efficiency when building models.

5 References

- Ahmet& Tevfik: Real-time recommendation with locality sensitive hashing
- $\bullet\,$ Dennis Chen: Recommender System Matrix Factorization
- Shashwat Tiwari: Crafting Recommendation Engine in PySpark
- Spark: LSH
- Spark: Dimensionality Reduction -
- Spark: MinHashLSHModel
- Spark: Vector