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# Introduction

In this report we study a matrix representation of a Recommendation System that utilizes Collaborative Filtering. There is much industry interest in such systems; for example the Netflix suggestion system for its users may use a scheme similar to that presented here. The problem we will study in detail is the following: based on feedback data from users indicating a rating of items, we construct a matrix,where the element corresponds to the rating given by user on item*.*

We would like to extrapolate this matrix to infer which unrated items that a user will likely enjoy. Therefore, we adopt the following construction: where the rows of are vectors that characterize a particular user, the columns of characterize a particular item, and represents the error, parameterized by a factor.

The factorization algorithm used throughout this report is the *Alternating Least Squares Method* which seeks to minimize the following cost function:

(Equation 1)

We will build the recommendation system based on a dataset consisting of 100K movie ratings collected by GroupLens[[1]](#footnote-1).

# Part 1: A Simple Factorization Using ALS

Our Recommendation System uses the NMF MATLAB toolbox[[2]](#footnote-2) to perform the matrix factorization that minimizes the cost function in Equation 1. In this section, we used the NMF tools to factorize. The metric we used to determine the closeness of the factorization was the squared error (Equation 1). We only considered entries that of the prediction matrix that corresponded to actual prediction the user actually made, so Equation 1 was modified by an additional weight matrix where if user rated movie and 0 otherwise. We also varied the value of parameter to determine the optimal size of matrices and. Small values of encode less information which makes the reconstruction of less accurate but large values of could result in over-fitting the dataset. The results for squared error versus parameter are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Squared Error vs k

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| k | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| sq. error | 5.81E+04 | 4.39E+05 | 3.71E+05 |

Although the squared error decreased with increasing, the difference is not significant.

# Part 2: A Modified Construction Using Non-Trivial Weights

In the second part, we apply the same cost function but this time, we reverse the roles of the and (weight) matrices in the factorization step. We again applied the ALS factorization algorithm for different values of parameter and measured the squared error. The results are summarized below in Table 2.

Table 2: Squared error vs k

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| k | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| sq. error | 5.71E+04 | 2.50E+04 | 1.18E+04 |

# Part 3: 10-Fold Cross Validation

In this section, we show results from the same system built using 10-Fold Cross validation. The original dataset is transformed via random permutation, then divided into a testing and training set. The training set is used to construct the matrix which is factorized into and. This process is repeated for ten iterations (10 folds). The values of the prediction matrix are validated against the ratings in the testing set. We define a new metric based on this prediction error shown below in Equation 2.

(Equation 2)

Where is the testing set and is the prediction matrix defined by and. The results of the 10-Fold Cross Validation is shown below in Table 3.

Table 3: Ten-Fold Cross Validation Prediction Error

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| fold | error |
| 1 | 1.5592 |
| 2 | 1.5476 |
| 3 | 1.5413 |
| 4 | 1.5685 |
| 5 | 1.537 |
| 6 | 1.5629 |
| 7 | 1.5686 |
| 8 | 1.538 |
| 9 | 1.5632 |
| 10 | 1.5688 |

The minimum prediction error occurred in the 5th fold and the maximum error occurred in the 10th fold. The average prediction error across all ten folds is.

This process is repeated for the weighted ALS factorization matrices from Part 2 (factorize using the {0, 1} matrix). These results are shown below (note that the errors were normalized by the weight matrix to be comparable with the previous results).

Table 4: Prediction Error for ALS on 1/0 Matrix

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| fold | error |
| 1 | 2.4846 |
| 2 | 2.4791 |
| 3 | 2.4655 |
| 4 | 2.5008 |
| 5 | 2.456 |
| 6 | 2.4858 |
| 7 | 2.473 |
| 8 | 2.475 |
| 9 | 2.4787 |
| 10 | 2.4673 |

In this case, the 4th fold provided the largest Prediction error while the 5th fold had the lowest.

# Part 4: Precision And Recall

Next, we apply the 10-Fold Cross Validation techniques developed in Part 3 to a classification problem where we conclude that ratings above a certain threshold are movies the user “Liked”. We use this to quantify the Precision and Recall metrics which are defined as follows:

(Equation 3)

(Equation 4)

A true positive (tp) is defined as an element in the matrix where for some threshold. A false positive (fp) is defined as an element of where and so on.

For each of the 10 folds, we sweep the threshold between 1 and 5 and obtain a value for precision and recall. We average these values across the folds and plot Precision vs Recall parameterized by threshold. This result is shown below in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Precision vs Recall for Standard ALS Factorization

We repeat the process for the modified factorization using the non-trivial weight matrix from Part 2. The Precision vs Recall plot is shown below in Figure 2.

[**PLOT GOES HERE**]

# Part 5: Improved ALS With Regularization

In this section, we introduce an improvement on the ALS cost function, called a Regularization termwhich reduces the effect of over-fitting the data. The new cost function is modeled by the following Equation:

(Equation 5)

The NMF code was modified to implement a new update rule based on this cost function and the results were re-evaluated for Parts 1 & 2 for.

Table 5: Squared Error vs k and λ (Part 1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| λ\k | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| 0.01 | 57420 | 57363 | 58712 |
| 0.1 | 25286 | 24878 | 26543 |
| 1 | 11636 | 11738 | 13549 |

The squared error is reduced compared to the case with no regularization factor. It also is reduced as λ increases.

Again, the process is repeated on the matrix and matrix in Part 2.

Table 6: lambda and k versus Squared Error

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| λ\k | 10 | 50 | 100 |
| 0.01 | 65384 | 66265 | 66462 |
| 0.1 | 31888 | 31772 | 32271 |
| 1 | 17027 | 17329 | 18012 |

Surprisingly, although the squared error was reduced in Part 2 as a result of swapping the roles of the matrix with, these results indicate the opposite. The squared error with regularization terms increase when you use the weight matrix.

1. http://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://sites.google.com/site/nmftool/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)