

# MM6761: Take-home Assignment 1

Dai Yao (dai@{yaod.ai, mle.bi})

February 24, 2024

## 1 Chen et al. (2017)

The set of model parameters in this paper is:  $\{L, \hat{B}^S, Q, B^S, B\}$ , and each element in this set itself is a collection of various parameters.

- Based on the notation, please specify the focal model in the paper (i.e., MCH), the UCH model, as well as the FM model. Please also briefly discuss their differences.

**Answer:**

**MCH** (Section 2.3 on page 142):

The ratings vector  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  is generated based on  $\beta_i$ , which is generated based on the segment-level partworths  $\beta_i^S$ .

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{X}_i \beta_i + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\beta_i = \beta_i^S + \eta_i. \quad (2)$$

**UCH:**

The ratings vector  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  is generated based on  $\beta_i$ , which is generated based on the population-level partworths  $\bar{\beta}$ . Different from MCH, in UCH, all the individual-level partworths are drawn from a common, population-level partworths vector.

Hence, we keep Equation (1) the same, and twist Equation (2) to specify the UCH model.

$$\beta_i = \bar{\beta} + \eta_i. \quad (3)$$

**FM:**

The ratings vector  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  is generated based on  $\beta_i$ . Among the population, there are  $S$  segments. Individual  $i$  belongs to a particular segment and adopts the segment-level partworths directly. Different from MCH, in FM, the individual-level partworths are exactly the same as the segment-level partworths.

Hence, we keep Equation (1) the same, and twist Equation (2) to specify the FM model.

$$\beta_i = \beta_i^S. \quad (4)$$

- In Section 2.3 (page 142), right above Assumption 1 (A1), the authors said that "a closer examination reveals that learning  $\{B^S, B\}$  is sufficient, as ..." Please explain why.

**Answer:**

First,  $\beta_i, \beta_i^S$ , and  $\hat{\beta}_i^S$  are all  $n \times 1$  column vectors, where  $n$  is the number of elements in  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Thus,  $\hat{B}^S \triangleq \{\hat{\beta}_i^S\}_{i=1}^L$  is a  $n \times L$  matrix, and both  $B^S \triangleq \{\beta_i^S\}_i^I$  and  $B \triangleq \{\beta_i\}_i^I$  are  $n \times I$  matrices.

The number of unique columns in  $B^S$  is  $L$ . Also, if we start from  $i = 1$  to  $i = I$ , and retain only the unique columns and arrange them by the appearance order, then we obtain  $\hat{B}^S$ . Finally, with  $L$  and  $\hat{B}^S$ , we can easily compute  $Q$ .

## 2 Text Embeddings

Please describe the similarities (one to two aspects) and main differences (one to two aspects as well) between the two major approaches to construct text embeddings: Dhillon and Aral (2021), and Ansari, Li, and Zhang (2018).

**Answer:**

Main differences:

- Model: DA builds a matrix factorization (unsupervised) model and incorporates it into a deep neural network structure, while ALZ adopts the supervised latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA) approach.
- Heterogeneity: DA models dynamic user heterogeneity (via  $u_i^t$ , see Section 4.2 on page 1063), while ALZ models static user heterogeneity (via  $\gamma_i$ , see Figure 4 and Section 4.6 on page 993).
- Estimation: DA uses standard optimization methods to train its model, while ALZ uses stochastic variational Bayesian approach (i.e., a combination of optimization and Bayesian estimation).
- Many more points.

Similarities:

- Task: Both are about text analysis using advanced machine learning methods.
- Findings: Both uncover consumer content preferences (relatively static in ALZ, but over time as well in DA).
- Maturity: Both papers are solid in terms of both methodology and substantive findings.
- Many more points if you will.