Information Retrieval - Project Report

# Problem Statement

There is an abundance of music available in today’s world. Numerous songs, artists and even genres have been popping up all over the world over the last couple of decades. The sheer amount of musical material sometimes makes it difficult for a person to find new music that he or she would really like. To remedy this problem, services have begun to implement recommender systems to help people discover artists or songs that suits them based on their or similar users’ taste in music.

This is where our project comes into play. We are going to build a recommender system for Last.FM, one of these services, because we would like to know which method works best (user-based, item-based or a combination of both) for accurately recommending music artists to listen to. Last.FM is an online service that allows users to listen and share any music that they would like. Since their inception in 2003, over 100,000,000,000 tracks have been listened to on the service. Our recommender system will utilise a provided dataset containing the activity of users in regards to which artists they have listened to and how much they have listened to those artists to determine similar users for the user-based recommender. For the item-based recommender, we will make use of a provided dataset of tags that have been given to songs and artists to determine similar songs or artists. We believe this system could prove fruitful in helping improve the algorithm for discovering new music on the Last.FM service. What combination of recommender techniques gives the best results in recommending artists to users?

This project is directly derived from the research proposal submitted by Karel Beckeringh (s2600358). We felt that he hit the nail on the head with his proposal, since the subject matter and dataset is rather unique and appeals to all of us on a personal level and the project would offer a welcome challenge for us as a group. As such, we unanimously decided to perform his proposal.

Materials  
Datasets:

The datasets that have been used are mostly the same as found in (Hetrec LITERATUUR) with some added.

\* artists.dat - This file contains information about music artists listened and tagged by the users.

\* tags - This file contains the set of tags available in the dataset.

\* user\_artists.dat – This file contains the artists listened by each user. It also provides a listening count for each [user, artist] pair.

\* user\_friends.dat – These files contain the friend relations between users in the database.

\* test.dat – This file contains 10% randomly selected lines from user\_artists.dat to use as test set.

\* training.dat – This file contains the other 90% of the lines from user\_artists.dat to use as a training set.

Also pickle files created by ourself that use files shown above to make the program more efficient have been used

\* item\_sim50.pickle – This file contains the cosine similarity between artists, only containing those having a score of 0.50 or higher.

\* user\_sim01.pickle – This file contains the cosine similarity between users, only containing those having a score of 0.10 or higher.

Cosine Similarity:

With cosine similarity, two items are thought of as to be vectors in an n dimensional space. The cosine of the angle between the two vectors is seen to be the similarity between the two items, being a value between 0 and 1. The cosine\_sim.py program included in the files is a basic representation on how we computed similarity scores between users and items.

Item based:

The most crucial step in the item based recommender is to compute the similarity scores using cosine similarity. The file containg these similarities between artists is called “item\_sim50” and only contains similarity scores higher than 0.50 as we found out that none of the results we first had, using a file containg only scores higher than 0.10, didn’t contain any similarity scores lower than 0.50. Setting this value higher, made the similarity file much smaller, going from 23 million lines to 1.1 million lines. This in turn made running the program much faster.

Our item based recommender first looks up what artists user U already follows, using the training dataset. These artists and their listencount are added to a list for the user U, sorted in a top N by listencount from highest to lowest. Then using the item similarity pickle explained above, similar artists to the ones U already follows could be computed. These also were sorted in a top N from highest to lowest on their similarity scores. Using the listen count for each already listened artist and the similarity scores for the similar artists, a weight is calculated by multiplying the listencount by the similarityscores. This is done to only get the most similar artists to artists that user U listens to a lot, but doesn’t know yet. This weighted score for each similar artist is sorted in a top 10 and this in turn is the end result for the recommendation of artists that user U doesn’t listen to yet, but might want to.

For the optimal value of N it was found that N=30 gives the most desirable results for speed and score.

# Evaluation

In order to properly evaluate the different recommender systems, the complete dataset “user\_artists.dat” was randomly split into a test set 10% and a training set 90%. This was done randomly so the recommender system will predict missing artists from the training set instead of recommending new ones. This way an accuracy can be easily calculated. From the top N recommended artists that the recommender gives back it will look if that artist is already in the training dataset and if it is, it is a hit and if it is not it is a miss. So in the end you can divide the total amount of hits by the total amound of lines in the test set and you have the percentage of correct predictions. In order to see how long the program took to finish a timer command in the terminal has been added to evaluate the efficiency of the code.

Results:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item-based** | **User-based** | **Friend-based** |
| Correct out of 9283 | *643* | *1795* | *1009* |
| Percentage correct | *6.93%* | *19.34%* | *10.87%* |
| Time to finish | *54.887s* | *20.639s* | *6.929s* |

Discussion:  
As you can see from figure .. the user based approach was most accurate and the item based is least accurate. The item based recommender probably is least accurate as there is a lot of artists similar to the ones a user already listens to. Our way of evaluation the recommender by predicting the missing artists from the dataset with the test set, isn’t saying much about the accuracy of a recommender. There’s so much differences in musical taste, a user could have either a very narrow or a broad musical taste, which influences our way of evaluation the program. If further research would have been done to this, a different way of evaluating the different recommenders would be preferred.

USER BASED and friend based discussion please……..