

An Introduction to Recommender Systems

Charu C. Aggarwal



Carlos Gonzalez

University of Oxford - Department of Economics

Machine Learning Reading Group

June 3rd, 2025

Introduction

Data Types

Families of Recommender Systems

Further Topics in Recommender Systems

Introduction

Data Types

Families of Recommender Systems

Further Topics in Recommender Systems

- ▶ **Repeated interaction** between a *platform* and a set of *users* can be exploited to learn users' preferences
- ▶ This knowledge can be leveraged in many different ways
 - ▶ In general, better understanding of user's preferences yields **higher profits**, i.e. price discrimination, market expansion (new products and new customers), etc.
 - ▶ But it can also be user **welfare improving**, i.e. increase in diversity, reduced search costs, shopping experience, etc.
 - ▶ **Q:** Is user welfare just a proxy for long term profit maximization?
- ▶ Today we focus on the dynamic of *item* recommendation

- ▶ User-item preference relations can be codified in two ways
 - ▶ **Knowledge-Based Systems:** Connections between users' types and item characteristics are hard-coded through a set of *rules*. The user is compelled to reveal their private type.
 - ▶ **Data driven:** Connections between users' types and items characteristics are learned/inferred automatically under regularity conditions
 - ▶ Similar users like the same items as in **user-based collaborative filtering**
 - ▶ Same user likes similar items as in **item-based collaborative filtering**
 - ▶ Same user likes the same characteristics in an item as in **content-based systems**
 - ▶ The learning process is grounded on explicit preferences like **ratings** or implicit preferences like **customer behavior**

- ▶ **Q:** Can similarity based recommendations lead to *echo chambers*?
- ▶ **Q:** What are the limits of what can and should be tracked?
- ▶ **Q:** How can Economics be leveraged to learn preferences from implicit behavior?

- ▶ The approach to learning is virtually **assumption free**
 - ▶ Often times, no underlying utility functions (in the Debreu and Von Neumann–Morgenstern sense), nor even rationality
 - ▶ Although, recent success when combining structural and reduced form approaches
- ▶ Preferences can be captured in cardinal terms (*matrix completion*) or ordinal terms (*rank identification*). Ordinal preferences are usually enough.
- ▶ There are two sources of uncertainty in preference learning
 - ▶ Statistical / small sample
 - ▶ **Intrinsic:** Preferences may be time varying, even “random” (taste for diversity)

- ▶ Given some preference learning what should you recommend? **Q:** What is the **objective function** to be maximized?
 - ▶ Trade-off between **exploitation** (best user-item match, *relevance*) and **exploration** (learn more about some users or some items)
 - ▶ Guide users' **preference discovery** process (*novelty* and *serendipity*)
 - ▶ **Others:** Cater for *diversity* (inherent randomness in preferences), *explainability*, etc. **Q:** Are agents more likely to comply as an exploration unit if recommendations are explained?
 - ▶ One more twist: Preferences are shaped by platform recommendations. **Q:** Any thoughts?
 - ▶ **Q:** Should private firms optimize for socially desirable goals?

Introduction

Data Types

Families of Recommender Systems

Further Topics in Recommender Systems

- ▶ **Explicit** vs **Implicit** data
- ▶ **Two-sided** (bandit) vs **One-sided** (apple tasting)
- ▶ Discrete, Categorical, Binary and Unary
 - ▶ In unary settings, 1 means “yes” but 0 does not mean “no” like in buying decisions. Typical in implicit data settings
 - ▶ Different tools for matrix completion in discrete vs unary settings like the treatment of 0s

Introduction

Data Types

Families of Recommender Systems

Further Topics in Recommender Systems

- ▶ Classification is somewhat arbitrary, and focused on the spirit of the system, not necessarily the underlying models and data
- ▶ Three big **families**: Collaborative filtering (user/item **similarity**), content-based (item **characteristics**), knowledge-based (hard-coded **rules** with user inputs)
- ▶ Intermediate categories, hybrid methods and especial cases

- ▶ **Heuristics**

- ▶ *User-based CF*: Similar people like the same items
- ▶ *Item-based CF*: The same user likes similar items

- ▶ They can take a non-parametric nearest-**neighbors** approach (*memory-based*) or a **modeling** approach (*model-based*). The latter are more successful, especially in sparse matrix contexts, the former are more explainable

- ▶ CF as **generalized regression**. Let $(Y_{ij})_{n \times m-1}$ be a matrix of ratings, and Y_{im} the vector of ratings of movie m
- ▶ Classic regression. Assume $Y_{im} = f(Y_{ij})$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Pick some $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\hat{f}(Y_{ij}) \approx Y_{im}$. Finally, predict $\hat{Y}_{n+1,m} = \hat{f}(Y_{n+1,j})$
- ▶ In CF,
 - ▶ **Any covariate might be missing** (in both training and testing, not just Y_{im})
 - ▶ No distinction between **training and testing** sample (as Y_{im} are also missing for some i)
- ▶ *Transductive learning* (semi-supervised learning). Learn only what you need to learn, not necessary to learn structural rules

- ▶ Conceptualized as an **intermediate category** between CF and KB
 - ▶ Items are perceived as (known) functions of **latent characteristics** or descriptions
 - ▶ When user likes an item, items with similar characteristics are recommended to the user (item-based CF)
 - ▶ Characteristics are usually hard-coded (KB)
- ▶ Easier to make predictions for new items. More difficult to make predictions for new users
- ▶ They also suffer from lack of diversity (echo chambers)

- ▶ What if users just say what they want? Wouldn't that be easier? **Q:** Connections to direct mechanisms in mechanism design?
- ▶ We could then map users' inputs to items via hard-coded rules or similarity functions
- ▶ Or we could map inputs to items' characteristics and then apply CB methods

- ▶ **Example:** User inputs “cheap near me”, system returns houses below £500 ordered by location from closest to furthest
- ▶ Very useful in settings with few ratings and highly heterogeneous products like the housing market
- ▶ Similar pros and cons that content-based
- ▶ **Utility-based systems:** Platform assumes a utility function on item attributes

- ▶ **Demographic Systems:** Use attributes and map them to items in a KB way (i.e. “old customers do not like risky products”) or use demographics as covariates in similarity functions to predict ratings *à la* CF
 - ▶ **Q:** What are the pros and cons of DS compared to user-input methods or agnostic data driven methods?
 - ▶ **Q:** Are data driven methods simply picking on demographics?
- ▶ **Hybrid Systems**
 - ▶ Interpolate across recommendations depending on user or context, i.e. demographic knowledge-based system for cold start and user-based CF after enough data has been collected
 - ▶ Combine predictions from different models, i.e. $\text{avg}(\text{CB rating}, \text{CF rating})$

Introduction

Data Types

Families of Recommender Systems

Further Topics in Recommender Systems

- ▶ Evaluation resembles those of classic ML (like OOS-MSE, ROC curves, etc.)
- ▶ But methods will depend on recommender's problem (prediction vs rank), and recommender's objective function (relevance, novelty, explainability, etc.)

- ▶ Adjust base models to **context** like time, location or social information
- ▶ Two approaches: Treat it as additional covariates (like demographic characteristics) in CF/CB settings or set rules as in KS
- ▶ They may worsen the **sparsity problem**. Dimension reduction methods
- ▶ (Social) networks are particularly interesting as there exist some structural connection between users or between items. These structural connections can be exploited by tuning benchmark algorithms or developing ad-hoc methods

- ▶ Q: Influencer mediated recommendations
- ▶ Q: Trustworthy neighbors in CF
- ▶ Q: Attack-resistant systems
- ▶ Q: Privacy
- ▶ Q: User-identification