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***Abstract*:** This project involves evaluating and comparing two recommendation systems: a collaborative filtering-based recommender and a hybrid recommender system. Matrix Factorization is used for the collaborative filtering strategy with the Movie Lens dataset, which consists of 100,000 user ratings on 1,682 films from 943 individuals. User ratings (u.data), movie details (u.item), and genre information (u.genre) are the main constituents of the dataset. The hybrid recommender system incorporates sentiment analysis from Redit API, genre information, and movie reviews. To calculate average sentiment scores, tweets are gathered, tidied up, and examined using a distinct tag-word for every film. By combining these many data sources, the hybrid system makes use of PyTorch's Neural Embedding layer to provide a more thorough suggestion. This project aims to highlight the strengths and limitations of each approach, providing insights into their performance and effectiveness in generating personalized movie recommendations.

**1. Introduction**

This project focuses on developing a sophisticated hybrid recommender system using the MovieLens dataset, which provides a rich source of movie ratings and metadata. Collected by the GroupLens Research Project, the dataset includes 100,000 ratings from 943 users across 1,682 movies. Each rating is accompanied by user and movie identifiers, a numeric rating on a scale from 1 to 5, and a timestamp indicating when the rating was given.The u.item file in the dataset contains comprehensive movie information as well, such as movie titles, release dates, IMDb URLs, and a collection of binary genre markers. Each movie can have binary flags that indicate which genre it belongs to, for as Drama, Comedy, or Action. This project is utilizing Redit API sentiment analysis in addition to MovieLens data. To find relevant tweets of Movies , a distinct tagword derived from the film's title is employed for every movie. Following cleaning and analysis, an average sentiment score representing the general opinion of the public toward each film is calculated from thesetweets.  
  
We use matrix factorization as our collaborative filtering technique to construct the recommender system, utilizing the u.data ratings dataset to forecast user preferences.

**2. Related Study**

**[1**]. Linden, G., Smith, B., & York, J. (2003, January). Amazon.com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering. IEEE Internet Computing, 7(1), 76-80.This paper introduces Amazon's item-to-item collaborative filtering algorithm, which improves the relevance of recommendations by comparing items directly rather than users, providing a scalable and effective solution for e-commerce platforms.

[2]. Sarwar, B., Karypis, G., Konstan, J., & Riedl, J. (2001, April). Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on World Wide Web (pp. 285-295).The authors present item-based collaborative filtering techniques, which focus on finding similarities between items rather than users, thereby enhancing the quality of recommendations by leveraging item-item relationships.

[3]. Su, X., & Khoshgoftaar, T. M. (2009). A survey of collaborative filtering techniques. Advances in Artificial Intelligence, 2009, 1-19.This survey provides a comprehensive overview of collaborative filtering methods, discussing various approaches and their applications, which is crucial for understanding the foundational techniques used in recommendation systems.

[4]. Burke, R. (2002). Hybrid recommender systems: Survey and experiments. UserModeling and User-Adapted Interaction, 12(4), 331-370.Burke's work explores hybrid recommender systems that combine multiple recommendation techniques, detailing their strengths and limitations through various experiments, which is essential for understanding advanced recommendation approaches.

[5] Melville, P., Mooney, R. J., & Nagarajan, R. (2002, July). Content-boosted collaborative filtering for improved recommendations. In Proceedings of the 18th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (pp. 187-192).This paper introduces content-boosted collaborative filtering, which enhances traditional collaborative methods by incorporating content-based features to improve recommendation accuracy.

[6] Bell, R. M., & Koren, Y. (2007). Lessons from the Netflix prize challenge. SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter, 9(2), 75-79.The authors reflect on the Netflix Prize competition, discussing the innovative approaches and lessons learned from the challenge, which contributed significantly to advancements in recommendation system methodologies

[7] Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., Liu, K., Liu, J., & Nie, L. (2017, August). Social collaborative filtering by trust. In Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (pp. 2727-2733).This paper presents a social collaborative filtering approach that incorporates trust relationships among users to enhance recommendation accuracy. By leveraging trust information, the method improves the relevance of recommendations in social networks.

[8] He, J., Wang, W., Jiang, H., & Liao, L. (2014, July). A hybrid recommendation algorithm adapted for social networks. In Proceedings of the 2014 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (pp. 1050-1055).The authors propose a hybrid recommendation algorithm tailored for social networks, combining both collaborative filtering and content-based methods to leverage social context and user preferences, thereby improving the quality of recommendations in such environments.

[9] Tang, J., Wang, X., & Liu, H. (2015, August). Combining social media and behavior modeling for improved recommendations. In Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (pp. 195-204).

[10] Koren, Y., & Bell, R. (2015). Advances in collaborative filtering. *In Recommender* Systems Handbook (pp. 77-118). Springer.This chapter provides a detailed overview of the latest advancements in collaborative filtering techniques, covering improvements in algorithmic approaches, evaluation methods, and practical applications. It is a valuable resource for understanding the current state and future directions of collaborative filtering in recommendation systems.

**3. Methodology**

**3.1** In this experiment we are applying several methodologies, each of which contributes to the overall objective of building and evaluating a recommender system. Here's an overview of the methodologies being used:

**3.1.1 Data Preparation and Cleaning**

* **Loading Data**: You start by loading and parsing the MovieLens dataset, which includes user ratings and movie information.
* **Merging Data**: Combining user ratings with movie metadata to enrich the dataset with additional features like genres and sentiment scores.
* **Handling Missing Values**: Filling in or handling missing values, especially for sentiment scores and genre columns.

**3. 1.2 Sentiment Analysis**

* **Data Collection**: Fetching textual data (e.g., tweets or movie descriptions) related to movies.
* **Sentiment Analysis**: Using tools like TextBlob to analyze the sentiment of the collected text and derive sentiment scores for each movie.
* **Integration**: Incorporating sentiment scores into the dataset to enhance the feature set used for recommendations.

**3.1.3 Matrix Factorization**

* **User-Item Matrix**: Creating a matrix where rows represent users, columns represent items (movies), and values represent ratings.
* **Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)**: Applying SVD to decompose the user-item matrix into latent factors, capturing underlying patterns in user preferences and item characteristics.

**3.1.4 Neural Network-Based Recommender System**

* **Model Design**: Designing a hybrid neural network model that combines embeddings for users and items with additional features like movie genres and sentiment scores.
* **Embedding Layers**: Using embedding layers to capture user and item interactions.
* **Feature Integration**: Incorporating genre and sentiment information into the model to enhance its ability to make personalized recommendations.
* **Training**: Training the neural network model using the data prepared and evaluating its performance.

**3.2** System architecture diagram for the Hybrid Recommender system

A Hybrid Recommender System combines multiple recommendation techniques to improve the quality and accuracy of recommendations. Here’s a general architecture diagram for such a system:

A diagram of a hybrid recommendation system
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*Fig1: System architecture of hybrid recommendation system*

**Data Sources:**

* **User Data:** Demographic information, preferences, purchase history, etc.
* **Item Data:** Item attributes, content descriptions, categories, etc.
* **Interaction Data:** Ratings, clicks, views, purchase data, etc.

**Preprocessing:**

* **Data Cleaning:** Handling missing values, noise reduction.

**Recommendation Techniques:**

* **Collaborative Filtering:**
  + **User-Based CF:** Finds similarities between users.
  + **Item-Based CF:** Finds similarities between items.

**Knowledge-Based Systems:**

* **Domain Knowledge:** Using expert knowledge to enhance recommendations.

**Matrix Factorization:**

* **SVD (Singular Value Decomposition):** Decomposing user-item interaction matrices.

**Recommendation Generation:**

* **Scoring and Ranking:** Aggregating and ranking recommendations based on user preferences and predicted scores.

**Evaluation and Feedback:**

* **Performance Metrics:** Measuring accuracy, precision, recall, and user satisfaction.
* **User Feedback:** Collecting feedback from users to improve recommendations.

**User Interface:**

* **Recommendation Display:** Presenting recommendations in a user-friendly manner.

3.3 **Describe the datasets used in this study, focusing on their characteristics, sources, and relevance, without including any quantifiable details such as the total number of ratings or tweets.**

The dataset is composed of posts retrieved from the 'movies' subreddit on Reddit. This subreddit is a community hub where users discuss various topics related to films, including reviews, opinions, and industry news.

3.4 **Matrix Factorization using Collaborative Filtering SVD**

A diagram of a matrix

Description automatically generated

*Fig 2: Matrix Factorization*

Matrix Factorization is a technique used in recommendation systems to predict missing ratings in a user-item matrix. It works by decomposing the matrix into two lower-dimensional matrices: user features matrix UUU and item features matrix VVV.

Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) is a powerful technique for matrix factorization, commonly used in collaborative filtering for recommendation systems. SVD decomposes a matrix into three other matrices, capturing the latent features of users and items.

**SVD Overview**

The SVD of  mxn matrix A is given by the formula  A=UΣVT*A*=*U*Σ*VT*

where:

* U:  *mxm* matrix of the orthonormal eigenvectors of AAT.
* VT: transpose of a *nxn* matrix containing the orthonormal eigenvectors of ATA*ATA*.
* ΣΣ : diagonal matrix with r elements equal to the root of the positive eigenvalues of AAᵀ or Aᵀ A (both matrices have the same positive eigenvalues anyway).

3.5 **Neural Embedding Layer**

Embeddings have become the standard way to represent categorical features in Machine Learning. The ability to encode words, entities or category values into meaningful, dense vector representations and to perform numerical operations and comparisons between them has led to a lot of progress in the field during the last years. Neural based recommender system, embedding layers are used to transform categorical data (such as user IDs and movie IDs) into dense vector representations. These vectors capture the latent features of users and items, which are essential for making accurate recommendations.

Entity embeddings are used to represent categorical data (like user IDs, item IDs, genres, etc.) in a continuous vector space. They capture the relationships and similarities between different entities (users, items, genres) by learning lower-dimensional representations.
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*Fig 3: Entities that are converted into embeddings*

In the HybridRecommender neural network model, we have used four different types of embeddings to capture various aspects of the data. Here's a breakdown of each embedding used:

**3.5.1 How Embedding Layers Work:**

1. **User Embedding**: Each user is represented by an embedding vector, which encapsulates their preferences based on their historical interactions with various items.
2. **Item Embedding**: Each item (movie) is represented by an embedding vector, which captures its characteristics based on the ratings it has received from users.
3. **Genre Embedding**: Movie genres are also encoded into dense vectors through a linear layer, providing additional contextual information to the model.
4. **Sentiment Embedding**: Sentiment scores, representing the average sentiment of reviews or tweets about a movie, are transformed into an embedding vector through a linear layer.

**3.5.2** **Latent features that are generated using the embedding layers**

We are using hybrid recommender system by experimenting with different sizes of latent vectors (embedding dimensions). It trains the model using various embedding sizes (10, 20, 30, 40, 50) and measures its performance through Root Mean Square Error (RMSE). For each dimension, the model is trained for 10 epochs with Mean Squared Error (MSE) as the loss function. After training, the RMSE is computed to assess the accuracy of the model's predictions compared to actual ratings.

The results are then plotted to visualize how the embedding dimension affects model performance. The plot helps identify which embedding size offers the best balance between complexity and accuracy, providing insights into the optimal configuration for the recommender system.
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*Fig 4: RMSE Vs Embedding Dimension*

3.6 Sentiment Score Analysis

Sentiment scores in this study are generated using the ***TextBlob*** library, which provides a straightforward approach to sentiment analysis by analyzing the polarity of text. The TextBlob library is used to assess the sentiment of each post, where the sentiment polarity ranges from -1 (indicating negative sentiment) to 1 (indicating positive sentiment). The function get\_sentiment takes a text input, applies ***TextBlob*** to compute its sentiment polarity, and returns this score. This process is repeated for a list of cleaned posts to obtain individual sentiment scores.

To derive meaningful insights from these sentiment scores, the average sentiment score for specific tagwords is calculated. This involves fetching posts related to each tagword, cleaning the text, and applying the get\_sentiment function to each cleaned post.

**3.7 Activation Functions in the Hybrid Recommender System**

In our hybrid recommender system, activation functions play a crucial role in enhancing the model's ability to capture and interpret complex interactions between users and items. Specifically, we have utilized the Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) activation function in our neural network layers. ReLU is defined as f(x)=max(0,x)f(x) = \max(0, x)f(x)=max(0,x), which allows the model to introduce non-linearity while maintaining computational efficiency. This function is particularly advantageous due to its simplicity and effectiveness in mitigating the vanishing gradient problem, thereby accelerating the training process and improving the network's performance.

Additionally, In the output layer, no activation function is applied, which is typical for regression tasks where you want to output continuous values directly. The raw output from the final linear layer is used to predict the rating.

**4. Experiments**

4.1 Experiment Design

The experiment was designed to build and evaluate a hybrid recommender system that integrates collaborative filtering, content-based features, and sentiment analysis. We began by collecting data using the Reddit API to gather user comments and posts, which were essential for sentiment analysis. Additionally, we integrated movie ratings and genre information to create a comprehensive dataset. The data preprocessing involved cleaning the text from Reddit posts and calculating sentiment scores using the TextBlob library, which were then combined with the movie ratings and genre information to form a cohesive dataset.

For the model, we constructed a MovieDataset class in PyTorch to handle data in tensor format, facilitating efficient training with the DataLoader. The Hybrid-Recommender neural network modelwas developed with embedding layers forusers and items, and linear layers for genre and sentiment information. The network uses ReLU activation functions in the hidden layers to introduce non-linearity. We configured the training process with Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss and the Adam optimizer, running the training for 10 epochs to optimize the model's performance. The system leverages PyTorch for model implementation and training, ensuring a robust and scalable approach to recommendation tasks.

4.2 Dataset Preparation

To prepare the datasets for the hybrid recommender system, we undertook a comprehensive process involving data collection, cleaning, and integration. Initially, we utilized the Reddit API to gather user comments and posts related to movies, which provided valuable sentiment data. The Reddit data was cleaned to remove noise and irrelevant content. Sentiment scores were calculated using the TextBlob library to quantify the emotional tone of these posts. This sentiment data was then combined with movie ratings and genre information to create a unified dataset that integrates both user-generated content and structured rating data.

Following data collection, we loaded and processed the ratings data from a tab-separated file (u.data), containing user IDs, item IDs, ratings, and timestamps. The timestamp column was discarded, as it was not required for our analysis. Movie information was extracted from another file (u.item), which included movie IDs, titles, and genre labels. Unnecessary columns such as release dates and IMDb URLs were removed to streamline the dataset. We then constructed a user-item matrix from the ratings data, filled missing values with zeros, and converted it to a sparse format for efficient computation.

Statistical analysis was conducted to understand the distribution of ratings across movies. On average, each movie received approximately 59.45 ratings. The movie with the highest number of ratings was "Star Wars (1977)," with 583 ratings, while the movie with the fewest ratings was "Police Story 4: Project S (Chao ji ji hua) (1993)," which received only 1 rating. These metrics, combined with sentiment analysis from Reddit, provided a comprehensive view of user engagement and sentiment, essential for building and evaluating the hybrid recommender system.

Data Analysis:

Highest No of Ratings for a movie title is Movie: Star Wars (1977) and ratings of 583

A graph with blue squares

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

*Fig 5: Highest No of Ratings for a movie*

Lowest No of ratings for a movie title is: Scream of Stone (Schrei aus Stein) (1991) which has a rating of 1.
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*Fig 6: Lowest No of ratings for a movie*

* 1. **Evaluation Metrics**

In this experiment, several evaluation metrics were utilized to assess the performance of the hybrid recommender system, including Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), Mean Absolute Error (MAE), Precision, Recall, and F1-Score. Each metric provides unique insights into the model's accuracy and effectiveness in making recommendations.

**Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE)** measures the square root of the average squared differences between predicted and actual ratings. It quantifies the magnitude of prediction errors, with lower values indicating better model performance. The formula for RMSE is:

A mathematical equation with numbers and symbols
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**Mean Absolute Error (MAE)** provides the average magnitude of errors in predictions without accounting for their direction. It is calculated as the mean of the absolute differences between the predicted and actual ratings. The formula for MAE is:

A mathematical equation with numbers and symbols

Description automatically generated

**Precision, Recall, and F1-Score** are metrics adapted from classification tasks to evaluate recommendation systems, especially for binary outcomes such as relevant versus non-relevant recommendations. Precision measures the proportion of true positive recommendations out of all positive recommendations made:
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Recall assesses the proportion of true positive recommendations out of all actual positives:
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The F1-Score, the harmonic mean of precision and recall, balances both metrics to provide a single performance measure:
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* 1. **Results and Analyses**

Hyperparameter Selection:

In the context of training and optimizing the hybrid recommender system, hyperparameter selection is a crucial step to ensure the model achieves optimal performance. For our recommender system, several hyperparameters were tuned, including the embedding dimensions, learning rate, and the number of epochs.

**Embedding Dimensions**: One of the primary hyperparameters we adjusted was the embedding dimension for user, item, genre, and sentiment embeddings. Different latent vector sizes (embedding dimensions) were tested, specifically values of 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50. By evaluating the RMSE for each of these dimensions, we were able to determine which embedding size yielded the best performance. As observed, smaller embedding dimensions often resulted in higher RMSE, indicating that the model might be underfitting due to insufficient capacity. Conversely, larger dimensions could capture more complex patterns but also risk overfitting. The optimal embedding dimension was chosen based on the trade-off between complexity and model performance.

In evaluating the performance of the hybrid recommender system, several key metrics were used to assess the model's accuracy and effectiveness. These include Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), Mean Absolute Error (MAE), Precision, Recall, and F1-Score.

1. **Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE)**: RMSE measures the square root of the average squared differences between predicted and actual ratings, providing insight into the magnitude of prediction errors. In our experiment, the RMSE values showed a decreasing trend over epochs, starting at 0.8308 in the first epoch and improving to 0.8006 by the third epoch. This indicates that the model's predictions became more accurate as training progressed.
2. **Mean Absolute Error (MAE)**: MAE calculates the average magnitude of errors in predictions without considering their direction. In our results, MAE decreased from 0.6527 in the first epoch to 0.6279 by the third epoch, reflecting a reduction in the average error magnitude and further corroborating the improvement in prediction accuracy over time.
3. **Precision, Recall, and F1-Score**: These metrics assess the relevance of the recommendations. Precision measures the proportion of true positive recommendations among all positive predictions, while Recall evaluates the proportion of true positive recommendations among all actual positives. The F1-Score provides a balanced measure of precision and recall. Our results showed high and stable performance across epochs, with Precision ranging from 0.9241 to 0.9317, Recall from 0.8681 to 0.8707, and F1-Score from 0.8952 to 0.8994. These high values indicate that the model consistently delivered relevant recommendations and effectively balanced precision and recall.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the model improved over the epochs, achieving better accuracy and relevance in its recommendations, as evidenced by decreasing RMSE and MAE values and consistently high Precision, Recall, and F1-Score.

TOP 10 matrix factorization Model Recommendations for user 5
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Fig 7: Top 10 Recommended Movies for User 5

**5. Conclusion**

In this experiment, we implemented and evaluated a hybrid recommender system that combines collaborative filtering with content-based methods to enhance the quality of recommendations. By integrating collaborative filtering techniques with content-based features such as genre and sentiment analysis, the model aimed to leverage both user-item interactions and item attributes for improved recommendation performance.

The evaluation metrics, including RMSE, MAE, Precision, Recall, and F1-Score, were used to assess the effectiveness of the hybrid recommender system. The results indicated that the hybrid approach effectively balanced the strengths of collaborative filtering and content-based methods. Specifically, the model's accuracy improved with optimal hyperparameters for embedding dimensions, and performance metrics such as precision and recall highlighted its ability to provide relevant recommendations. The inclusion of content-based features allowed the model to offer more personalized and accurate recommendations by considering both user preferences and item attributes.
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