

# An Improved Scheme for Asymmetric LSH

**Anshumali Shrivastava**

Department of Computer Science  
Computer and Information Science  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853, USA  
anshu@cs.cornell.edu

**Ping Li**

Department of Statistics and Biostatistics  
Department of Computer Science  
Rutgers University  
Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA  
pingli@stat.rutgers.edu

## Abstract

A recent technical report [16] developed a provably sublinear time algorithm for approximate *Maximum Inner Product Search* (MIPS), by observing that inner products, after independent asymmetric transformations, can be converted into the problem of approximate near neighbor search in terms of the  $L_2$  distance. We name the particular ALSH scheme in [16] as *L2-ALSH*. In this study, we present another asymmetric transformation scheme which converts the problem of maximum inner products into the problem of maximum correlation search. The latter can be solved efficiently by “sign random projections”. We name this new scheme as *Sign-ALSH*. Theoretical analysis shows that *Sign-ALSH* can be noticeably more advantageous than *L2-ALSH*. Our experimental study confirms the theoretical finding.

# 1 Introduction

In this paper, we revisit the problem of *Maximum Inner Product Search (MIPS)*, which was studied in a recent technical report [16]. Finding hashing based algorithms for MIPS was considered hard [14, 10]. Given an input query point  $q \in \mathbb{R}^D$ , the task of MIPS is to find  $p \in \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a giant collection of size  $N$ , which maximizes (or approximately maximizes) the **inner product**  $q^T p$ :

$$p = \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} q^T x \quad (1)$$

The MIPS problem is related to the problem of *near neighbor search (NNS)*. For example, L2-NNS

$$p = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \|q - x\|_2^2 = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} (\|x\|_2^2 - 2q^T x) \quad (2)$$

or, correlation-NNS

$$p = \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{q^T x}{\|q\| \|x\|} = \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{q^T x}{\|x\|} \quad (3)$$

These three problems are equivalent if the norm of every element  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  is constant. Clearly, the value of the norm  $\|q\|_2$  has no effect. In many scenarios, MIPS arises naturally at places where the norms of the elements in  $\mathcal{S}$  have significant variations [10]. As reviewed in [16], examples of applications of MIPS include recommender system [11, 2, 10], large-scale object detection with DPM [5, 4, 9, 9], structural SVM [4], and multi-class label prediction [14, 10, 17].

**Asymmetric LSH (ALSH):** Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH) [8] is popular in practice for efficiently solving NNS. In the prior work [16], the concept of “asymmetric LSH” (ALSH) was proposed that one can transform the input query  $Q(p)$  and data in the collection  $P(x)$  independently, where the transformations  $Q$  and  $P$  are different. [16] developed a particular set of transformations to convert MIPS into L2-NNS and then solved the problem by standard L2-hash [3]. In this paper, we name the scheme in [16] as **L2-ALSH**. The initial idea of ALSH was partially inspired by the work on three-way similarity search [15], where they applied different hashing functions for handling query and data in the repository.

**Our contribution:** In this study, we propose another scheme for ALSH, by developing a new set of asymmetric transformations to convert MIPS into a problem of correlation-NNS, which is solved by “sign random projections” [7, 1]. We name this new scheme as **Sign-ALSH**. Our theoretical analysis and experimental study show that Sign-LSH is more advantageous than L2-ALSH for solving the MIPS problem.

## 2 Review of Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH)

The problem of efficiently finding nearest neighbors has been an active research since the very early days of computer science [6]. Approximate versions of the near neighbor search problem [8] were proposed to break the linear query time bottleneck. The following formulation is often adopted.

**Definition:** (*c*-Approximate Near Neighbor or *c*-NN) *Given a set of points in a  $D$ -dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^D$ , and parameters  $S_0 > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , construct a data structure which, given any query point  $q$ , does the following with probability  $1 - \delta$ : if there exists an  $S_0$ -near neighbor of  $q$  in  $P$ , it reports some  $cS_0$ -near neighbor of  $q$  in  $P$ .*

*Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH)* [8] is a family of functions, with the property that more similar items have a higher collision probability. LSH trades off query time with extra (one time) preprocessing cost

and space. Existence of an LSH family translates into provably sublinear query time algorithm for c-NN problems.

**Definition:** (Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH)) A family  $\mathcal{H}$  is called  $(S_0, cS_0, p_1, p_2)$ -sensitive if, for any two point  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^D$ ,  $h$  chosen uniformly from  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies the following:

- if  $Sim(x, y) \geq S_0$  then  $Pr_{\mathcal{H}}(h(x) = h(y)) \geq p_1$
- if  $Sim(x, y) \leq cS_0$  then  $Pr_{\mathcal{H}}(h(x) = h(y)) \leq p_2$

For efficient approximate nearest neighbor search,  $p_1 > p_2$  and  $c < 1$  is needed.

**Fact 1:** Given a family of  $(S_0, cS_0, p_1, p_2)$  -sensitive hash functions, one can construct a data structure for c-NN with  $O(n^\rho \log n)$  query time and space  $O(n^{1+\rho})$ , where  $\rho = \frac{\log p_1}{\log p_2} < 1$ .

LSH is a generic framework and an implementation of LSH requires a concrete hash function.

## 2.1 LSH for L2 distance

[3] presented an LSH family for  $L_2$  distances. Formally, given a fixed window size  $r$ , we sample a random vector  $a$  with each component from i.i.d. normal, i.e.,  $a_i \sim N(0, 1)$ , and a scalar  $b$  generated uniformly at random from  $[0, r]$ . The hash function is defined as:

$$h_{a,b}^{L2}(x) = \left\lfloor \frac{a^T x + b}{r} \right\rfloor \quad (4)$$

where  $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$  is the floor operation. The collision probability under this scheme can be shown to be

$$Pr(h_{a,b}^{L2}(x) = h_{a,b}^{L2}(y)) = 1 - 2\Phi(-r/d) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}(r/d)} \left(1 - e^{-(r/d)^2/2}\right) \quad (5)$$

where  $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx$  and  $d = \|x - y\|_2$  is the Euclidean distance between the vectors  $x$  and  $y$ .

## 2.2 LSH for correlation

Another popular LSH family is the so-called ‘‘sign random projections’’ [7, 1]. Again, we choose a random vector  $a$  with  $a_i \sim N(0, 1)$ . The hash function is defined as:

$$h^{Sign}(x) = sign(a^T x) \quad (6)$$

And collision probability is

$$Pr(h^{Sign}(x) = h^{Sign}(y)) = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{x^T y}{\|x\| \|y\|} \right) \quad (7)$$

## 2.3 Connection between the two LSH schemes

Recently [12] studied ‘‘coding for random projections’’ in the context of building large-scale linear classifiers as well as near neighbor search [13]. They showed that the hashing scheme for  $L_2$  distance can be improved when the data are normalized. By studying the influence of the number of bits used for coding each hashed value, they built the connection between the above two LSH schemes. In particular, [13] showed that 1-bit coding (i.e., sign random projections) or 2-bit coding are often better compared to using more bits. In light of the results in [12, 13], it is not surprising that our proposed Sign-ALSH can outperform L2-ALSH. This conclusion, of course, has to be established through a rigorous analysis.

### 3 Review of ALSH for MIPS and L2-ALSH

**Definition [16]:** (*Asymmetric Locality Sensitive Hashing (ALSH)*) A family  $\mathcal{H}$ , along with the two vector functions  $Q : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D'}$  (**Query Transformation**) and  $P : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D'}$  (**Preprocessing Transformation**), is called  $(S_0, cS_0, p_1, p_2)$ -sensitive if for a given  $c$ -NN instance with query  $q$ , and the hash function  $h$  chosen uniformly from  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfies the following:

- if  $Sim(q, x) \geq S_0$  then  $Pr_{\mathcal{H}}(h(Q(q)) = h(P(x))) \geq p_1$
- if  $Sim(q, x) \leq cS_0$  then  $Pr_{\mathcal{H}}(h(Q(q)) = h(P(x))) \leq p_2$

Here  $x$  is any point in the collection  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Note that the query transformation  $Q$  is only applied on the query and the pre-processing transformation  $P$  is applied to  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  while creating hash tables. By letting  $Q(x) = P(x) = x$ , we can recover the vanilla LSH. Using different transformations (i.e.,  $Q \neq P$ ) can counter the fact that self similarity is not highest with inner products, as we just need the probability of the new collision event  $\{h(Q(q)) = h(P(y))\}$  to satisfy the conditions of Definition of  $c$ -NN for  $Sim(q, y) = q^T y$ .

**Theorem 1** [16] *Given a family of hash function  $\mathcal{H}$  and the associated query and preprocessing transformations  $P$  and  $Q$ , which is  $(S_0, cS_0, p_1, p_2)$ -sensitive, one can construct a data structure for  $c$ -NN with  $O(n^\rho \log n)$  query time and space  $O(n^{1+\rho})$ , where  $\rho = \frac{\log p_1}{\log p_2}$ .*

[16] also provided an explicit construction of ALSH, which we call **L2-ALSH**. Without loss of generality, one can always assume  $\|q\|_2 = 1$  and choose to let  $U < 1$  be a number such that

$$\|x_i\|_2 \leq U < 1, \quad \forall x_i \in \mathcal{S} \quad (8)$$

In L2-ALSH, two vector transformations  $P : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D+m}$  and  $Q : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D+m}$  are defined as follows:

$$P(x) = [x; \|x\|_2^2; \|x\|_2^4; \dots; \|x\|_2^{2^m}] \quad (9)$$

$$Q(x) = [x; 1/2; 1/2; \dots; 1/2], \quad (10)$$

where  $[\cdot]$  is the concatenation.  $P(x)$  appends  $m$  scalars of the form  $\|x\|_2^{2^i}$  at the end of the vector  $x$ , while  $Q(x)$  simply appends  $m$  “1/2” to the end of the vector  $x$ . By observing that

$$\|P(x_i)\|_2^2 = \|x_i\|_2^2 + \|x_i\|_2^4 + \dots + \|x_i\|_2^{2^m} + \|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} \quad (11)$$

$$\|Q(q)\|_2^2 = \|q\|_2^2 + m/4 = 1 + m/4 \quad (12)$$

$$Q(q)^T P(x_i) = q^T x_i + \frac{1}{2}(\|x_i\|_2^2 + \|x_i\|_2^4 + \dots + \|x_i\|_2^{2^m}) \quad (13)$$

one can obtain the following key equality:

$$\|Q(q) - P(x_i)\|_2^2 = (1 + m/4) - 2q^T x_i + \|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} \quad (14)$$

Since  $\|x_i\|_2 \leq U < 1$ , we have  $\|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} \rightarrow 0$  at the tower rate (exponential to exponential). Thus, as long as  $m$  is not too small (e.g.,  $m \geq 3$  would suffice), we have

$$\arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} q^T x \simeq \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \|Q(q) - P(x)\|_2 \quad (15)$$

This scheme is the first connection between solving un-normalized MIPS and approximate near neighbor search. Transformations  $P$  and  $Q$ , when norms are less than 1, provide correction to the L2 distance  $\|Q(q) - P(x_i)\|_2$  making it rank correlate with the (un-normalized) inner product. The general idea of ALSH was partially inspired by the work on three-way similarity search [15], where they applied different hashing functions for handling query and data in the repository.

## 4 The New Proposal: Sign-ALSH

In the new proposal, the problem of MIPS is first transformed to correlation-NNS, which is then solved by sign random projections.

### 4.1 From MIPS to Correlation-NNS

Without loss of generality, we again assume  $\|q\|_2 = 1$  and  $\|x_i\|_2 \leq U < 1$ ,  $\forall x_i \in \mathcal{S}$ . We define two vector transformations  $P : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D+m}$  and  $Q : \mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{D+m}$  as follows:

$$P(x) = [x; 1/2 - \|x\|_2^2; 1/2 - \|x\|_2^4; \dots; 1/2 - \|x\|_2^{2^m}] \quad (16)$$

$$Q(x) = [x; 0; 0; \dots; 0], \quad (17)$$

By observing that  $\|Q(q)\|_2^2 = \|q\|_2^2 = 1$ ,  $Q(q)^T P(x_i) = q^T x_i$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(x_i)\|_2^2 &= \|x_i\|_2^2 + 1/4 + \|x_i\|_2^4 - \|x_i\|_2^2 + 1/4 + \|x_i\|_2^8 - \|x_i\|_2^4 + \dots + 1/4 + \|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} - \|x_i\|_2^{2^m} \\ &= m/4 + \|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} \end{aligned}$$

we obtain the following key equality:

$$\frac{Q(q)^T P(x_i)}{\|Q(q)\|_2 \|P(x_i)\|_2} = \frac{q^T x_i}{\sqrt{m/4 + \|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}}}} \quad (18)$$

The term  $\|x_i\|_2^{2^{m+1}} \rightarrow 0$ , again vanishing at the tower rate. This means we have approximately

$$\arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} q^T x \simeq \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{Q(q)^T P(x_i)}{\|Q(q)\|_2 \|P(x_i)\|_2} \quad (19)$$

This provides another solution for solving MIPS using known methods for approximate correlation-NNS.

### 4.2 Fast Algorithms for MIPS Using Sign Random Projections

Eq. (19) shows that MIPS reduces to the standard approximate near neighbor search problem which can be efficiently solved by sign random projections, i.e.,  $h^{Sign}$  (defined by Eq. (6)). Formally, we can state the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** *Given a  $c$ -approximate instance of MIPS, i.e.,  $Sim(q, x) = q^T x$ , and a query  $q$  such that  $\|q\|_2 = 1$  along with a collection  $\mathcal{S}$  having  $\|x\|_2 \leq U < 1 \forall x \in \mathcal{S}$ . Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be the vector transformations defined in Eq. (16) and Eq. (17), respectively. We have the following two conditions for hash function  $h^{Sign}$  (defined by Eq. (6))*

- if  $q^T x \geq S_0$  then

$$Pr[h^{Sign}(Q(q)) = h^{Sign}(P(x))] \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{S_0}{\sqrt{m/4 + U^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \quad (20)$$

- if  $q^T x \leq cS_0$  then

$$Pr[h^{Sign}(Q(q)) = h^{Sign}(P(x))] \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\min\{cS_0, z^*\}}{\sqrt{m/4 + (\min\{cS_0, z^*\})^{2^{m+1}}}} \right)$$

where  $z^* = \left( \frac{m/2}{2^{m+1}-2} \right)^{2^{-m-1}}$ .

**Proof:** When  $q^T x \geq S_0$ , we have, according to Eq. (7)

$$\Pr[h^{\text{Sign}}(Q(q)) = h^{\text{Sign}}(P(x))] = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{q^T x}{\sqrt{m/4 + \|x\|_2^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{q^T x}{\sqrt{m/4 + U^{2^{m+1}}}} \right)$$

When  $q^T x \leq cS_0$ , by noting that  $q^T x \leq \|x\|_2$ , we have

$$\Pr[h^{\text{Sign}}(Q(q)) = h^{\text{Sign}}(P(x))] = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{q^T x}{\sqrt{m/4 + \|x\|_2^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{q^T x}{\sqrt{m/4 + (q^T x)^{2^{m+1}}}} \right)$$

For this one-dimensional function  $f(z) = \frac{z}{a+z^b}$ , where  $z = q^T x$ ,  $a = m/4$  and  $b = 2^{m+1} \geq 2$ , we know

$$f'(z) = \frac{a - z^b (b/2 - 1)}{(a + z^b)^{3/2}}$$

One can also check that  $f''(z) \leq 0$  for  $0 < z < 1$ , i.e.,  $f(z)$  is a concave function. The maximum of  $f(z)$  is attained at  $z^* = \left(\frac{2a}{b-2}\right)^{1/b} = \left(\frac{m/2}{2^{m+1}-2}\right)^{2^{-m-1}}$ . If  $z^* \geq cS_0$ , then we need to use  $f(cS_0)$  as the bound.  $\square$

Therefore, we have obtained, in LSH terminology,

$$p_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{S_0}{\sqrt{m/4 + U^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \quad (21)$$

$$p_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\min\{cS_0, z^*\}}{\sqrt{m/4 + (\min\{cS_0, z^*\})^{2^{m+1}}}} \right), \quad z^* = \left(\frac{m/2}{2^{m+1}-2}\right)^{2^{-m-1}} \quad (22)$$

Theorem 1 allows us to construct data structures with worst case  $O(n^\rho \log n)$  query time guarantees for  $c$ -approximate MIPS, where  $\rho = \frac{\log p_1}{\log p_2}$ . For any given  $c < 1$ , there always exist  $U < 1$  and  $m$  such that  $\rho < 1$ . This way, we obtain a sublinear query time algorithm for MIPS. Because  $\rho$  is a function of 2 parameters, we can find the best query time chooses  $U$  and  $m$ , which minimizes the value of  $\rho$ . For convenience, we define

$$\rho^* = \min_{U, m} \frac{\log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{S_0}{\sqrt{m/4 + U^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \right)}{\log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{\min\{cS_0, z^*\}}{\sqrt{m/4 + (\min\{cS_0, z^*\})^{2^{m+1}}}} \right) \right)} \quad (23)$$

See Figure 1 for the plots of  $\rho^*$ , which also compares the optimal  $\rho$  values for L2-ALSH in the prior work [16]. The results show that Sign-ALSH is noticeably better.

### 4.3 Parameter Selection

Figure 2 presents the  $\rho$  values for two sets of selected parameters:  $(m, U) = (2, 0.75)$  and  $(m, U) = (3, 0.85)$ . We can see that even if we use fixed parameters, the performance would not degrade much. This essentially frees practitioners from the burden of choosing parameters.




Figure 1: Optimal values of  $\rho^*$  (lower is better) with respect to approximation ratio  $c$  for different  $S_0$ , obtained by a grid search over parameters  $U$  and  $m$ , given  $S_0$  and  $c$ . The curves show that Sign-ALSH (solid curves) is noticeably better than L2-ALSH (dashed curves) in terms of their optimal  $\rho^*$  values. The results for L2-ALSH were from the prior work [16]. For clarity, we present the results in two figures.




Figure 2: The solid curves are the optimal  $\rho$  values of Sign-ALSH from Figure 1. The dashed curves represent the  $\rho$  values for fixed parameters:  $m = 2$  and  $U = 0.75$  (left panel), and  $m = 3$  and  $U = 0.85$  (right panel). This shows that even with fixed parameters, the performance of Sign-ALSH does not degrade much.

## 5 Ranking Evaluations

In [16], the L2-ALSH scheme was shown to outperform the LSH for L2 distance in retrieving maximum inner products. Since our proposal is an improvement over L2-ALSH, we focus on comparisons with L2-ALSH. In this section, we compare L2-ALSH with Sign-ALSH based on ranking experiments.

### 5.1 Datasets

We use the same two popular collaborative filtering datasets **MovieLens 10M** and **Netflix**, for the task of item recommendations. These were also the same datasets used in [16]. Each dataset is a sparse **user-item**

**matrix**  $R$ , where  $R(i, j)$  indicates the rating of user  $i$  for movie  $j$ . For getting the latent feature vectors from user item matrix, we follow the methodology of [16]. They use PureSVD procedure described in [2] to generate user and item latent vectors, which involves computing the SVD of  $R$

$$R = W\Sigma V^T$$

where  $W$  is  $n_{users} \times f$  matrix and  $V$  is  $n_{item} \times f$  matrix for some appropriately chosen rank  $f$  also known as latent dimension.

After the SVD step, the rows of matrix  $U = W\Sigma$  are treated as the user characteristic vectors while rows of matrix  $V$  correspond to the item characteristic vectors. This simple procedure has been shown to outperform other popular recommendation algorithms for the task of top item recommendations in [2], on these two datasets. We use the same choices for the latent dimension  $f$ , i.e.,  $f = 150$  for Movielens and  $f = 300$  for Netflix as [16].

## 5.2 Evaluations

In this section, we show how the rankings of the two ALSH schemes, L2-ALSH and Sign-ALSH, correlates with the top- $T$  inner products. Given a user  $i$  and its corresponding user vector  $u_i$ , we compute the top- $T$  gold standard items based on the actual inner products  $u_i^T v_j, \forall j$ . We then generate  $K$  different hash codes of the vector  $u_i$  and all the item vectors  $v_j$ s and then compute

$$Matches_j = \sum_{t=1}^K \mathbb{1}(h_t(u_i) = h_t(v_j)), \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}$  is the indicator function and the subscript  $t$  is used to distinguish independent draws of  $h$ . Based on  $Matches_j$  we rank all the items. Ideally, for a better hashing scheme,  $Matches_j$  should be higher for items having higher inner products with the given user  $u_i$ . This procedure generates a sorted list of all the items for a given user vector  $u_i$  corresponding to the each hash function under consideration.

For L2-ALSH, we used the same parameters used and recommended in [16]. For Sign-ALSH, we used the two recommended choices shown in Section 4.3, which are  $U = 0.75, m = 2$  and  $U = 0.85, m = 3$ . It should be noted that Sign-ALSH does not have the parameter  $r$ .

We compute the precision and recall of the top- $T$  items for  $T \in \{1, 5, 10\}$ , obtained from the sorted list based on  $Matches$ . To compute this precision and recall, we start at the top of the ranked item list and walk down in order. Suppose we are at the  $k^{th}$  ranked item, we check if this item belongs to the gold standard top- $T$  list. If it is one of the top- $T$  gold standard item, then we increment the count of *relevant seen* by 1, else we move to  $k + 1$ . By  $k^{th}$  step, we have already seen  $k$  items, so the *total items seen* is  $k$ . The precision and recall at that point is then computed as:

$$Precision = \frac{\text{relevant seen}}{k}, \quad Recall = \frac{\text{relevant seen}}{T} \quad (25)$$

We vary  $K \in \{64, 128, 256, 512\}$ . Note that it is important to balance both precision and recall. The method which obtains higher precision at a given recall is superior. Higher precision indicates higher ranking of the relevant items. We report averaged precisions and recalls over 2000 randomly chosen users.

The plots for MovieLens and Netflix datasets are shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4 respectively. We can clearly see, that our proposed Sign-ALSH scheme gives significantly higher precision recall curves than the L2-ALSH scheme, indicating better correlation of the top neighbors under inner products with Sign-ALSH compared to L2-ALSH. In addition, there is not much difference in the two different combinations of the parameters  $U$  and  $m$  in Sign-ALSH. The results are very consistent across both datasets.






Figure 3: **MovieLens**. Precision-Recall curves (higher is better), of retrieving top- $T$  items, for  $T = 1, 5, 10$ . We vary the number of hashes  $K$  from 64 to 512. We compare L2-ALSH (using parameters recommended in [16]) with our proposed Sign-ALSH using two sets of parameters:  $(m = 2, U = 0.75)$  and  $(m = 3, U = 0.85)$ . We can see that Sign-ALSH noticeably outperform L2-ALSH.




Figure 4: **Netflix**. Precision-Recall curves (higher is better), of retrieving top- $T$  items, for  $T = 1, 5, 10$ . We vary the number of hashes  $K$  from 64 to 512. We compare L2-ALSH (using parameters recommended in [16]) with our proposed Sign-ALSH using two sets of parameters:  $(m = 2, U = 0.75)$  and  $(m = 3, U = 0.85)$ . We can see that Sign-ALSH noticeably outperform L2-ALSH.

## 6 LSH Bucketing Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the actual savings in the number of inner product evaluations for recommending top- $T$  items for the MovieLens dataset. For this, we implemented the standard  $(K, L)$  algorithms in [8], where  $K$  is number of hashes in each hash table and  $L$  is the total number of tables. For each query point, the returned results are the union of matches in all  $L$  tables. In order to find the top- $T$  items, we need to compute the actual inner products only on the candidate items retrieved by the bucketing procedure.

In this experiment, we choose  $T \in \{1, 5, 10\}$  and compute the recall value for each combination of  $(T, K, L)$  for every query. For example, given query  $q$  and a  $(K, L)$ -LSH scheme, if  $T = 10$  and only 5 of the true top-10 data points are retrieved, the recall will be 50% for this  $(T, K, L)$ . At the same time, we can also compute the **FIP** (fraction of inner products):

$$\text{FIP} = \text{Fraction of Inner Products} = \frac{(K \times L) + \text{TotalRetrieved}}{\text{Total Items}} \quad (26)$$

which is basically the total number of inner products evaluation (where  $K \times L$  represents the cost of hashing), normalized by the total number of items in the repository. Thus, for each  $q$  and  $(T, K, L)$ , we can compute two values: recall and FIP. We also need to figure out a way to aggregate the results for all queries.

We choose the following scheme. For each  $(T, K, L)$ , we compute the averaged recall and averaged FIP, over all queries. Then for each “target” recall level (and  $T$ ), we can find the  $(K, L)$  which produces the best (lowest) averaged FIP. This way, for each  $T$ , we can compute a “FIP-recall” curve, which can be used to compare Sign-ALSH with L2-ALSH. In this experiment, we use  $K \in \{4, 5, \dots, 20\}$  and  $L \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, 200\}$ .

The results are summarized in Figure 5. We can clearly see from the plots that for achieving the same recall for top- $T$ , Sign-ALSH scheme needs to do less computations compared to L2-ALSH.




Figure 5: **MovieLens**. Recall-FIP (Fractions of Inner Products) curves (lower is better) for top-1, top-5, and top-10, for comparing Sign-ALSH with L2-ALSH. We used the recommended parameters for L2-ALSH [16]. For Sign-ALSH, we used  $m = 2$  and  $U = 0.75$ .

## 7 Conclusion

The MIPS (maximum inner product search) problem has numerous important applications in machine learning, databases, and information retrieval. [16] developed the framework of Asymmetric LSH and provided an explicit scheme (L2-ALSH) for approximate MIPS in sublinear time. In this study, we present another asymmetric transformation scheme (Sign-ALSH) which converts the problem of maximum inner products

into the problem of maximum correlation search, which is subsequently solved by sign random projections. Theoretical analysis and experimental study demonstrate that *Sign-ALSH* can be noticeably more advantageous than *L2-ALSH*.

## References

- [1] M. S. Charikar. Similarity estimation techniques from rounding algorithms. In *STOC*, pages 380–388, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, 2002.
- [2] P. Cremonesi, Y. Koren, and R. Turrin. Performance of recommender algorithms on top-n recommendation tasks. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pages 39–46. ACM, 2010.
- [3] M. Datar, N. Immorlica, P. Indyk, and V. S. Mirrokni. Locality-sensitive hashing scheme based on  $p$ -stable distributions. In *SCG*, pages 253 – 262, Brooklyn, NY, 2004.
- [4] T. Dean, M. A. Ruzon, M. Segal, J. Shlens, S. Vijayanarasimhan, and J. Yagnik. Fast, accurate detection of 100,000 object classes on a single machine. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2013 IEEE Conference on*, pages 1814–1821. IEEE, 2013.
- [5] P. F. Felzenszwalb, R. B. Girshick, D. McAllester, and D. Ramanan. Object detection with discriminatively trained part-based models. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 32(9):1627–1645, 2010.
- [6] J. H. Friedman and J. W. Tukey. A projection pursuit algorithm for exploratory data analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 23(9):881–890, 1974.
- [7] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson. Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming. *Journal of ACM*, 42(6):1115–1145, 1995.
- [8] P. Indyk and R. Motwani. Approximate nearest neighbors: Towards removing the curse of dimensionality. In *STOC*, pages 604–613, Dallas, TX, 1998.
- [9] T. Joachims, T. Finley, and C.-N. J. Yu. Cutting-plane training of structural svms. *Machine Learning*, 77(1):27–59, 2009.
- [10] N. Koenigstein, P. Ram, and Y. Shavitt. Efficient retrieval of recommendations in a matrix factorization framework. In *CIKM*, pages 535–544, 2012.
- [11] Y. Koren, R. Bell, and C. Volinsky. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems.
- [12] P. Li, M. Mitzenmacher, and A. Shrivastava. Coding for random projections. In *ICML*, 2014.
- [13] P. Li, M. Mitzenmacher, and A. Shrivastava. Coding for random projections and approximate near neighbor search. Technical report, arXiv:1403.8144, 2014.
- [14] P. Ram and A. G. Gray. Maximum inner-product search using cone trees. In *KDD*, pages 931–939, 2012.
- [15] A. Shrivastava and P. Li. Beyond pairwise: Provably fast algorithms for approximate k-way similarity search. In *NIPS*, Lake Tahoe, NV, 2013.

- [16] A. Shrivastava and P. Li. Asymmetric lsh (alsh) for sublinear time maximum inner product search (mips). Technical report, arXiv:1405.5869 (Submitted to KDD 2014), 2014.
- [17] R. Weber, H.-J. Schek, and S. Blott. A quantitative analysis and performance study for similarity-search methods in high-dimensional spaces. In *VLDB*, pages 194–205, 1998.