

Distributed-Representation Based Hybrid Recommender System with Short Item Descriptions

Junhua He, Hankz Hankui Zhuo and Jarvan Law

Dept. of Computer Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, GuangZhou, China. 510006
hejunh@mail2.sysu.edu.cn, zhuohank@sysu.edu.cn, JarvanLaw@gmail.com

Abstract

Collaborative filtering (CF) aims to build a model from users' past behaviors and/or similar decisions made by other users, and use the model to recommend items for users. Despite of the success of previous collaborative filtering approaches, they are all based on the assumption that there are sufficient rating scores available for building high-quality recommendation models. In real world applications, however, it is often difficult to collect sufficient rating scores, especially when new items are introduced into the system, which makes the recommendation task challenging. We find that there are often "short" texts describing features of items, based on which we can approximate the similarity of items and make recommendation together with rating scores. In this paper we "borrow" the idea of vector representation of words to capture the information of short texts and embed it into a matrix factorization framework. We empirically show that our approach is effective by comparing it with state-of-the-art approaches.

1 Introduction

Recommender systems are a subclass of information filtering systems that seek to predict the rating or preference that a user would give to an item (Ricci et al., 2011). Recommender systems have been applied to a variety of applications, e.g., movies, music, news, books, research articles, search queries, social tags, financial services (Felfernig et al., 2007), and Twitter followers (Gupta et al., 2013). In general there are three ways to design recommender systems (Adomavicius and Tuzhilin, 2005), i.e., collaborative filtering (Breese et al., 1998), content-based filtering (Gopalan et al., 2014), and the hybrid filtering (Burke, 2002). Our work follows the strand of hybrid filtering systems.

There have been works on hybrid filtering systems. For example, Saveski and Mantrach (Saveski and Mantrach, 2014) propose to exploit information from *item document*, i.e., each item is assumed to be associated with a document, to help with recommendation based on the word frequency (or TF-IDF) in documents. Chen et al. present a topic-model based approach to utilize the context and item information (Chen et al., 2014) to help with recommendation. McAuley and Leskovec propose to build a hybrid recommender system by integrating information from review texts with rating scores (McAuley and Leskovec, 2013). Despite the success of the previous approaches, they are based on the assumption that the text information is abundant enough for frequency mining or topic models extraction. When the item description is limited or short, e.g., only a few phrases or tags available, they will not work well since "similar" items with limited descriptions can be very different based on frequency. For example, an item described by "a portable device" should be similar to the item described by "a light-weight and small equipment", while they are very different based on frequency mining since they share very few words. There are indeed many applications, i.e., MovieLens¹ as shown in Table 1, where item descriptions are often short.

In this paper, we aim to explore the similarity between short item descriptions by looking into the semantic relations between descriptions. Inspired by the vector representations of words (Mikolov et al., 2013c), which has been shown to be effective in capturing the semantic relations among words, we borrow the idea of vector representations to take advantage of short item descriptions to assist

¹<https://movielens.org>

Table 1: Examples of item descriptions in MovieLens

Item	Description
Toy Story	animation, children’s, comedy
Jumanji	adventure, children’s, fantasy
Heat	action, crime, thriller
Sabrina	comedy, romance
Tom and Huck	adventure, children’s
Sudden Death	action
GoldenEye	action, adventure, thriller

recommendation. We first build a matrix based on the vector representations of words, and then integrate the matrix into the rating scores to build a matrix factorization objective function. Finally we solve the objective function using an expectation-maximization algorithm to make item recommendation. We call our algorithm RECF, which stands for hybrid RECommender system based on collaborative Filtering with short reviews.

2 Related Work

Our work is related to distributed representations of words. In earlier work, many models have been proposed to learn a distributed representation of words. Collobert and Weston (Collobert and Weston, 2008) propose a single convolutional neural network called SENNA, to output a host of language processing predictions. Mnih and Hinton (Mnih and Hinton, 2008) propose a fast hierarchical language model called HLBL, based on Log-Bilinear in (Mnih and Hinton, 2007) along with a simple feature-based algorithm, which outperforms non-hierarchical neural models in their evaluations. Mikolov (Mikolov, 2012) proposes a new statistical language model, RNNLM, based on RNN in (Mikolov et al., 2010). Huang et al. (Huang et al., 2012) propose a new model which increases the global context-aware to enrich the semantic information of words. And Mikolov et al. (Mikolov et al., 2013a) proposed two new models, CBOW and Skip-gram. Both models use a simple neural network architecture that aims to predict the neighbors of a word. CBOW predicts the current words based on the context and Skip-gram tries to maximize the classification accuracy of a word based on another word in the same sentence. Mikolov et al. (Mikolov et al., 2013a) also proposed a new tool for learning word vectors called word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013c). To improve the accuracy of the word representation, Then in the following year, focusing on this technology of distributed representations. Frome et al. used it to make the language model pre-training of a new deep visual-semantic embedding model, as it has been shown to efficiently learn semantically-meaningful floating point representations of terms from unannotated text (Frome et al., 2013). Mikolov et al. (Mikolov et al., 2013b) developed a method that can automate the process of generating and extending dictionaries and phrase tables. Le and Mikolov (Le and Mikolov, 2014) proposed an unsupervised algorithm that learns fixed-length feature representations from variable-length texts. Qiu et al. (Qiu et al., 2015) explored distributed representations of words to detect analogies. In this paper, we exploit the distributed representation approach to transform item descriptions to vectors, and assist recommendation based on these vectors.

3 Problem Formulation

A *rating* matrix is denoted by $R \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ?\}^{N \times M}$, where R_{uv} is a rating score given by user u for item v , N is the number of users, M is the number of items, and the symbol “?” indicates no score is given by user u . An *labeling* matrix is denoted by $L \in \{0, 1, ?\}^{N \times M}$, where L_{uv} is the label given by user u for item v , with the meaning of “dislike”, “like” and “unknown label” for “0”, “1” and “?”, respectively. An *item description* vector is denoted by Q , where Q_v is composed of a set of words describing the properties of item v . Note that Q_v can be an empty set \emptyset suggesting no item description given to item v .

Our recommender system can be defined by: given as input a rating matrix R , a labeling matrix L and an item description vector Q , it aims to estimate *unknown* rating scores “?” in R .

4 Our RECF Algorithm

In this section, we present our RECF algorithm in detail. We first build distributed representations of item descriptions, and then integrate the ratings, labelings and distributed representations of item descriptions to build a bayesian model and learn parameters of the model to build the recommender system. An overview of RECF is shown in Algorithm 1. We will address each step of Algorithm 1 in detail in the subsequent sections.

Algorithm 1 The framework of our RECF algorithm

input: ratings R , labelings L , item descriptions Q

output: estimated ratings \hat{R}

- 1: build representations C from descriptions Q
- 2: build hybrid model \mathcal{M} based on R , L and C
- 3: learn the parameters of \mathcal{M} with EM approach
 - 3.0: initiate U , V , B_R , B_L and W_C

while the maximal iteration is not reached **do**

- 3.1: update V using U , B_R , B_L and W_C
- 3.2: update U using V , B_R , B_L and W_C
- 3.3: calculate B_R , B_L and W_C using V and U

end while

- 4: compute $\hat{R} = U^T B_R V$

return \hat{R}

4.1 Distributed representations of descriptions

As the first step of Algorithm 1, we aim to build the distributed representations of item descriptions with Q as input. We first learn the vector representations for words using the Skip-gram model with hierarchical softmax, which has been shown an efficient method for learning high-quality vector representations of words from unstructured corpora (Mikolov et al., 2013c). The objective of the Skip-gram model is to learn vector representations for predicting the surrounding words in a sentence or document. Given a corpus \mathcal{C} , composed of a sequence of training words $\langle w_1, w_2, \dots, w_T \rangle$, where $T = |\mathcal{C}|$, the Skip-gram model maximizes the average log probability

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{-c \leq j \leq c, j \neq 0} \log p(w_{t+j}|w_t), \quad (1)$$

where c is the size of the training window or context.

The basic probability $p(w_{t+j}|w_t)$ is defined by the hierarchical softmax, which uses a binary tree representation of the output layer with the K words as its leaves and for each node, explicitly represents the relative probabilities of its child nodes (Mikolov et al., 2013c). For each leaf node, there is a unique path from the root to the node, and this path is used to estimate the probability of the word represented by the leaf node. There are no explicit output vector representations for words. Instead, each inner node has an output vector $v'_{n(w,j)}$, and the probability of a word being the output word is defined by $p(w_{t+j}|w_t) = \prod_{i=1}^{L(w_{t+j})-1} \left\{ \sigma(\mathbb{I}(n(w_{t+j}, i+1) = \text{child}(n(w_{t+j}, i))) \cdot v_{n(w_{t+j}, i)} \cdot v_{w_t}) \right\}$, where $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-x))$. $L(w)$ is the length from the root to the word w in the binary tree, e.g., $L(w) = 4$ if there are four nodes from the root to w . $n(w, i)$ is the i th node from the root to w , e.g., $n(w, 1) = \text{root}$ and $n(w, L(w)) = w$. $\text{child}(n)$ is a fixed child (e.g., left child) of node n . v_n is the vector representation of the inner node n . v_{w_t} is the input vector representation of word w_t . The identity function $\mathbb{I}(x)$ is 1 if

x is true; otherwise it is -1. We can thus build vector representations of words w , denoted by $vec(w)$, by maximizing Equation (1) with corpora.

With vector representations of words, we calculate the overall representations of item descriptions by “summarizing” all words in each item description. There could be many different ways to “summarize” all words. In this paper we consider a straightforward way of computing the overall representations of item descriptions, i.e., calculating an average representation over all words in each item description. We have $C_v = \frac{1}{|Q_v|} \sum_{w \in Q_v} vec(w)$, where Q_v is the set of words describing the properties of item v . If $Q_v = \emptyset$, C_v is assigned with symbol “?” with the same meaning in R . Note that we assume the importance of different words in Q_v is identical in describing item v . It is possible to extend it to considering different importance of words by introducing weights to words when the prior knowledge is provided. We call the resulting matrix $C = [C_1, C_2, \dots, C_M]^T$ *description matrix*.

4.2 The hybrid model with item descriptions

In Step 2 of Algorithm 1, we aim to build a hybrid model \mathcal{M} to capture the underlying relations among ratings R , labelings L , and item descriptions C . The framework of the hybrid model is shown in Figure




Figure 1: The hybrid model with ratings, labelings and item descriptions.

1. The rationale of the hybrid model is based on the following four assumptions.

Assumption 1: Each user u and item v are characterized by an *unknown* feature vector U_u controlled by parameter θ_u and V_v controlled by parameter θ_v , respectively. The rating R_{uv} , which is controlled by parameter α , is assumed to be resulted from bridging U_u and V_v with *unknown* matrix B_R controlled by parameter β . In other words, rating R_{uv} should be close to $U_u B_R V_v^T$, i.e., $R_{uv} \sim U_u B_R V_v^T$. The similar idea is exploited by (Pan and Yang, 2013). This idea can be formulated by maximizing the conditional distribution below, assuming it follows a Gaussian distribution: $p(R_{uv}|U_u, B_R, V_v, \alpha) = \mathcal{N}(R_{uv}|U_u B_R V_v^T, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I})$ where $\mathcal{N}(x|\mu, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I}) = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}} \exp(-\alpha(x - \mu)^2)$.

Assumption 2: Likewise, the labeling L_{uv} , which is controlled by parameter α , is assumed to be resulted from bridging U_u and V_v with *unknown* matrix B_L controlled by the same parameter β of B_R , i.e., $L_{uv} \sim U_u B_L V_v^T$. We thus have $p(L_{uv}|U_u, B_L, V_v, \alpha) = \mathcal{N}(L_{uv}|U_u B_L V_v^T, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I})$.

Assumption 3: The item description C_v , which is controlled by parameter ξ , is assumed to be resulted from the item features V_v and *unknown* matrix W_C controlled by parameter δ , i.e., $C_v \sim V_v^T W_C$. We thus have $p(C_v|V_v, W_C, \xi) = \mathcal{N}(C_v|V_v^T W_C, \xi^{-1}\mathbf{I})$.

Assumption 4: Furthermore, we assume the distributions of U_u , V_v , B_R , B_L and W_C are $p(U_u|\theta_u) = \mathcal{N}(U_u|\mathbf{0}, \theta_u^{-1}\mathbf{I})$, $p(V_v|\theta_v) = \mathcal{N}(V_v|\mathbf{0}, \theta_v^{-1}\mathbf{I})$, $p(B_R|\beta) = \mathcal{N}(B_R|\mathbf{0}, (\beta/q_R)^{-1}\mathbf{I})$, $p(B_L|\beta) = \mathcal{N}(B_L|\mathbf{0}, (\beta/q_L)^{-1}\mathbf{I})$, $p(W_C|\delta) = \mathcal{N}(W_C|\mathbf{0}, (\delta/q_C)^{-1}\mathbf{I})$, where q_R , q_L , and q_C are numbers of not “?” elements in R , L and C , respectively.

Based on the hybrid model shown in Figure 1, our objective is to maximize the function as below:

$$\max_{U, V, B_R, B_L, W_C} \log \mathcal{F}_R + \lambda_L \log \mathcal{F}_L + \lambda_C \log \mathcal{F}_C \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda_L > 0$ and $\lambda_C > 0$ are tradeoff parameters to balance the ratings, labelings and item descriptions. $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ satisfy $U^T U = I$ and $V^T V = I$, respectively. \mathcal{F}_R , \mathcal{F}_L and \mathcal{F}_C are defined by $\mathcal{F}_R = \prod_{u,v} \left[p(R_{uv}|U_u, B_R, V_v, \alpha) p(U_u|\theta_U) p(V_v|\theta_V) p(B_R|\beta) \right]^{x_{uv}}$, $\mathcal{F}_L = \prod_{u,v} \left[p(L_{uv}|U_u, B_L, V_v, \alpha) p(U_u|\theta_U) p(V_v|\theta_V) p(B_L|\beta) \right]^{y_{uv}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_C = \prod_v \left[p(C_v|W_C, V_v, \xi) p(V_v|\theta_V) p(W_C|\delta) \right]^{z_v}$, where x_{uv} , y_{uv} and z_v are indicator variables for R_{uv} , L_{uv} and C_v , respectively. If $R_{uv} = \text{"?"}$ (or $L_{uv} = \text{"?"}$ or $C_v = \emptyset$), then $x_{uv} = 0$ (or $y_{uv} = 0$ or $z_v = 0$); otherwise $x_{uv} = 1$ (or $y_{uv} = 1$ or $z_v = 1$).

Specifically, based on the Gaussian distributions given above, the log-posterior function of the ratings is shown below:

$$\log \mathcal{F}_R = - \sum_{u,v} x_{uv} \left[\frac{\alpha}{2} (R_{uv} - U_u B_R V_v^T)^2 + \frac{\theta_U}{2} \|U_u\|^2 + \frac{\theta_V}{2} \|V_v\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2q} \|B_R\|_F^2 + K_R \right], \quad (3)$$

where $K_R = \ln \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}} + \ln \sqrt{\frac{\theta_U}{2\pi}} + \ln \sqrt{\frac{\theta_V}{2\pi}} + \ln \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2qR\pi}}$ is a constant. Likewise, we can compute the log-posterior functions of the labelings $\log \mathcal{F}_L$ and descriptions $\log \mathcal{F}_C$. We can see the objective function Equation (2) can be reduced to a polynomial function. We will solve the optimization problem using an EM-style algorithm in the next subsection.

4.3 The EM algorithm

In Step 3 of Algorithm 1 we aim to learn the parameters B_R , B_L , W_C , U and V using the EM approach. As the beginning of the EM approach, we initialize U and V using the SVD result of labelings L , since the labeling data L describes users' "high-level" or general interest in items. After that we initialize B_R , B_L and W_C with Equations (5) and (6) using U and V , which will be introduced in Section 4.3.2.

4.3.1 Learning V and U

In Steps 3.1 and 3.2 of Algorithm 1, we aim to learn V and U . Given U and B_R , B_L , W_C , we can update V using gradient descent approach. We first simplify the optimization function from Equation (2), as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{U, V} f &= \min_{U, V} \frac{1}{2} \|X \odot (R - U B_R V^T)\|_F^2 + \frac{\lambda_R}{2} \|Y \odot (L - U B_L V^T)\|_F^2 + \frac{\lambda_C}{2} \|Z \odot (C - V W_C)\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &U^T U = I, V^T V = I, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $X = [x_{uv}]$, $Y = [y_{uv}]$, $Z = [z_v]$. We then iteratively update V and U by $V = V - \gamma_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial V}$ and $U = U - \gamma_2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial U}$, where γ_1 and γ_2 are two learning constants.

4.3.2 Calculating B_R , B_L and W_C

In Step 3.3 of Algorithm 1, we compute B_R , B_L and W_C using U and V . For B_R , we have the optimal function shown below, $\min_{B_R} \frac{1}{2} \|X \odot (R - U B_R V^T)\|_F^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|B_R\|_F^2$. Letting $\mathbb{B}_R = \text{vec}(B_R) = [B_{R,1} \cdots B_{R,d}]$, $m_{ui} = \text{vec}(U_u^T V_i)$, $\mathbb{R} = \text{vec}(R)$, where $\text{vec}(Y)$ indicates a vector built by concatenating columns of the matrix Y , we have the following equivalent problem, $\min_{\mathbb{B}_R} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{R} - \mathbb{M} \cdot \mathbb{B}_R\|_F^2 + \frac{\beta}{2} \|\mathbb{B}_R\|_F^2$, where $\mathbb{M} = [\dots m_{ui} \dots]^T$. Letting $\nabla \mathbb{B}_R = 0$, we have

$$\text{vec}(B_R) = \mathbb{B}_R = (\mathbb{M}^T \mathbb{M} + \beta I)^{-1} \mathbb{M}^T \mathbb{R}. \quad (5)$$

Likewise, we have $\text{vec}(B_L) = (\mathbb{M}^T \mathbb{M} + \beta I)^{-1} \mathbb{M}^T \mathbb{L}$, where $\mathbb{L} = \text{vec}(L)$. Finally, we can easily compute B_R and B_L from $\text{vec}(B_R)$ and $\text{vec}(B_L)$, respectively.

Given V , we can estimate the parameter W_C by optimizing the subject function from Equation (2). We have $\min_{W_C} \frac{\lambda_C}{2} \|Z \odot (C - VW_C)\|_F^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} \|W_C\|_F^2$. We calculate the gradient $\nabla W_C = -V^T C + V^T V W_C + \beta W_C$, and set $\nabla W_C = 0$. As a result, we have

$$W_C = (V^T V + \delta I)^{-1} V^T C. \quad (6)$$

4.3.3 Tradeoff between λ_L and λ_C

The initial values of the tradeoff parameters λ_L and λ_C are set before running the program, which are determined through repeated experiments. During execution, λ_L will remain the same while C will change. The reason is that, the labeling data includes accurate information while item description matrix C is obtained based on distributed representations of descriptions. When the labeling data is sparse, the noise issue with item descriptions may be worsen. Thus, the positive influence of C only plays in a macroscopic level but not in a microcosmic one. At the later period of convergence, continuing using C may reduce the accuracy. In other words, the influence of C should be gradually decreased as running the algorithm. We thus propose three options to adjust the value of λ_C , as shown below.

1. **Linear decline:** Linear decline is the simplest model to specify the declining, in which we compute λ_C as follows:

$$\lambda_C = \begin{cases} m - (iter - 1) \cdot k & \text{if } iter < \frac{m}{k} + 1 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where m is the initial value of λ_C , $iter$ is the iteration and k is the step size.

2. **Nonlinear decline:** To emphasize the strong influence of C in the early period, in nonlinear decline, the decreasing speed of λ_C also decreases in the execution. We propose a simple model as follows:

$$\lambda_C = m/iter \quad (8)$$

3. **Mutation:** While the two methods mentioned above are easy to implement, the problem is that it is difficult to determine the step size. Intuitively, if the number of iterations before convergence is large, we should adjust the value of m to decrease the step size, thus extending the time of influence by C . Hence, we propose a method of mutating C according to the convergence situation:

$$\lambda_C = \begin{cases} m & \text{if before the first convergence} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The advantage of this method is that we do not need to consider the convergence speed.

Finally, in Step 4 of Algorithm 1, we estimate values of “?” in R for recommendations by calculating $UB_R V^T$.

5 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate our RECF algorithm using two datasets MovieLens and Douban² by comparing it against other four algorithms, SVD (Pan and Yang, 2013), CSVD (Pan and Yang, 2013), CSVD+Binary (Saveski and Mantrach, 2014) and CSVD+TFIDF (Saveski and Mantrach, 2014). SVD is an approach that exploits just ratings for building models for item recommendations. CSVD is an approach that exploits both ratings and labelings information for building models for item recommendations. CSVD+Binary and CSVD+TFIDF are two state-of-the-art approaches that exploit item description information for improving recommendation accuracy. They convert the item descriptions to *Binary* matrix and *tf-idf* representations, respectively, and combine them with ratings together to build recommender systems (Saveski and Mantrach, 2014). To make the comparison fair, we fed the labelings to the

²<http://www.datatang.com/data/42832> and <http://www.datatang.com/data/44858>

approaches by (Saveski and Mantrach, 2014), resulting in CSVD+Binary and CSVD+TFIDF. For both datasets MovieLens and Douban, we randomly split the data into n ($n=3, 5, 10, 15, 20$) subsets. We randomly selected one for training, one for building labeling data L by setting L_{uv} be 1 if $R_{ui} > 3$ and L_{uv} be 0 otherwise (as done by (Pan and Yang, 2013)). The other $n - 2$ subsets are used for testing.

We exploit two metrics to measure the performance, i.e., Mean Absolute Error (MAE) and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), as shown below, $MAE = \sum_{(u,i,r_{ui}) \in T_E} |r_{ui} - \hat{r}_{ui}| / |T_E|$ and $RMSE = \sqrt{\sum_{(u,i,r_{ui}) \in T_E} (r_{ui} - \hat{r}_{ui})^2 / |T_E|}$, where r_{ui} is the *ground-truth* rating, \hat{r}_{ui} is the predicted rating and $|T_E|$ is the number of testing ratings.




Figure 2: Performance of our RECF algorithm and w.r.t. sparsity of rating scores in dataset **Douban**.




Figure 3: Performance of our RECF algorithm and w.r.t. sparsity of rating scores in dataset **MovieLens**.

5.1 Performance w.r.t. sparsity

We first would like to see the performance with respect to different sparsities, by varying the percentage of available ratings (i.e., the rating scores given by users). We ran our RECF algorithm and SVD, CSVD, CSVD+Binary, CSVD+TFIDF five times with different training and testing subsets and computed an average of accuracies. In our RECF algorithm we set λ_L to be 0.2 and λ_C to be 2.5 in Equation (2). The results are shown in Figures 2 and 3, where we varied the sparsity from 1.4% to 0.21% in dataset **Douban**, and from 0.16% to 0.02% in dataset **MovieLens**, respectively.

From the figures, we can see that both MAE and RMSE become larger when the percentage of ratings decreases in both datasets. This is consistent with our intuition since the fewer the ratings are, the larger the MAE and RMSE are. Comparing different curves, CSVD+Binary, CSVD+TFIDF and RECF algorithms generally perform better than SVD and CSVD in terms of MAE and RMSE, especially when the rating message is very sparse. This indicates item descriptions can indeed help improve the recommendation accuracy. However, in Douban field, we find that CSVD+TFIDF performs almost the same as CSVD while CSVD+Binary even makes a negative effect on the result. The main reason is that the item descriptions we can use are only tags instead of long text descriptions. The item description information cannot be captured correctly by *Binary* or *tf-idf* matrix, which harms the recommendation accuracy. In contrast, our RECF algorithm can better leverage these item description information based on distributed representations of words.

Furthermore, in both datasets, we can also observe that MAE (or RMSE) of SVD (or CSVD, CSVD+Binary, CSVD+TFIDF) increases faster than our RECF algorithm as the percentage of rating scores decreases, i.e., the sparsity increases, which suggests that our RECF algorithm functions even better, compared to the other four approaches, when the rating data is much sparser. This is because the impact of item descriptions relatively becomes larger when rating data decreases, resulting larger improvement of accuracies by item descriptions.

5.2 Tradeoff between λ_C and λ_L

Next, we would like to see the impact of λ_C in Equation (2). We tuned the tradeoff between λ_L and λ_C by varying the value of λ_C with respect to the number of iterations in RECF, as presented by Equation (9). As we can see from Equation (9), the value of λ_C is fixed to be m before the first convergence and 0 once our RECF algorithm converging, where m is the preset initial value of λ_C . We fixed m to be 2.5 and λ_L to be 0.2 as done in the last subsection. We present the results in Figures 4 and 5.




Figure 4: Impact of λ_C and λ_L in our RECF algorithm in dataset **Douban**.




Figure 5: Impact of λ_C and λ_L in our RECF algorithm in dataset **MovieLens**.

We find that the changes of performance (i.e., curves) can be divided into two stages, which indicate two phases of convergence. The first phase is for the tradeoff parameter of description matrix C , namely λ_C . At the beginning of convergence, C weights more than L and dominates the convergence. In this period, the curve declines as expected. However, as we can see from the figures, the curve may prematurely converge with a relatively low accuracy. The reason is that, due to the characteristics of C – capturing the similarity information in short descriptions with noise generated by word embedding, it may have a negative effect in a microcosmic level to get more accurate results. When we change λ_C to 0, i.e., C no longer has any impact on the recommendation result, the curves go to another convergence stage, which verifies that C mainly help improve the accuracy in the early stage by estimating values of “?” in R . Once the information from item descriptions C has been encoded in R and L after the first convergence, the impact of item descriptions should be reduced (letting λ_C be 0) and as a result, the impact of rating scores R and labelings L is relatively magnified to improve the recommendation accuracy. The rationale is that when the number of iterations reaches a threshold reducing the impact of description matrix C could help avoiding overfitting when continuing running our RECF algorithm. Note that setting λ_C to be 0 indicates we do not need to update parameters W_C in the objective function of Equation (2) and as a result the size of parameters to be learnt is reduced. In summary, C should be weighed larger than L in the early stage for quickly injecting its impact on the learning process, and then reduced to zero to increase the impact of R and L .

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel algorithm RECF to explore item descriptions to help improve the recommendation accuracy using distributed representations of item descriptions. Using this vector representation, we transform the item descriptions into vector representations, and combine them with rating and labeling data to build a hybrid recommender system. We exhibit that our RECF approach is effective by comparing with the state-of-the-art approaches that exploit item descriptions. In the future, we would like to explore more information in our algorithm framework, such as user profiles or reviews, to further improve recommendation accuracies.

References

- [Adomavicius and Tuzhilin2005] Gediminas Adomavicius and Alexander Tuzhilin. 2005. Toward the next generation of recommender systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and possible extensions. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 17(6):734–749.
- [Breese et al.1998] John S. Breese, David Heckerman, and Carl Myers Kadie. 1998. Empirical analysis of predictive algorithms for collaborative filtering. In *UAI '98: Proceedings of the Fourteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, University of Wisconsin Business School, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, July 24-26, 1998*, pages 43–52.
- [Burke2002] Robin D. Burke. 2002. Hybrid recommender systems: Survey and experiments. *User Model. User-Adapt. Interact.*, 12(4):331–370.
- [Chen et al.2014] Chaochao Chen, Xiaolin Zheng, Yan Wang, Fuxing Hong, and Zhen Lin. 2014. Context-aware collaborative topic regression with social matrix factorization for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of AAAI*, pages 9–15.
- [Collobert and Weston2008] Ronan Collobert and Jason Weston. 2008. A unified architecture for natural language processing: deep neural networks with multitask learning. In *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference (ICML 2008), Helsinki, Finland, June 5-9, 2008*, pages 160–167.
- [Felfernig et al.2007] Alexander Felfernig, Klaus Isak, Kalman Szabo, and Peter Zachar. 2007. The VITA financial services sales support environment. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 22-26, 2007, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada*, pages 1692–1699.
- [Frome et al.2013] Andrea Frome, Gregory S. Corrado, Jonathon Shlens, Samy Bengio, Jeffrey Dean, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Tomas Mikolov. 2013. Devise: A deep visual-semantic embedding model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2013. Proceedings of a meeting held December 5-8, 2013, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, United States.*, pages 2121–2129.
- [Gopalan et al.2014] Prem Gopalan, Laurent Charlin, and David M. Blei. 2014. Content-based recommendations with poisson factorization. In *Proceedings of NIPS*, pages 3176–3184.
- [Gupta et al.2013] Pankaj Gupta, Ashish Goel, Jimmy Lin, Aneesh Sharma, Dong Wang, and Reza Zadeh. 2013. Wtf: The who to follow service at twitter. In *Proceedings of the 22Nd International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '13*, pages 505–514, Republic and Canton of Geneva, Switzerland. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- [Huang et al.2012] Eric H. Huang, Richard Socher, Christopher D. Manning, and Andrew Y. Ng. 2012. Improving word representations via global context and multiple word prototypes. In *The 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the Conference, July 8-14, 2012, Jeju Island, Korea - Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 873–882.
- [Le and Mikolov2014] Quoc V. Le and Tomas Mikolov. 2014. Distributed representations of sentences and documents. In *Proceedings of the 31th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2014, Beijing, China, 21-26 June 2014*, pages 1188–1196.
- [McAuley and Leskovec2013] Julian J. McAuley and Jure Leskovec. 2013. Hidden factors and hidden topics: understanding rating dimensions with review text. In *Proceedings of RecSys*, pages 165–172.
- [Mikolov et al.2010] Tomas Mikolov, Martin Karafiát, Lukas Burget, Jan Cernocký, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. 2010. Recurrent neural network based language model. In *INTERSPEECH 2010, 11th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Makuhari, Chiba, Japan, September 26-30, 2010*, pages 1045–1048.
- [Mikolov et al.2013a] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013a. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *CoRR*, abs/1301.3781.
- [Mikolov et al.2013b] Tomas Mikolov, Quoc V. Le, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013b. Exploiting similarities among languages for machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1309.4168.
- [Mikolov et al.2013c] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. 2013c. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In C.J.C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26*, pages 3111–3119. Curran Associates, Inc.

- [Mikolov2012] Tomáš Mikolov. 2012. Statistical language models based on neural networks. *Presentation at Google, Mountain View, 2nd April*.
- [Mnih and Hinton2007] Andriy Mnih and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2007. Three new graphical models for statistical language modelling. In *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference (ICML 2007), Corvallis, Oregon, USA, June 20-24, 2007*, pages 641–648.
- [Mnih and Hinton2008] Andriy Mnih and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2008. A scalable hierarchical distributed language model. In *Proceedings of NIPS*, pages 1081–1088.
- [Pan and Yang2013] Weike Pan and Qiang Yang. 2013. Transfer learning in heterogeneous collaborative filtering domains. *Artif. Intell.*, 197:39–55.
- [Qiu et al.2015] Likun Qiu, Yue Zhang, and Yanan Lu. 2015. Syntactic dependencies and distributed word representations for analogy detection and mining. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal, September 17-21, 2015*, pages 2441–2450.
- [Ricci et al.2011] Francesco Ricci, Lior Rokach, Bracha Shapira, and Paul B. Kantor, editors. 2011. *Recommender Systems Handbook*. Springer.
- [Saveski and Mantrach2014] Martin Saveski and Amin Mantrach. 2014. Item cold-start recommendations: learning local collective embeddings. In *Proceedings of RecSys*, pages 89–96.