

Privacy-preserving recommender system using the data collaboration analysis for distributed datasets

Tomoya Yanagi^a, Shunnosuke Ikeda^{a,*}, Noriyoshi Sukegawa^b, Yuichi Takano^c

^a*Graduate School of Science and Technology, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba-shi, 305-8573, Ibaraki, Japan*

^b*Department of Advanced Sciences, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Hosei University, 3-7-2 Kajinocho, Koganei-shi, 184-8584, Tokyo, Japan*

^c*Institute of Systems and Information Engineering, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba-shi, 305-8573, Ibaraki, Japan*

Abstract

In order to provide high-quality recommendations for users, it is desirable to share and integrate multiple datasets held by different parties. However, when sharing such distributed datasets, we need to protect personal and confidential information contained in the datasets. To this end, we establish a framework for privacy-preserving recommender systems using the data collaboration analysis of distributed datasets. Numerical experiments with two public rating datasets demonstrate that our privacy-preserving method for rating prediction can improve the prediction accuracy for distributed datasets. This study opens up new possibilities for privacy-preserving techniques in recommender systems.

Keywords: recommender system, data collaboration analysis, factorization machine, privacy

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: yanagi.tomoya.ta@alumni.tsukuba.ac.jp (Tomoya Yanagi), ikeda.shunnosuke@gmail.com (Shunnosuke Ikeda), sukegawa@hosei.ac.jp (Noriyoshi Sukegawa), ytakano@sk.tsukuba.ac.jp (Yuichi Takano)

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

In recent years, advances in information and communication technology have made it possible for individuals and organizations to access vast amounts of information on a daily basis. Against this background, recommender systems have become one of the most successful technologies based on data analytics (Resnick and Varian, 1997; Aggarwal et al., 2016). These systems involve suggesting a personalized list of appealing items based on the users' past preferences. Various algorithms, including collaborative filtering (Resnick et al., 1994) and matrix factorization (Koren et al., 2009), have been developed to provide high-quality recommendations for users. Additionally, these algorithms are actively implemented in a variety of web services (Lu et al., 2015; del Carmen Rodríguez-Hernández and Ilarri, 2021).

A number of prior studies have focused on improving the prediction accuracy of recommender algorithms (Bobadilla et al., 2013). In particular, deep learning techniques have recently received attention and achieved remarkable success in various real-world services (Zhang et al., 2019; Gao et al., 2022). The recommendation accuracy can be enhanced not only through sophisticated algorithms but also through data fusion, which involves merging multiple datasets into a single, consistent, and clean representation (Bleiholder and Naumann, 2009). Therefore, to develop highly accurate recommender algorithms, it is desirable to share and integrate multiple datasets possessed by different parties.

When sharing such distributed datasets, however, we need to protect personal and confidential information contained in the datasets (Jeckmans et al., 2013; Himeur et al., 2022; Ogunseyi et al., 2023). Privacy is an important issue for recommender systems, which contain information on a large number of registered users (Bobadilla et al., 2013). In fact, recommender systems may access users' sensitive information, such as gender, age, and location, to improve the prediction accuracy (Sun and Zhang, 2018). Therefore, integrating datasets for better recommendations requires an algorithmic framework to protect user privacy.

1.2. Related work

Various privacy-preserving techniques have been used to protect personal and confidential information in recommender systems (Jeckmans et al., 2013; Himeur et al., 2022; Ogunseyi et al., 2023); these include anonymization,

randomization, cryptography techniques, differential privacy, and federated learning.

Anonymization involves removing personally identifiable information from data, whereas randomization aims at modifying data by adding some random noise. Although these techniques are readily available in recommender systems (Weinsberg et al., 2012; Polatidis et al., 2017; Wei et al., 2018; Saleem et al., 2021), they can lead to the loss of key information that is useful in generating accurate recommendations (Ogunseyi et al., 2023).

Cryptography techniques allow us to conduct data analysis while keeping data secret. Canny (2002) was probably the first to apply cryptography techniques to collaborative filtering. Nikolaenko et al. (2013) designed a recommender system based on matrix factorization using a cryptography technique known as garbled circuits. Although various cryptography techniques have been used for privacy protection in recommender systems, these techniques incur substantial computational and communication costs, making them impractical (Ogunseyi et al., 2023).

Differential privacy is a rigorous mathematical definition of privacy to guarantee that no individual-level information in a dataset is leaked. This is typically achieved by adding noise to individual data, where the amount of noise depends on the required level of privacy protection. McSherry and Mironov (2009) proposed a movie recommendation algorithm that mitigates the impact of noise added for differential privacy through post-processing. Various algorithms have been studied to apply differential privacy to collaborative filtering (Aïmeur et al., 2008; Yin et al., 2020), matrix factorization (Berlioz et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2015; Ran et al., 2022), and variational autoencoders (Fang et al., 2022). However, when a high degree of privacy protection is required, the differential privacy significantly reduces recommendation accuracy (Bagdasaryan et al., 2019).

Federated learning aims at training a machine learning model from multiple local datasets while keeping them decentralized. The basic strategy consists of training local models from each local dataset and updating the global model by centralizing only the trained parameters. Ammad-Ud-Din et al. (2019) proposed a federated collaborative filtering algorithm based on matrix factorization. Since then, various recommender systems based on federated learning have been proposed for privacy protection (Yang et al., 2020); these systems use matrix factorization (Liang et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2023), deep neural networks (Liu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022), and variational autoencoders (Imran et al., 2023). However, one of the challenges facing

federated learning is the substantial communication costs required to train a machine learning model, which can result in long execution times (Zhang et al., 2021).

To overcome these challenges associated with the privacy-preserving techniques mentioned above, Imakura and Sakurai (2020) proposed the data collaboration analysis for distributed datasets. This method enables collaborative data analysis by sharing intermediate representations, each being individually constructed for privacy protection by each party from original datasets. Bogdanova et al. (2020) demonstrated that when the number of involved parties is small, the data collaboration analysis consistently outperforms federated learning with lower computational and communication costs. Imakura et al. (2021a) proved that original datasets can be protected by the data collaboration analysis against insider and external attacks. Imakura et al. (2023b) proposed an improved version of the data collaboration analysis sharing intermediate representations that are not readily identifiable to the original datasets.

It is, however, impossible to directly apply the data collaboration analysis to recommender systems. A main reason for this is that the data collaboration analysis is specifically designed for regression and classification tasks. Therefore, this analysis cannot be performed to impute missing values in the user–item rating matrix used for rating prediction. To our knowledge, no prior studies have applied the data collaboration analysis to missing value imputation.

1.3. Our contribution

The goal of this paper is to establish a framework for privacy-preserving recommender systems using the data collaboration analysis. For this purpose, we take advantage of the flattened data format used in the factorization machines (Rendle, 2010). Specifically, we convert a user–item rating matrix into the flattened format with the aim of treating the missing value imputation as the regression analysis. This conversion makes it possible to apply the data collaboration analysis to rating prediction for recommender systems. Additionally, our algorithm can handle both horizontal and vertical integration of rating matrices.

To verify the effectiveness of our privacy-preserving method for rating prediction, we performed numerical experiments with two public rating datasets. For comparison, we implemented two alternative methods: the individual analysis, which uses distributed datasets separately for rating prediction;

and the centralized analysis, which merges distributed datasets without preserving privacy. Numerical results demonstrate that, similar to the centralized analysis, our method using the data collaboration analysis significantly outperformed the individual analysis. Moreover, our method improved its prediction accuracy as the number of involved parties increased.

2. Data collaboration analysis

In this section, we provide an overview of the data collaboration analysis based on the literature (Imakura and Sakurai, 2020; Imakura et al., 2021b). Throughout this paper, we denote the set of consecutive integers ranging from 1 to n as $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

2.1. Distributed datasets

We suppose that there are m parties, and each party $k \in [m]$ holds the following dataset containing $n(k)$ instances:

$$\mathbf{X}^{(k)} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(k)} \\ \mathbf{x}_2^{(k)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_{n(k)}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(k) \times p}, \quad \mathbf{y}^{(k)} := \begin{pmatrix} y_1^{(k)} \\ y_2^{(k)} \\ \vdots \\ y_{n(k)}^{(k)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(k) \times 1}, \quad (1)$$

where for each instance $i \in [n(k)]$, $\mathbf{x}_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p}$ is a row vector composed of p predictor variables, and $y_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}$ is a response variable to be predicted.

In the *individual data analysis*, each party $k \in [m]$ uses the dataset (Eq. (1)) separately to train its own machine learning model. In this case, the prediction accuracy of trained models tends to be lower when the size of each dataset is small. In the *centralized data analysis*, the datasets held by parties $k \in [m]$ are merged as

$$\mathbf{X} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{X}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{X}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \quad \mathbf{y} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{y}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}, \quad (2)$$

where $n := \sum_{k=1}^m n(k)$. This merged dataset is then used to train a machine learning model; however, sharing datasets is often impossible due to privacy issues.

2.2. Intermediate representations

We aim to analyze multiple datasets collaboratively while keeping them decentralized for privacy protection. For this purpose, we use the *anchor dataset*, which is an artificially prepared dataset containing r instances:

$$\mathbf{S} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}_1 \\ \mathbf{s}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{s}_r \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times p}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p}$ is a row vector corresponding to p predictor variables for each instance $i \in [r]$. This dataset can be generated using random numbers or through more sophisticated methods as proposed by Takahashi et al. (2021) and Imakura et al. (2023a). The anchor dataset is shared by all parties.

To preserve the privacy of the original datasets (Eq. (1)), each party $k \in [m]$ applies an individual *encoding function*

$$f_k : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \tilde{p}(k)} \quad (4)$$

to all instances (i.e., row vectors) of the original and anchor datasets, $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$ and \mathbf{S} , thereby transforming them into the following *intermediate representations*:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(k) \times \tilde{p}(k)}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \tilde{p}(k)}. \quad (5)$$

For example, each party can employ dimensionality reduction techniques, such as the principal component analysis and the singular value decomposition, as an encoding function (Eq. (4)). Each party $k \in [m]$ sends the intermediate representations (Eq. (5)) and the response vector $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ to the analyzer for data collaboration. The privacy of the original datasets is preserved by not sharing the encoding function with other parties or the analyzer, and not sharing the anchor dataset with the analyzer.

2.3. Collaboration representations

It is ineffective to merge and analyze the intermediate representations $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}$ collected from parties $k \in [m]$, because they are created by each party using different encoding functions to preserve privacy. To remedy this situation, the analyzer applies the *integration function*

$$g_k : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \tilde{p}(k)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \tilde{p}} \quad (6)$$

to all instances (i.e., row vectors) of the intermediate representations (Eq. (5)), resulting in the following \hat{p} -dimensional *collaboration representations*:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^{(k)} \times \hat{p}}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{p}}.$$

Imakura and Sakurai (2020) considered the following linear integration function:

$$g_k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{G}^{(k)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{G}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{p}^{(k)} \times \hat{p}}$ is the coefficient matrix for each party $k \in [m]$. In this case, the collaboration representations for party $k \in [m]$ are expressed as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \mathbf{G}^{(k)}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \mathbf{G}^{(k)}. \quad (8)$$

Recall here that the anchor dataset is common among all parties. Therefore, the corresponding collaboration representations should be close to each other to ensure data consistency between different parties $k, k' \in [m]$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \mathbf{G}^{(k)} \approx \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k')} \mathbf{G}^{(k')} \quad (k \neq k').$$

To estimate linear integration functions (Eq. (7)), Imakura and Sakurai (2020) proposed solving a minimum perturbation problem. This method first computes the singular value decomposition of the following matrix, which consists of the intermediate representations (Eq. (5)) of the anchor dataset:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}} := \left(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(1)} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(2)} \quad \dots \quad \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(m)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \tilde{p}},$$

where $\tilde{p} := \sum_{k=1}^m \tilde{p}^{(k)}$. Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \tilde{p}}$ be a target matrix consisting of the left-singular vectors corresponding to the largest \hat{p} singular values of $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}}$.

We next calculate the coefficient matrix $\mathbf{G}^{(k)}$ such that the squared distance between the target matrix \mathbf{Z} and the collaboration representation (Eq. (8)) of the anchor dataset will be minimized for each party $k \in [m]$ as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{G}^{(k)}} \|\mathbf{Z} - \tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)} \mathbf{G}^{(k)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2. \quad (9)$$

We obtain $\mathbf{G}^{(k)} = (\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)})^\dagger \mathbf{Z}$ as the analytical solution to problem (Eq. (9)), where $(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)})^\dagger$ is the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)}$. The generalized eigenvalue problem (Kawakami et al., 2024) and the matrix manifold optimal computation (Nosaka and Yoshise, 2023) were also proposed to estimate linear integration functions (Eq. (7)).

2.4. Collaborative machine learning

The collaboration representations (Eq. (8)) obtained from the integration functions (Eq. (7)) enable collaborative machine learning. Specifically, after combining the collaboration representations from all parties $k \in [m]$ into a single dataset $\{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i, y_i) \mid i \in [n]\}$, we train a machine learning model

$$h : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \hat{p}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad \text{such that} \quad h(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i) \approx y_i \quad (i \in [n]). \quad (10)$$

The obtained machine learning model (Eq. (10)) and the integration function (Eq. (7)) are returned to each party. Each party $k \in [m]$ can then acquire a highly accurate machine learning model for the original dataset by adding its encoding function (Eq. (4)) as follows:

$$h \circ g_k \circ f_k : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (11)$$

3. Rating prediction using the data collaboration analysis

In this section, we first describe a rating prediction problem for recommendations and its data format conversion. We then formulate our rating prediction algorithm using the data collaboration analysis for privacy protection.

3.1. Data format conversion

The process of predicting ratings in recommendation systems deals with a user-item rating matrix as shown in Table 1, where each entry indicates the user’s rating for a particular item. For example, these ratings can be expressed as a five-point scale of the degree of preferences, or as a binary scale indicating “likes/dislikes.” We now focus on the problem of predicting ratings for items that have not yet been rated by a target user in a ratings matrix.

As described in Section 2, the data collaboration analysis is aimed at regression and classification tasks, where a single response variable is predicted from multiple predictor variables. However, these tasks are fundamentally different from the rating prediction problem, which aims at imputing missing values in a rating matrix. Therefore, the data collaboration analysis cannot be directly applied to the rating prediction problem for recommender systems.

To overcome the aforementioned challenge, we focus on the factorization machines (Rendle, 2010) as a rating prediction algorithm. This method

Table 1: User–item rating matrix

		item			
		i_1	i_2	i_3	i_4
user	u_1		2	1	
	u_2	3	1	4	
	u_3		2	3	1
	u_4	3		4	3

Table 2: Flattened data format derived from Table 1

	user				item				response
	u_1	u_2	u_3	u_4	i_1	i_2	i_3	i_4	
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
\vdots		\vdots				\vdots			\vdots
10	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3

treats the rating prediction problem as a regression task by converting the rating matrix into a flattened data format as shown in Table 2. Here, dummy variables for users and items are created as predictor variables, and the corresponding ratings are employed as a response variable. Additionally, other attributes such as user gender and item category can readily be added as predictor variables in factorization machines. This data format conversion makes it possible to apply the data collaboration analysis to recommender systems.

3.2. Our algorithm

Algorithm 1 describes our rating prediction algorithm using the data collaboration analysis. We suppose that each party $k \in [m]$ possesses its user–item rating matrix $\mathbf{R}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U(k)| \times |I|}$, where $U(k)$ is the user index set in party $k \in [m]$, and I is the common item index set.

Each party $k \in [m]$ first converts the data format of rating matrix from $\mathbf{R}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U(k)| \times |I|}$ to $(\mathbf{X}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(k) \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^{n(k) \times 1}$ (e.g., from Table 1 to Table 2), as defined by Eq. (1). Here, $n(k)$ is the number of ratings held by party $k \in [m]$, and $p := \sum_{k=1}^m |U(k)| + |I|$ is the number of dummy variables

Algorithm 1 Rating prediction using the data collaboration analysis

Input: $\mathbf{R}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U^{(k)}| \times |I|}$ ($k \in [m]$).

Output: $h \circ g_k \circ f_k : \mathbb{R}^{1 \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($k \in [m]$).

- {Phase 0 (party-side). Data preparation}
- 1: Convert $\mathbf{R}^{(k)}$ into $(\mathbf{X}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ for each $k \in [m]$.
 - 2: Share \mathbf{S} among all parties.
- {Phase 1 (party-side). Construction of intermediate representations}
- 3: Apply f_k to $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$ and \mathbf{S} to obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)}$ for each $k \in [m]$.
 - 4: Send $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ for all $k \in [m]$ to the analyzer.
- {Phase 2 (analyzer-side). Construction of collaboration representations}
- 5: Compute the singular value decomposition of $\mathbf{W}_{\tilde{\mathbf{S}}}$ to obtain \mathbf{Z} .
 - 6: Calculate $\mathbf{G}^{(k)} = (\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)})^\dagger \mathbf{Z}$ as the solution to problem (Eq. (9)) for $k \in [m]$.
 - 7: Calculate $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)} \mathbf{G}^{(k)}$ for $k \in [m]$.
 - 8: Merge $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ for all $k \in [m]$ to obtain $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y})$ as in Eq. (12).
- {Phase 3 (analyzer-side). Collaborative rating prediction}
- 9: Train h from $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y})$.
 - 10: Return h and g_k (i.e., $\mathbf{G}^{(k)}$) to each party $k \in [m]$.
-

corresponding to users and items. All parties also share an anchor dataset $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times p}$ for data collaboration.

In the first phase, each party $k \in [m]$ applies its encoding function (Eq. (4)) to the predictor matrix $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$ and the anchor dataset \mathbf{S} , thereby yielding the privacy-preserving intermediate representations (Eq. (5)). Then, all parties $k \in [m]$ send $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^{(k)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^{(k)}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ to the analyzer.

In the second phase, the analyzer calculates the collaboration representations (Eq. (8)) based on the integration functions (Eq. (7)) according to the procedure described in Section 2.3. After that, the analyzer merges the resultant datasets as

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(1)} \\ \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{X}}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \hat{p}}, \quad \mathbf{y} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{y}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}. \quad (12)$$

In the third phase, the analyzer uses the merged dataset $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y})$ to train a machine learning model (Eq. (10)) for rating prediction. The analyzer then returns the trained model h and integration function g_k to each party

$k \in [m]$. As a result, each party $k \in [m]$ obtains a highly accurate model (Eq. (11)) for rating prediction.

Note that Algorithm 1 is aimed at the *horizontal partitioning* (Yang et al., 2020), where items are shared but users are different between parties; however, this algorithm can be readily applicable to the *vertical partitioning* (Yang et al., 2020), where users are shared but items are different among parties. Specifically, the same algorithm can be used after transposing rating matrices.

4. Numerical experiments

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of our privacy-preserving method for rating prediction through numerical experiments.

4.1. Experimental setup

We used two public rating datasets, namely the MovieLens 100K¹ and SUSHI preference² datasets. The MovieLens 100K dataset contains 100,000 ratings for 1,682 movies from 943 users on a scale of 1 to 5. The SUSHI preference dataset contains ratings for 100 sushi items from 5,000 users, where each user rated 10 sushi items on a scale of 0 to 4. For reference, Figure 2 shows the frequency distributions of ratings in these datasets.

Ratings of each user were randomly split into training (80%) and testing (20%) datasets. These datasets were randomly distributed to 9 and 50 parties for the MovieLens 100K and SUSHI preference datasets, respectively, with each party holding ratings from 100 users. Machine learning models were trained on the training dataset, and prediction accuracy was measured by the root mean squared error (RMSE) in user ratings on the testing dataset. The process of dataset generation and accuracy evaluation was repeated 10 times, and the average RMSE values with standard errors are given as numerical results.

We compare the prediction accuracy of the following methods for analyzing distributed datasets (Figure 2):

Individual analysis: individual machine learning models are trained by each party using only its own dataset (Eq. (1));

¹<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/100k/>

²<https://www.kamishima.net/sushi/>




Figure 1: Frequency distributions of ratings




Figure 2: Workflow of the methods for analyzing distributed datasets

Centralized analysis: a common machine learning model is trained by all parties using the merged dataset (Eq. (2)), while privacy concerns are disregarded;

Data collaboration analysis: a common machine learning model is trained using the data collaboration analysis for privacy protection (Algorithm 1).

For the data collaboration analysis, an anchor dataset (Eq. (3)) containing 1,000 instances (i.e., $r = 1,000$) was generated from a uniform distribution over the interval $[0, 1]$. The intermediate representations (Eq. (5)) were created using the singular value decomposition for dimensionality reduction. The numbers of dimensions for the intermediate and collaboration representations were set as $\tilde{p}^{(k)} \in \{100, 200, 400\}$ and $\hat{p} \in \{\tilde{p}^{(k)}/2, \tilde{p}^{(k)}, 2\tilde{p}^{(k)}\}$, respectively for $k \in [m]$. As in the data collaboration analysis, the flattened

data format $(\mathbf{X}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ (e.g., Table 2) was used to train machine learning models in both the individual and centralized analyses.

For rating prediction, we used the following machine learning models:

pyFM: a Python implementation of factorization machines³;

LightGBM: a framework of gradient boosting decision trees (Ke et al., 2017).

The length of latent vectors in the pyFM was set to 100. To mitigate the sparsity of datasets, the number of dataset dimensions for the LightGBM was reduced to 200 through the singular value decomposition. The hyperparameters of the LightGBM were tuned through 5-fold cross-validation using Optuna (Akiba et al., 2019), a library for Bayesian optimization.

4.2. Numerical results

Tables 3 and 4 give the testing RMSEs provided by the rating prediction methods for the MovieLens 100K and SUSHI preference datasets, respectively. Recall that these tables give average values over 10 repetitions, with standard errors in parentheses.

First, we compare the performance of the three analysis methods (i.e., individual, centralized, and data collaboration analyses). For both datasets, the RMSEs of the data collaboration analysis were larger than those of the centralized analysis and smaller than those of the individual analysis. Recall that the individual analysis does not merge distributed datasets, whereas the centralized analysis merges distributed datasets without protecting privacy. For these reasons, the obtained results are considered reasonable.

Next, we discuss the dimensionality of intermediate and collaboration representations (i.e., $\tilde{p}^{(k)}$ and \hat{p}) employed in the data collaboration analysis. As for the dimensionality of intermediate representations, the lowest RMSEs were obtained when setting $\tilde{p}^{(k)} = 400$. This is because low-dimensional intermediate representations lose information from the original datasets. As for the dimensionality of collaboration representations, the lowest RMSEs were obtained when setting $\hat{p} = \tilde{p}^{(k)}$ or $\hat{p} = 2\tilde{p}^{(k)}$. This is probably because high-dimensional collaboration representations increase the flexibility of integration functions.

³<https://github.com/coreylynch/pyFM>

Table 3: RMSE for the MovieLens 100K dataset ($m = 9$)

Analysis method	$\tilde{p}^{(k)}$	\hat{p}	Machine learning model	
			pyFM	LightGBM
Individual analysis	—	—	1.072 (± 0.007)	1.080 (± 0.009)
Centralized analysis	—	—	0.948 (± 0.002)	0.978 (± 0.002)
Data collaboration analysis	100	50	1.063 (± 0.003)	1.027 (± 0.002)
		100	1.058 (± 0.004)	1.024 (± 0.001)
		200	1.052 (± 0.002)	1.021 (± 0.002)
	200	100	1.063 (± 0.002)	1.021 (± 0.003)
		200	1.055 (± 0.002)	1.012 (± 0.002)
		400	1.048 (± 0.002)	1.014 (± 0.001)
	400	200	1.060 (± 0.002)	1.020 (± 0.002)
		400	1.055 (± 0.002)	1.012 (± 0.002)
		800	1.048 (± 0.001)	1.010 (± 0.001)

Then, we focus on the machine learning models (i.e., pyFM and LightGBM) implemented for rating prediction. The factorization machines (pyFM) consistently outperformed the gradient boosting decision trees (LightGBM) for the individual and centralized analyses, whereas the opposite results were obtained for the data collaboration analysis. Although factorization machines generally perform well for rating prediction, the data collaboration analysis involves dimensionality reduction for creating intermediate representations, thereby improving prediction performance of gradient boosting decision trees.

Figure 3 shows the testing RMSEs provided by the rating prediction methods as a function of the number of involved parties for the MovieLens 100K and SUSHI preference datasets. Recall that this figure shows average values over 10 repetitions, with standard errors shown as error bars. Note here that the factorization machines were used for the individual and centralized analyses, and that the gradient boosting decision trees were used for the data collaboration analysis; this is due to the effectiveness of these combinations, as previously discussed. The numbers of dimensions for the intermediate and collaboration representations were set as $\tilde{p}(k) = 200$ and $\hat{p} = 400$ for $k \in [m]$.

Table 4: RMSE for the SUSHI preference dataset ($m = 50$)

Analysis method	$\tilde{p}^{(k)}$	\hat{p}	Machine learning model	
			pyFM	LightGBM
Individual analysis	—	—	1.240 (± 0.009)	1.257 (± 0.009)
Centralized analysis	—	—	1.134 (± 0.004)	1.145 (± 0.006)
Data collaboration analysis	100	50	1.221 (± 0.002)	1.197 (± 0.003)
		100	1.219 (± 0.003)	1.194 (± 0.003)
		200	1.214 (± 0.002)	1.177 (± 0.003)
	200	100	1.215 (± 0.003)	1.195 (± 0.003)
		200	1.216 (± 0.003)	1.188 (± 0.002)
		400	1.209 (± 0.003)	1.172 (± 0.002)
	400	200	1.215 (± 0.003)	1.195 (± 0.001)
		400	1.214 (± 0.002)	1.187 (± 0.001)
800		1.208 (± 0.001)	1.169 (± 0.002)	

Naturally, increasing the number of parties did not improve prediction accuracy in the individual analysis. In contrast, the RMSEs decreased with the increasing number of parties in the centralized and data collaboration analyses. Additionally, although the individual analysis always showed relatively large standard errors of RMSEs, the data collaboration analysis decreased the standard errors as the number of parties increased. These results demonstrate that increasing the number of involved parties yields more accurate and stable prediction models in the data collaboration analysis.

5. Conclusion

We focused on privacy-preserving recommender systems on distributed datasets. For this purpose, we designed a rating prediction algorithm using the data collaboration analysis (Imakura and Sakurai, 2020) for privacy protection. In this algorithm, the user-item rating matrix is converted into the flattened format with the aim of treating missing value imputation as regression. This conversion makes it possible to apply the data collaboration analysis to rating prediction for recommendations. Note also that our algorithm is readily applicable to both horizontal and vertical integration of




Figure 3: RMSE as a function of the number of involved parties

rating matrices.

To verify the effectiveness of our method, we performed numerical experiments using two public rating datasets. Our method for collaborative rating prediction improved the prediction accuracy while protecting privacy of the original datasets. Even when each party owns a small dataset, our method can produce a reliable recommendation system through data collaboration. Numerical results also confirmed that the prediction accuracy of our method surpassed that of the individual analysis for both datasets and was comparable to that of the centralized analysis, particularly in the SUSHI preference dataset.

A future research direction will be to use more sophisticated methods for creating anchor datasets (Takahashi et al., 2021; Imakura et al., 2023a) and integration functions (Kawakami et al., 2024; Nosaka and Yoshise, 2023) in the data collaboration analysis. Other directions include the application of the data collaboration analysis to generating a high-quality list of recommendations (Wang, 2009; Hurley and Zhang, 2011; Yasumoto and Takano, 2023) and promoting sales through price optimization (Klein et al., 2020; Ikeda et al., 2023).

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21K04526.

References

- Aggarwal, C.C., et al., 2016. Recommender systems. volume 1. Springer.
- Aïmeur, E., Brassard, G., Fernandez, J.M., Mani Onana, F.S., 2008. Alam-bic: A privacy-preserving recommender system for electronic commerce. *International Journal of Information Security* 7, 307–334.
- Akiba, T., Sano, S., Yanase, T., Ohta, T., Koyama, M., 2019. Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework, in: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 2623–2631.
- Ammad-Ud-Din, M., Ivannikova, E., Khan, S.A., Oyomno, W., Fu, Q., Tan, K.E., Flanagan, A., 2019. Federated collaborative filtering for privacy-preserving personalized recommendation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09888* .
- Bagdasaryan, E., Poursaeed, O., Shmatikov, V., 2019. Differential privacy has disparate impact on model accuracy. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32, 15479—15488.
- Berlioz, A., Friedman, A., Kaafar, M.A., Boreli, R., Berkovsky, S., 2015. Applying differential privacy to matrix factorization, in: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pp. 107–114.
- Bleiholder, J., Naumann, F., 2009. Data fusion. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 41, 1–41.
- Bobadilla, J., Ortega, F., Hernando, A., Gutiérrez, A., 2013. Recommender systems survey. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 46, 109–132.
- Bogdanova, A., Nakai, A., Okada, Y., Imakura, A., Sakurai, T., 2020. Federated learning system without model sharing through integration of dimensional reduced data representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06803* .
- Canny, J., 2002. Collaborative filtering with privacy, in: *Proceedings 2002 IEEE symposium on security and privacy, IEEE*. pp. 45–57.

- del Carmen Rodríguez-Hernández, M., Ilarri, S., 2021. AI based mobile context-aware recommender systems from an information management perspective: Progress and directions. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 215, 106740.
- Fang, L., Du, B., Wu, C., 2022. Differentially private recommender system with variational autoencoders. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 250, 109044.
- Gao, C., Wang, X., He, X., Li, Y., 2022. Graph neural networks for recommender system, in: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pp. 1623–1625.
- Himeur, Y., Sohail, S.S., Bensaali, F., Amira, A., Alazab, M., 2022. Latest trends of security and privacy in recommender systems: a comprehensive review and future perspectives. *Computers & Security* 118, 102746.
- Hurley, N., Zhang, M., 2011. Novelty and diversity in top-n recommendation—analysis and evaluation. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)* 10, 1–30.
- Ikeda, S., Nishimura, N., Sukegawa, N., Takano, Y., 2023. Prescriptive price optimization using optimal regression trees. *Operations Research Perspectives* 11, 100290.
- Imakura, A., Bogdanova, A., Yamazoe, T., Omote, K., Sakurai, T., 2021a. Accuracy and privacy evaluations of collaborative data analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11144* .
- Imakura, A., Kihira, M., Okada, Y., Sakurai, T., 2023a. Another use of smote for interpretable data collaboration analysis. *Expert Systems with Applications* 228, 120385.
- Imakura, A., Sakurai, T., 2020. Data collaboration analysis framework using centralization of individual intermediate representations for distributed data sets. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering* 6, 04020018.
- Imakura, A., Sakurai, T., Okada, Y., Fujii, T., Sakamoto, T., Abe, H., 2023b. Non-readily identifiable data collaboration analysis for multiple datasets including personal information. *Information Fusion* 98, 101826.

- Imakura, A., Ye, X., Sakurai, T., 2021b. Collaborative data analysis: Non-model sharing-type machine learning for distributed data, in: Knowledge Management and Acquisition for Intelligent Systems: 17th Pacific Rim Knowledge Acquisition Workshop, PKAW 2020, Yokohama, Japan, January 7–8, 2021, Proceedings 17, Springer. pp. 14–29.
- Imran, M., Yin, H., Chen, T., Nguyen, Q.V.H., Zhou, A., Zheng, K., 2023. Refrs: Resource-efficient federated recommender system for dynamic and diversified user preferences. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 1–30.
- Jeckmans, A.J., Beye, M., Erkin, Z., Hartel, P., Lagendijk, R.L., Tang, Q., 2013. Privacy in recommender systems. *Social media retrieval* , 263–281.
- Kawakami, Y., Takano, Y., Imakura, A., 2024. New solutions based on the generalized eigenvalue problem for the data collaboration analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14164* .
- Ke, G., Meng, Q., Finley, T., Wang, T., Chen, W., Ma, W., Ye, Q., Liu, T.Y., 2017. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30, 3146—3154.
- Klein, R., Koch, S., Steinhardt, C., Strauss, A.K., 2020. A review of revenue management: Recent generalizations and advances in industry applications. *European Journal of Operational Research* 284, 397–412.
- Koren, Y., Bell, R., Volinsky, C., 2009. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer* 42, 30–37.
- Liang, F., Pan, W., Ming, Z., 2021. Fedrec++: Lossless federated recommendation with explicit feedback, in: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 4224–4231.
- Liu, Z., Wang, Y.X., Smola, A., 2015. Fast differentially private matrix factorization, in: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pp. 171–178.
- Liu, Z., Yang, L., Fan, Z., Peng, H., Yu, P.S., 2022. Federated social recommendation with graph neural network. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 13, 1–24.

- Lu, J., Wu, D., Mao, M., Wang, W., Zhang, G., 2015. Recommender system application developments: A survey. *Decision Support Systems* 74, 12–32.
- McSherry, F., Mironov, I., 2009. Differentially private recommender systems: Building privacy into the netflix prize contenders, in: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 627–636.
- Nikolaenko, V., Ioannidis, S., Weinsberg, U., Joye, M., Taft, N., Boneh, D., 2013. Privacy-preserving matrix factorization, in: *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer & Communications Security*, pp. 801–812.
- Nosaka, K., Yoshise, A., 2023. Creating collaborative data representations using matrix manifold optimal computation and automated hyperparameter tuning, in: *2023 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Electronic Communications, Internet of Things and Big Data (ICEIB)*, IEEE. pp. 180–185.
- Ogunseyi, T.B., Avoussoukpo, C.B., Jiang, Y., 2023. A systematic review of privacy techniques in recommendation systems. *International Journal of Information Security* 22, 1651–1664.
- Polatidis, N., Georgiadis, C.K., Pimenidis, E., Mouratidis, H., 2017. Privacy-preserving collaborative recommendations based on random perturbations. *Expert Systems with Applications* 71, 18–25.
- Ran, X., Wang, Y., Zhang, L.Y., Ma, J., 2022. A differentially private nonnegative matrix factorization for recommender system. *Information Sciences* 592, 21–35.
- Rendle, S., 2010. Factorization machines, in: *2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, IEEE. pp. 995–1000.
- Resnick, P., Iacovou, N., Suchak, M., Bergstrom, P., Riedl, J., 1994. GroupLens: An open architecture for collaborative filtering of netnews, in: *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, pp. 175–186.
- Resnick, P., Varian, H.R., 1997. Recommender systems. *Communications of the ACM* 40, 56–58.

- Saleem, Y., Rehmani, M.H., Crespi, N., Minerva, R., 2021. Parking recommender system privacy preservation through anonymization and differential privacy. *Engineering Reports* 3, e12297.
- Sun, Y., Zhang, Y., 2018. Conversational recommender system, in: *The 41st international ACM sigir Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 235–244.
- Takahashi, Y., Chang, H.t., Nakai, A., Kagawa, R., Ando, H., Imakura, A., Okada, Y., Tsurushima, H., Suzuki, K., Sakurai, T., 2021. Decentralized learning with virtual patients for medical diagnosis of diabetes. *SN Computer Science* 2, 1–10.
- Wang, J., 2009. Mean-variance analysis: A new document ranking theory in information retrieval, in: *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, Springer. pp. 4–16.
- Wang, Q., Yin, H., Chen, T., Yu, J., Zhou, A., Zhang, X., 2022. Fast-adapting and privacy-preserving federated recommender system. *The VLDB Journal* 31, 877–896.
- Wei, R., Tian, H., Shen, H., 2018. Improving k-anonymity based privacy preservation for collaborative filtering. *Computers & Electrical Engineering* 67, 509–519.
- Weinsberg, U., Bhagat, S., Ioannidis, S., Taft, N., 2012. Blurme: Inferring and obfuscating user gender based on ratings, in: *Proceedings of the 6th ACM conference on Recommender systems*, pp. 195–202.
- Yang, L., Tan, B., Zheng, V.W., Chen, K., Yang, Q., 2020. Federated recommendation systems. *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive* , 225–239.
- Yasumoto, Y., Takano, Y., 2023. Mean–variance portfolio optimization with shrinkage estimation for recommender systems. *Optimization Online* .
- Yin, C., Shi, L., Sun, R., Wang, J., 2020. Improved collaborative filtering recommendation algorithm based on differential privacy protection. *The Journal of Supercomputing* 76, 5161–5174.
- Zhang, C., Xie, Y., Bai, H., Yu, B., Li, W., Gao, Y., 2021. A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 216, 106775.

Zhang, H., Luo, F., Wu, J., He, X., Li, Y., 2023. Lightfr: Lightweight federated recommendation with privacy-preserving matrix factorization. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 1–28.

Zhang, S., Yao, L., Sun, A., Tay, Y., 2019. Deep learning based recommender system: A survey and new perspectives. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 52, 1–38.