

CAPRI-FAIR: Integration of Multi-sided Fairness in Contextual POI Recommendation Framework

Francis Zac dela Cruz
f.dela_cruz@student.unsw.edu.au
School of Computer Science and Engineering
University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia

Yonchanok Khaokaew
y.khaokaew@unsw.edu.au
School of Computer Science and Engineering
University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia

Flora D. Salim*
flora.salim@unsw.edu.au
School of Computer Science and Engineering
University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia

Jeffrey Chan
jeffrey.chan@rmit.edu.au
School of Computing Technologies
RMIT University
Melbourne, Australia

ABSTRACT

Point-of-interest (POI) recommendation, a form of context-aware recommendation, takes into account spatio-temporal constraints and contexts like distance, peak business hours, and previous user check-ins. Given the ability of these kinds of systems to influence not just the consumer’s travel experience, but also the POI’s business, it is important to consider fairness from multiple perspectives. Unfortunately, these systems tend to provide less accurate recommendations to inactive users, and less exposure to unpopular POIs. The goal of this paper is to develop a post-filter methodology that incorporates provider and consumer fairness factors into pre-existing recommendation models, to satisfy fairness metrics like item exposure, and performance metrics like precision and distance, making the system more sustainable to both consumers and providers. Experiments have shown that using a linear scoring model for provider fairness in re-scoring recommended items yields the best tradeoff between performance and long-tail exposure, in some cases without a significant decrease in precision. When attempting to address consumer fairness by recommending more popular POIs to inactive users, the result was an increase in precision for only some recommendation models and datasets. Finally, when considering the tradeoff between both parameters, the combinations that reached the Pareto front of consumer and provider fairness, unfortunately, achieved the lowest precision values. We find that the nature of this tradeoff depends heavily on the model and the dataset.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Recommender systems**; *Combination, fusion and federated search.*

KEYWORDS

Information Systems, Recommender Systems, Point-of-interest Recommendation, Fairness, Multi-sided Fairness

1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems are pervasive across digital platforms, tailoring ranked lists of items for users in diverse contexts such as Spotify,

YouTube, TikTok, Facebook, and Amazon. Notably, point-of-interest (POI) recommender systems suggest locations such as restaurants and stores, prioritizing geographical proximity [15]. These systems significantly influence user experience and decision-making, necessitating an emphasis on fairness to avoid perpetuating biases. The discourse on fairness within machine learning and its applications to recommender systems has expanded, addressing different fairness definitions and sources of bias [6, 9].

The advancement of multi-stakeholder recommendation systems introduces the challenge of balancing diverging interests between consumers and providers. While consumers benefit from recommendations that accurately reflect their preferences and intentions, providers gain from equitable exposure and opportunities presented by their items being recommended. This dynamic creates a necessity for systems that can manage and mitigate the conflicting needs of all parties involved [1, 2]. Our approach integrates a ‘fairness factor’ into POI recommender systems, applying it through post-processing or post-filtering techniques that remain agnostic to the underlying model, thus ensuring broad applicability.

This paper focuses on exploring multi-objective fairness in POI recommender systems, with particular attention to the balance between provider and consumer interests. We pose the following research questions to guide our investigation:

- How does the scoring model used for the provider fairness factor influence the overall performance of the recommender system?
- What are the effects of implementing a provider fairness factor on performance, fairness, and distance metrics, and how do these compare when a consumer fairness factor is applied?
- How does the recommender system adapt when both provider and consumer fairness factors are integrated simultaneously?

To address these questions, we explore the complexities of designing fairness-oriented systems. The literature supports various fairness definitions, from Aristotle’s principle of treating equals equally, to more nuanced considerations of group and individual fairness in machine learning contexts [5, 6]. The spatial dimensions of POI recommendations, which consider the proximity of recommended sites to the user, add another layer of complexity, especially

*Corresponding author

given the often sparse data on user interactions with potential POIs [7, 15]. This study does not only address theoretical aspects of fairness and performance but also practical implementations, examining existing methodologies and proposing new ways to balance consumer and provider interests within the framework of POI recommender systems. By integrating considerations of geographical closeness, social connections, and categorical preferences, we aim to formulate a comprehensive system that aligns with contemporary needs for fairness and utility in digital recommendations.

2 MODELLING THE TASK AND THE FAIRNESS FACTORS

Problem Statement

This project aims to create a recommender system model that incorporates a user $u \in U$, a point-of-interest (POI) $p \in P$, and contextual factors $C(u, p)$ (e.g., distance, time, social connections). Additionally, it integrates consumer and provider fairness via abstract functions $F_c(u)$ for consumer fairness and $F_p(u)$ for provider fairness. This model, denoted \hat{M} , integrates the aforementioned contexts to produce personalized POI recommendations. Fairness is woven into this framework by adjusting the ranking score as follows:

$$M(u, p) = \hat{M}(u, p, C(u, p)) + \alpha \cdot F_p(u) + \beta \cdot F_c(u) \quad (1)$$

The tunable parameters α and β determine the impact of fairness on the rankings. Different configurations of these parameters will be evaluated to illustrate their effects on system performance and fairness, aiming to identify optimal balances in a Pareto front.

In this front, we propose a framework CAPRI-FAIR¹, where we extend a pre-existing framework for context-aware POI recommendation and incorporate fairness factors in a similar fashion. Consequently, we also add evaluations that take into account user and item fairness.

Consumer Fairness

Consumer fairness addresses the disparity between active and inactive users on the platform, distinguished by their frequency of check-ins. Active users benefit from more personalized recommendations due to their extensive interaction data, enhancing profile accuracy. Conversely, for inactive users, who may need a basic understanding of popular options to start exploring, a strategy of recommending widely popular POIs proves beneficial. This approach aligns with findings from Rahmani [11], indicating that less active users frequently attend popular POIs.

We propose recommending nearby, popular POIs to inactive users, defining "nearby" as POIs within the closest 20% of distances to any previously visited POI [14]. This method focuses on enhancing recommendation precision for inactive users without altering the accuracy of active ones.

Provider Fairness

Each POI has an associated popularity, indicated by user check-ins, which follows a power law distribution. Most check-ins are concentrated among a few POIs, while a large majority fall into the "long tail" with minimal exposure. This characteristic of the distribution underscores the challenge of achieving fairness among providers, as most POIs receive scant attention. To address this, we model

popularity with a power law, where the score of a POI is inversely proportional to its check-in count, helping to elevate less popular POIs. For a given number of x check-ins, the estimated number of POIs y with that popularity is expressed inline as $y = w_0 \cdot x^{-w_1}$. This relationship undergoes a log-log transformation to fit a linear regression, where parameters are determined using L2 regularization to manage data skew, with a regularization factor of 10.0 ensuring stable predictions. In addition to the power law model, we explore linear and logistic regression models for comparison. The linear model does not scale down exposure as sharply with increasing popularity, potentially offering a more gradual adjustment for moderately popular POIs. In contrast, logistic regression treats slight increases in popularity more harshly, impacting even moderately popular POIs significantly.

To assess provider fairness, we measure each item's exposure across recommendations, assuming each POI represents a unique provider. Exposure is influenced by the ranking position, which can be modeled as a function. For simplicity it is binary in the paper, indicating the presence or absence in the recommendation list.

3 EXPERIMENT SETUP

Datasets

We employ the Gowalla[3] and Yelp[8] datasets, recognized for their comprehensive feature sets which facilitate model comparisons [10, 14]. Following standard preprocessing, we remove POIs visited by fewer than 10 users and users visiting fewer than 10 POIs. The data is split into training, validation, and testing sets using a 70-20-10 ratio. Users are categorized as 'active' or 'inactive' based on their activity, with the top 20% being active. This is based on the defaults given by the original CAPRI framework [13], as well as the Pareto principle (i.e. where 20% of users account for 80% of check-ins). Items are similarly divided into 'short-head' and 'long-tail' groups, based on the top 20% of popularity metrics.

Evaluation Metrics

For evaluation, we primarily use Precision@k as our accuracy metric, which assesses if the target POI is among the top k entries in the recommendation list—suitable for scenarios with sparse hits.

We measure both Precision and Exposure across different groups to evaluate user and item fairness. We employ the Generalized Cross-Entropy (GCE), using Pearson's χ^2 measure for its robustness to outliers [4, 11], to assess fairness. This measure helps quantify disparities in item exposure, particularly focusing on long-tail exposure improvements. For consumer fairness, recommendation gain for each user is defined based on the presence of recommended POIs in their previous visits, akin to an attention function used for item exposure. Similarly, provider fairness is evaluated by whether POIs appear in recommendation lists, indicating their exposure. These metrics are crucial for understanding the impact of fairness adjustments on the recommendation system.

Benchmarking and Experimentation

Our model is compared against three commonly used POI recommenders: USG [15], GeoSoCa[17], and LORE[18], which are widely used in recent studies [12–14, 16]. In order to maintain consistency, we utilize the same datasets as referenced in [13]. We investigate several key hypotheses on the impact of fairness factors on model performance and fairness metrics:

¹<https://github.com/cruiseresearchgroup/CAPRI-FAIR/>

Dataset	Model	Exposure Model	Precision					Long-tail Exposure				
			0	0.25	0.50	0.75	1	0	0.25	0.50	0.75	1
Yelp	GeoSoCa	Linear	0.0225	0.0134	0.0117	0.0111	0.0107	1.7010	3.4467	4.1525	4.5026	4.6888
		Logistic	0.0225	0.0173	0.0089	0.0073	0.0073	1.7010	3.0696	4.5693	4.6969	4.6970
		PowerLaw	0.0225	0.0137	0.0109	0.0096	0.0081	1.7010	3.1636	3.5278	2.5025	1.8429
	LORE	Linear	0.0230	0.0179	0.0147	0.0132	0.0124	1.5290	2.7975	3.6141	4.1361	4.4426
		Logistic	0.0230	0.0183	0.0096	0.0074	0.0072	1.5290	3.4217	4.8180	4.9503	4.9565
		PowerLaw	0.0230	0.0196	0.0136	0.0106	0.0082	1.5290	2.2284	2.1647	1.8887	1.5768
	USG	Linear	0.0297	0.0314	0.0278	0.0228	0.0186	0.0077	0.0341	0.5424	1.8214	3.0765
		Logistic	0.0297	0.0296	0.0257	0.0123	0.0042	0.0077	0.0461	1.1532	4.5227	5.6810
		PowerLaw	0.0297	0.0300	0.0291	0.0152	0.0036	0.0077	0.0209	0.2791	2.9418	3.9288
Gowalla	GeoSoCa	Linear	0.0381	0.0300	0.0287	0.0274	0.0266	0.7990	0.9796	1.0734	1.1626	1.2465
		Logistic	0.0381	0.0316	0.0182	0.0140	0.0132	0.7990	1.2142	1.9263	2.0336	2.0459
		PowerLaw	0.0381	0.0277	0.0242	0.0222	0.0203	0.7990	1.3231	1.8073	2.0207	2.0636
	LORE	Linear	0.0482	0.0427	0.0405	0.0389	0.0378	0.7354	0.9356	1.0757	1.1958	1.2961
		Logistic	0.0482	0.0283	0.0149	0.0127	0.0125	0.7354	1.6326	2.0425	2.0815	2.0842
		PowerLaw	0.0482	0.0392	0.0260	0.0191	0.0156	0.7354	1.2983	1.6527	1.7724	1.7771
	USG	Linear	0.0514	0.0504	0.0477	0.0446	0.0424	0.0766	0.1056	0.1567	0.2523	0.3689
		Logistic	0.0514	0.0500	0.0334	0.0195	0.0103	0.0766	0.2319	1.4315	2.0190	2.2654
		PowerLaw	0.0514	0.0525	0.0468	0.0293	0.0158	0.0766	0.1513	0.7876	1.6531	2.0789

Table 1: Precision and Long-tail Exposure for different Provider Fairness factor weights and Exposure models used in the CAPRI-FAIR framework.

- **Exposure Model Impact:** We evaluate three exposure models—power law, linear, and logistic—across values of α (0, 0.25, 0.5, 1.0) to determine their effect on precision and long-tail exposure at $k = 10$. Statistical tests ascertain if the choice of exposure model significantly influences these metrics.
- **Provider Fairness Factor:** This factor’s impact on long-tail item exposure is assessed over a range of weights from 0 to 1, analyzing whether improvements in exposure can be achieved without compromising accuracy.
- **Consumer Fairness Factor:** We examine how adjusting the consumer fairness factor improves precision for inactive users, varying the weight from 0 to 1 and monitoring impacts at $k = 10$.

Each hypothesis is rigorously tested to find an optimal balance between fairness and performance, ensuring the model’s practical applicability and theoretical soundness.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The benchmark models were run first without modification, then slowly increasing the provider fairness factor’s coefficient α as outlined above. The impact of the provider fairness model used is first assessed by taking note of its impact on the precision and exposure metrics for the long tail, which it is aiming to improve. The results are shown below in Table 1.

The score of the best-performing exposure model for the metric is highlighted in bold. For precision, which is the accuracy or performance metric of choice here, the linear exposure model performs the best in most cases. This makes sense as it doesn’t punish even slightly popular POIs as harshly as the other models, as shown by the curves in Figure 5 in the appendix. Likewise, the logistic model performs best regarding exposure to the long tail, which makes sense as it only provides weights to the least popular POIs. However, note that the linear model still reasonably increases the long-tail exposure as the weight increases. The power law model, however, seems to perform the worst for the GeoSoCa and LORE models and even decreases past a certain weight. Running a Kruskal-Wallis

test on the precision and exposure values reveals a statistically significant difference in metric values among the 3 exposure models, starting from a factor weight of $\alpha = 0.5$, indicating that the choice of the exposure model does make a difference in the precision and long-tail exposure metrics. We can now use the linear model for the provider fairness factor, as it offers the highest precision values and permits moderate long-tail exposure.

Impact of the provider fairness factor

After adopting the linear model as the provider fairness factor for further analysis, its effects on performance metrics were thoroughly evaluated. As the previous table shows, increasing α typically leads to a decline in precision. However, we see that it does help with exposure to the long-tail POIs, who, under the normal regime, experience very low exposure rates of 1-2 recommendation appearances overall. For USG, this exposure is as low as near-0 by default. As shown in Figure 1, an increase in the factor’s weight increases the long-tail exposure, reaching up to 1.4 times the default for GeoSoCa and LORE and an even larger increase for the USG model.




Figure 1: Long-tail Exposure v.s. Provider fairness factor α

Impact of the consumer fairness factor

Increasing the weight of the consumer fairness factor, denoted as β , primarily aims to enhance precision for inactive users without affecting active users, as shown in Figures 2. In the Yelp dataset, adjusting β initially raises precision for the GeoSoCa and LORE models from 2.3% to 2.6%, but further increases lead to performance degradation, especially in the USG model, where precision drops

Model	Fairness Weights (α, β)	Precision			Item fairness GCE			User fairness GCE			Mean median distance		
		@5	@10	@20	@5	@10	@20	@5	@10	@20	@5	@10	@20
GeoSoCa	(0.0, 0.0)	0.02537	0.02252	0.01901	-0.67755	-0.59265	-0.5093	-0.14592	-0.14098	-0.14513	101.17249	100.45895	99.29816
	(0.0, 0.5)	0.0291	0.02537	0.02159	-5.89764	-4.54826	-3.34275	-0.09071	-0.09333	-0.09345	100.33198	99.73246	99.80617
	(0.0, 1.0)	0.02949	0.02562	0.02195	-9.9195	-8.07117	-6.32284	-0.08641	-0.09007	-0.08808	102.35795	102.48056	101.51285
	(0.25, 0.25)	0.0169	0.01598	0.01399	-0.6379	-0.56611	-0.49125	-0.04459	-0.03675	-0.04917	98.60541	97.4856	97.20788
	(0.5, 0.0)	0.01345	0.01173	0.0108	-0.00053	-0.00334	-0.00759	-0.06675	-0.06383	-0.06583	96.86406	96.87758	97.11985
	(0.5, 0.5)	0.01603	0.01453	0.01282	-0.57984	-0.52849	-0.46714	-0.03134	-0.02418	-0.03132	99.0131	98.98704	98.47554
LORE	(0.0, 0.0)	0.0252	0.023	0.02049	-0.765	-0.72147	-0.63036	-0.12356	-0.13072	-0.13131	97.35154	96.37364	96.67669
	(0.0, 0.5)	0.02826	0.02572	0.02305	-3.19637	-3.20054	-3.06965	-0.08243	-0.08841	-0.08695	98.88016	98.2366	98.32551
	(0.0, 1.0)	0.02929	0.02657	0.02341	-6.95594	-6.77278	-6.08884	-0.07205	-0.07841	-0.0821	100.45197	99.56773	99.89955
	(0.25, 0.25)	0.02105	0.01964	0.01687	-0.58276	-0.57503	-0.53311	-0.09777	-0.09092	-0.0879	97.48547	96.56786	96.24566
	(0.5, 0.0)	0.01606	0.0147	0.01261	-0.07092	-0.05139	-0.0277	-0.1151	-0.10619	-0.11235	96.45963	95.95741	95.6067
	(0.5, 0.5)	0.01844	0.01755	0.01499	-0.5067	-0.50162	-0.47727	-0.06978	-0.0547	-0.05941	97.19982	96.48961	95.97415
USG	(0.0, 0.0)	0.03397	0.02968	0.02491	-404.16486	-235.5631	-100.90804	-0.05906	-0.07079	-0.08213	115.49726	115.60542	114.38432
	(0.0, 0.5)	0.03324	0.02882	0.02424	-595.83844	-552.20543	-267.68722	-0.06434	-0.07915	-0.09065	117.46961	115.80121	116.1397
	(0.0, 1.0)	0.03263	0.02804	0.02374	-707.64802	-665.99347	-419.15168	-0.06917	-0.08743	-0.09763	120.61967	119.56118	118.70201
	(0.25, 0.25)	0.03518	0.031	0.02639	-182.2632	-124.02658	-67.06192	-0.05818	-0.08549	-0.09072	112.82197	113.71123	113.15953
	(0.5, 0.0)	0.03083	0.02783	0.02346	-3.26253	-2.88418	-2.31393	-0.05556	-0.06852	-0.07835	112.54663	113.1397	113.10282
	(0.5, 0.5)	0.0317	0.0284	0.02397	-13.47004	-11.9686	-9.91389	-0.04953	-0.06343	-0.07234	112.05213	113.48431	113.014
(1.0, 0.0)	0.02094	0.01857	0.01501	-0.16983	-0.13466	-0.09566	-0.02918	-0.04137	-0.05436	112.63371	112.67297	110.77933	

Table 2: Precision, GCE, and Mean median distance metrics with respect to different weights for providers and consumers. Yelp dataset.

from 3.0% to 2.8%. A Wilcoxon signed rank test confirms that even a slight increase in β causes significant changes in precision across models, highlighting the sensitivity of recommender systems to fairness adjustments.




Figure 2: Precision@10 v.s. Consumer fairness factor β

Tradeoff between provider and consumer fairness

Naturally, the impact of combining provider and consumer fair-




Figure 3: Scatterplot showing the tradeoff between GCE for users, GCE for items, and precision

ness factors on performance metrics can be explored through GCE metrics for different tradeoffs, which are illustrated in Figure 3 and detailed in Table 2. The figure effectively plots the tradeoff

between user precision GCE and item exposure GCE metrics, using colour coding to denote precision levels and various shapes to differentiate between models and k values. This visualization is particularly revealing across the Yelp and Gowalla datasets, where the Pareto front usually occupies the upper right region of each plot. Here, models that achieve high user GCE often do so at the expense of item GCE, indicating a significant tradeoff. This tradeoff is particularly stark for the USG model, which generally shows the best precision, as evidenced by its performance metrics detailed in Table 2. The table highlights that GeoSoCa and LORE perform best with full weight on consumer fairness, but this undermines provider fairness. In contrast, the USG model works better with equal weights on both fairness factors. Adjusting fairness weights has nuanced impacts on mean median distances, typically improving provider fairness across all models. This illustrates how each model's properties, combined with dataset characteristics, affect the balance between consumer and provider fairness strategies, impacting overall fairness and performance in POI recommendation systems.

5 CONCLUSION

In order to integrate consumer and provider fairness into pre-existing POI recommendation models, a post-filter approach was employed using 2 fairness factors added into the pre-filter score with varying weights. The provider factor gives higher scores for less popular POIs, using a linear model fit to the popularity distribution, such that recommendations with moderate popularity are not severely penalized. The consumer factor attempted to increase recommendation quality for inactive users by recommending more popular POIs near previously visited ones.

The results show that increasing the provider factor's weight resulted in improved exposure to the long-tail, up to 3-fold in the Yelp dataset, especially for USG where exposure was almost none. This came at the cost of lower precision, varying between models. The consumer factor improved precision in some cases but failed to enhance performance for inactive users. Nevertheless, combining

both factors can yield reasonable results. Overall, there is a tradeoff between these factors, with the provider fairness factor achieving better long-tail exposure with minimal precision decreases for models like USG. Unfortunately, when comparing GCE metrics across models, a distinct correlation exists between low item exposure GCE values and higher precision, although this depends on the dataset, as the LORE model reached a middle ground between the metrics in the Gowalla dataset.

In the future, other models and strategies for consumer fairness can be assessed, and other objectives such as system stakeholder metrics can be incorporated in an attempt to balance multiple objectives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Himan Abdollahpour, Gediminas Adomavicius, Robin Burke, Ido Guy, Dietmar Jannach, Toshihiro Kamishima, Jan Krasnodebski, and Luiz Pizzato. 2020. Multistakeholder recommendation: Survey and research directions. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 30 (2020), 127–158.
- [2] Robin Burke, Nasim Sonboli, and Aldo Ordonez-Gauger. 2018. Balanced neighborhoods for multi-sided fairness in recommendation. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*. PMLR, 202–214.
- [3] Eunjoon Cho, Seth A Myers, and Jure Leskovec. 2011. Friendship and mobility: user movement in location-based social networks. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1082–1090.
- [4] Yashar Deldjoo, Vito Walter Anelli, Hamed Zamani, Alejandro Bellogin, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2021. A flexible framework for evaluating user and item fairness in recommender systems. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* (2021), 1–55.
- [5] Cynthia Dwork, Moritz Hardt, Toniann Pitassi, Omer Reingold, and Richard Zemel. 2012. Fairness through Awareness (*ITCS '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 214–226. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255>
- [6] Michael D Ekstrand, Anubrata Das, Robin Burke, Fernando Diaz, et al. 2022. Fairness in information access systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 16, 1-2 (2022).
- [7] Justin J Levandoski, Mohamed Sarwat, Ahmed Eldawy, and Mohamed F Mokbel. 2012. Lars: A location-aware recommender system. In *2012 IEEE 28th international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 450–461.
- [8] Yiding Liu, Tuan-Anh Nguyen Pham, Gao Cong, and Quan Yuan. 2017. An experimental evaluation of point-of-interest recommendation in location-based social networks. (2017).
- [9] Ninareh Mehrabi, Fred Morstatter, Nripsuta Saxena, Kristina Lerman, and Aram Galstyan. 2021. A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 54, 6 (2021), 1–35.
- [10] Hossein A Rahmani, Yashar Deldjoo, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2022. The role of context fusion on accuracy, beyond-accuracy, and fairness of point-of-interest recommendation systems. *Expert Systems with Applications* 205 (2022), 117700.
- [11] Hossein A Rahmani, Yashar Deldjoo, Ali Tourani, and Mohammadmehdi Naghiaei. 2022. The unfairness of active users and popularity bias in point-of-interest recommendation. In *Advances in Bias and Fairness in Information Retrieval: Third International Workshop, BIAS 2022, Stavanger, Norway, April 10, 2022, Revised Selected Papers*. Springer, 56–68.
- [12] Hossein A Rahmani, Mohammadmehdi Naghiaei, Ali Tourani, and Yashar Deldjoo. 2022. Exploring the Impact of Temporal Bias in Point-of-Interest Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 598–603.
- [13] Ali Tourani, Hossein A Rahmani, Mohammadmehdi Naghiaei, and Yashar Deldjoo. 2023. CAPRI: Context-Aware Interpretable Point-of-Interest Recommendation Framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11395* (2023).
- [14] Heitor Werneck, Nicollas Silva, Matheus Viana, Adriano CM Pereira, Fernando Mourao, and Leonardo Rocha. 2021. Points of interest recommendations: methods, evaluation, and future directions. *Information Systems* 101 (2021), 101789.
- [15] Mao Ye, Peifeng Yin, Wang-Chien Lee, and Dik-Lun Lee. 2011. Exploiting geographical influence for collaborative point-of-interest recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 34th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval*. 325–334.
- [16] Fuqiang Yu, Lizhen Cui, Wei Guo, Xudong Lu, Qingzhong Li, and Hua Lu. 2020. A category-aware deep model for successive POI recommendation on sparse check-in data. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2020*. 1264–1274.
- [17] Jia-Dong Zhang and Chi-Yin Chow. 2015. Geosoca: Exploiting geographical, social and categorical correlations for point-of-interest recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 38th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 443–452.
- [18] Jia-Dong Zhang, Chi-Yin Chow, and Yanhua Li. 2014. Lore: Exploiting sequential influence for location recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSPATIAL international conference on advances in geographic information systems*. 103–112.

A AUXILIARY

A.1 Evaluation Metrics

For evaluation, we will primarily use Precision@k as our accuracy metric, as this is the most commonly used one in the field. Precision@k simply checks if the target POI to be predicted lies in the first k entries in the recommendation list, which would suffice for a use case where hits (i.e. visits to a POI) are sparse.

We can measure precision and exposure across the user and item groups to evaluate user and item fairness. For a single measurable metric of fairness, the Generalized Cross-Entropy (GCE) of the metric distribution can be used for both cases [11] [4]. For categorical attributes $a \in A$ with respect to which fairness will be computed, the GCE for a given model m is defined as such:

$$GCE(m, a) = \frac{1}{\beta \cdot (1 - \beta)} \left[\sum_{a_j} p_f^\beta(a_j) p_m^{(1-\beta)}(a_j) - 1 \right] \quad (2)$$

Here, p_m and p_f represent the metric distributions of the model outputs and a theoretical fair model, respectively. The index β represents the index of the unfairness measure being used, which includes the Hellinger distance ($\beta = \frac{1}{2}$), Pearson's χ^2 ($\beta = 2$), Kullback-Leibler divergence ($\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 1}$), and a few others. As mentioned in [4], the Pearson's χ^2 measure is more robust to outliers, so a value of $\beta = 2$ will be used.

To adapt this GCE formulation to consumer fairness, we define a recommendation gain for each user based on the lists recommended to the user. Each of the POIs has an associated gain to them. In the case of recommendation hits or relevance, we can add 1 for each POI in each recommendation result that corresponds to one visited by the user. We can define this similarly to the attention function used in calculating item exposure $a(p, P_R)$. Suppose we define $\phi(u, p)$ as an indicator function that equals either 0 or 1 depending on whether or not the user has visited the POI. In that case, we can define the recommendation gain, as well as the overall metric distribution as follows:

$$p_m(a_i) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{u \in U_{a_i}} r_{gu} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{u \in U_{a_i}} \sum_{P_{Ru} \subset P} \sum_{p \in P_{Ru}} \phi(u, p) \cdot a(p, P_{Ru}) \quad (3)$$

Note that Z is a simple normalization factor which ensures that the sum of the metric distribution values equals 1. We can define a similar metric for provider fairness. We tweak the indicator function to indicate if a POI is in a recommendation list, and restate it as $\delta(p, P_{Ru})$. The resulting recommendation gain for POIs is as follows:

$$p_m(a_i) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i \in I_{a_i}} r_{gi} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i \in I_{a_i}} \sum_{P_{Ru} \subset P} \delta(p, P_{Ru}) \quad (4)$$

Because of the constraints of the POI recommendation task, metrics with respect to these constraints can also be defined. For geographical distance, a simple average distance of recommended POIs to users may be employed.

A.2 Modelling the provider fairness factor using various functions

As mentioned above, the popularity of POIs follows a power law distribution, which can be modelled with a power law, where the

score of a POI is inversely proportional to its check-in count, helping to elevate less popular POIs. The histogram of popularity values are shown in Figure 4, which includes the power law model determined via a linear regression on the log-log transformed data. In addition to the power law, we also use linear and logistic models that represent different methods of scaling the fairness factor to popularity. These are also plotted in Figure 5.




Figure 4: Histogram of popularity /check-in counts in the Yelp training dataset, with ridge regression linear model, $\alpha = 10.0$.




Figure 5: Different provider fairness scoring models.

A.3 More results on the tradeoff between provider and consumer fairness

Now that we have the 2 fairness factors to consider, the next question is to see how a combination of the 2 will affect the same metrics. For the graphs, a weight of 1.0 is shared between the consumer and provider factors. Although we see that even a high consumer fairness factor will decrease accuracy metrics for the USG model, it still affects it less than a high provider fairness factor. For GeoSoCa and LORE in particular, the performance increases as more weight is given to consumer fairness, and away from producer fairness. USG shows a peak midway, at a weight distribution of $\alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.7$ for the Yelp dataset, and $\alpha = 0.2, \beta = 0.8$ for the Gowalla dataset.

When looking at the fairness metrics for both long-tail items and inactive users, we see the expected changes, where an increase in the consumer fairness factor's weight corresponds to a decrease in

Dataset	Yelp	Gowalla
Users	7,135	5,628
POIs	16,621	31,803
Checkins	774,320	483,846
Sparsity	0.65%	0.27%
Active/Inactive Users	1,427 / 5,708	1,125 / 4,503
Long-tail/Short-head POIs	12,413 / 3,162	24,700 / 6,243
Long-tail/Short-head Check-ins	280,255 / 494,065	164,459 / 319387

Figure 9: Details about the datasets used.




Figure 6: Precision@10 v.s. Tradeoff between consumer and provider fairness factors

long-tail exposure, and an increase in precision for inactive users. In particular, even a small addition of consumer fairness weight can cause a large decrease in exposure, especially for USG, where a weight of $\beta = 0.2$ can cause a 3-fold decrease in long-tail exposure.




Figure 7: Exposure for Long tail items (bottom 80%)




Figure 8: Precision@10 for inactive users (bottom 80%)

A.4 Dataset statistics

The table below displays the details about the 2 datasets used in the study, Yelp and Gowalla. Note that the sparsity is below even 1%, highlighting the sparsity of this kind of recommendation task.

Received 29 January 2024