

# Efficient course recommendations with T5-based ranking and summarization

Thijmen Bijl<sup>1,2</sup>, Niels van Weeren<sup>1</sup> and Suzan Verberne<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Randstad, the Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science, Leiden University, the Netherlands

## Abstract

In this paper, we implement and evaluate a two-stage retrieval pipeline for a course recommender system that ranks courses for skill–occupation pairs. The in-production recommender system BrightFit provides course recommendations from multiple sources. Some of the course descriptions are long and noisy, while retrieval and ranking in an online system have to be highly efficient. We developed a two-step retrieval pipeline with RankT5 finetuned on MSMARCO as re-ranker. We compare two summarizers for course descriptions: a LongT5 model that we finetuned for the task, and a generative LLM (Vicuna) with in-context learning. We experiment with quantization to reduce the size of the ranking model and increase inference speed. We evaluate our rankers on two newly labelled datasets, with an A/B test, and with a user questionnaire. On the two labelled datasets, our proposed two-stage ranking with automatic summarization achieves a substantial improvement over the in-production (BM25) ranker: nDCG@10 scores improve from 0.482 to 0.684 and from 0.447 to 0.844 on the two datasets. We also achieve a 40% speed-up by using a quantized version of RankT5. The improved quality of the ranking was confirmed by the questionnaire completed by 29 respondents, but not by the A/B test. In the A/B test, a higher clickthrough rate was observed for the BM25-ranking than for the proposed two-stage retrieval. We conclude that T5-based re-ranking and summarization for online course recommendation can obtain much better effectiveness than single-step lexical retrieval, and that quantization has a large effect on RankT5. In the online evaluation, however, other factors than relevance play a role (such as speed and interpretability of the retrieval results), as well as individual preferences.

## Keywords

Course recommendation, Ranking models, Summarization, Evaluation, Quantization

## 1. Introduction

With a rapidly changing labour market, it is becoming more important for people to adapt to these changing demands in order to remain relevant to employers. The topic of *skilling* (learning new skills) plays an important role in the current labour market, both for employers and employees. For employers, it is in their best interest to let their employees learn new skills in order to remain competitive. For the employees, it is important to keep learning new skills in order to grow in their current job or get better career opportunities at other organizations.

In the “Future of Jobs” report by the World Economic Forum (WEF) [1], it is estimated that 44% of the in-demand skills will change between 2023 and 2028. Another survey among 2000

---

ReNeuIR 2024 (at SIGIR 2024) – 3rd Workshop on Reaching Efficiency in Neural Information Retrieval, 18 July, 2024, Washington D.C, USA

✉ s.verberne@liacs.leidenuniv.nl (S. Verberne)

🆔 0009-0000-9550-2502 (T. Bijl); 0000-0002-9609-9505 (S. Verberne)

© 2024 Copyright for this paper by its authors. Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

HR professionals and employees indicates that there is much interest in re- and up-skilling [2]. However, the survey also finds that while both employees and employers see the benefits of learning new skills, they struggle with finding and identifying good skilling opportunities.

The online recommender system *BrightFit*, a system developed by Randstad Risesmart<sup>1</sup>, aims to help users explore future potential roles by looking at their current skill set and determining the skill gap to the next job or role they aspire to get. For this, BrightFit recommends online courses from several mainstream course providers to help a user learn a particular skill.

In this paper, we approach the problem of recommending courses as an information retrieval (IR) problem. This alleviates the cold start problem that collaborative or content-based filtering approaches suffer from: both require historical user data to predict the users' preferences. The users of BrightFit are typically short-term users for whom historical profile data is not available. Thus, we are not recommending courses based on previous user activities, but based on a combination of the user's job profile and the skill they want to learn. A query consisting of the skill and the job profile is automatically constructed and issued to the index with course descriptions.

The current ranker in BrightFit's backend is BM25-based. We propose a two-stage retrieval method that leverages the power of transformer-based models while keeping the time to generate recommendations reasonable. We first evaluate two first-stage retrievers (the dense retriever GTR and BM25), followed by the re-ranker RankT5 [3].

Since we do not have any human-labelled training data, the ranking is performed in a zero-shot setting. For evaluation, we compile and label 2 datasets with relevance assessments on three levels, for over 2500 query-document pairs.

Course retrieval comes with an additional challenge that the course descriptions are often long and contain irrelevant information, making it more difficult to efficiently retrieve the correct courses. We therefore evaluate summarization methods in our retrieval pipeline to both shorten and de-noise the course descriptions. We investigate if we can improve the ranking by summarizing the course descriptions. We compare two summarization models: LongT5 (an encoder-decoder model), which we finetune on pairs of long and short course descriptions, and Vicuna (a decoder-only LLM), with a zero-shot instruction prompt.

Since we are providing recommendations to real users in real-time, inference of the models has to be fast: BrightFit has a few seconds at most to provide the recommendations. We therefore investigate model quantization (compressing the parameters of the RankT5 model) [4] as a way to increase inference speed and decrease storage/memory requirements. This can come at the cost of reduced model performance since we store the weights in lower precision. We evaluate quantization of our RankT5 model without compromising the quality of the recommendations too much.

Lastly, we evaluate how the improvements in offline datasets translate to the user's perception of the recommendations. Prior work has indicated the importance of user studies for the evaluation of recommender systems [5, 6]. We use an A/B test and a user questionnaire to evaluate whether our changes to the recommendations in BrightFit make a positive impact on the usage of the system.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

---

<sup>1</sup><https://go.randstadrisemart.com/BrightFit>

- We create two labelled datasets for evaluation of course retrieval for skills and occupations.<sup>2</sup>
- We show that automatic summarization of the course descriptions improves the effectiveness of the course ranking.
- We show that quantization of RankT5 does not reduce the effectiveness, while substantially improving the inference speed of the ranker.
- With an online A/B test with real users and explicit user feedback in a questionnaire, we show that evaluation of course recommendation is challenging and that other factors than relevance play a role in user preferences.

## 2. Related work

**Course recommendations** The previous work on course recommendations is largely based on user profiles. Imran et al. [7] ask users about their prior knowledge to establish a user profile. This profile is extended based on user behaviour in the recommender system. In the context of MOOCs (Massive open online courses), Jing and Tang [8] identify the challenges of user behavior modeling for course recommendation. They also argue that students might participate in courses for different reasons, and therefore collaborative filtering methods are not successful for course recommendation. They propose the use of historical user data to build an interest profile. For our use case, we do not have user behaviour history for the majority of the users, because BrightFit is used as a short-term tool and users have a large variety of occupations and skillsets. We therefore recommend courses for a specific skill, not based on a user profile.

Because skills can be organized in structured databases, ontology-based approaches are commonly used in prior work on course retrieval and recommendation [9, 10]. One approach is to map learners and learning materials to topics in an ontology, and then recommend courses for topics to the learners using the relations between items in the ontology [11, 12]. The alternative is to start with a skills ontology and then collect publicly available resources as educational content for each skill in the ontology [13]. Ontology-based approaches can be effective for finding and recommending courses that are related to a certain topic, however, they come with the drawback of knowledge engineering to map all courses to topics in the ontology. This makes these approaches unfeasible to use in contexts with a pre-defined large collection of unstructured course descriptions, like in BrightFit. In this setting, a text retrieval approach is more fit.

**Quantization of ranking models** There is only limited prior work on the use of quantization methods to make ranking models more efficient. Quantization has been applied in prior work to the encoding of token embeddings [14] and to efficient storage of decision trees in learning-to-rank ensembles [15]. Recent work has addressed quantization for the efficient coding of the document IDs in generative IR [16, 17]. In one prior work [18], quantization is mentioned

---

<sup>2</sup>We released our data through [https://github.com/tbijl/course\\_ranking\\_data](https://github.com/tbijl/course_ranking_data) Note that the documents are listed in the form of URLs in their course provider domain.

as a suggestion to further improve the efficiency of SPLADE (sparse neural retrieval). To the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first to apply quantization to RankT5 or other transformer-encoder ranking models.

### 3. Data collection

#### 3.1. Course data sources

BrightFit offers courses from four different online learning platforms. Table 1 shows an overview of the total number of courses per provider. *Udemy* is an online learning platform that offers video courses about a large variety of topics. Udemy is a marketplace where users can create and sell their own courses or buy and take courses created by other users. We retrieved course metadata from Udemy using the public Udemy affiliate API.<sup>3</sup> This API returns general information about the courses that Udemy provides. In total, Udemy has over 210,000 courses available on its website. We only use English courses. *Udemy Business* is similar to Udemy. It is a subscription service offered by Udemy to businesses that provides access to a curated subset of high-quality Udemy courses, via a separate Udemy Business API.<sup>4</sup> *edX* is a company that offers high-quality university-level courses. The data that we have available for the edX courses is limited compared to the data retrieved from the Udemy APIs. For the edX courses, we only have access to the course title, short course description and full course description. However, it is important to note that the short course descriptions of edX are of much better quality than the short course descriptions (headline) that we get from Udemy and Udemy Business. This makes them suitable for summarizer fine-tuning, as we will see later. *GoodHabitZ* provides online courses and training as a subscription service for businesses. The courses offered by GoodHabitZ are largely focused on soft skills, like teamwork and collaboration. Similar to the edX courses the GoodHabitZ courses only have a course title and course description to work with.

**Table 1**

Overview of the number of courses per provider.


Provider	Count
Udemy	54,348
Udemy Business	10,414
edX	2,077
GoodHabitZ	127
Total	66,966

#### 3.2. Pre-processing

We convert all course descriptions from HTML to plain text, harmonize the encoding to Unicode, and standardize the names of the fields from the different course providers. Figure 1 shows a

<sup>3</sup><https://www.udemy.com/developers/affiliate/>

<sup>4</sup><https://business-support.udemy.com/hc/en-us/articles/11965611508375-Udemy-Business-API-Best-Practices>



**Figure 1:** Overview of the tokenized input size distribution of the course titles combined with the descriptions of all BrightFit courses per provider. The horizontal line marks the input size of 512 tokens which is the maximum for T5.

comparison of the lengths of the inputs for each course provider, consisting of the course titles concatenated with their full descriptions, tokenized with the Huggingface T5-base tokenizer [19]. We see that a substantial proportion ( $18,467 / 66,966 = 27.6\%$ ) of courses are longer than the limit of 512 tokens. By default, inputs that go beyond this limit will be truncated. This motivates the use of summarization (see Section 4.3)

### 3.3. Queries

In BrightFit, users choose an occupation or job role they want to explore. They are asked to perform a self-assessment on how proficient they are in the most important skills for that role. After completing the self-assessment, users receive a report which includes the most important skills they need to develop, in order to have a more relevant skill set for the selected occupation or job role. For providing course recommendations, the BrightFit system generates a query based on the skill that the user wants to learn and their job/role title. The query that the retrieval engine receives has the form “<skill> for <occupation>”, e.g. “Python for Data Analyst”. Both terms come from a lookup in the Burning Glass taxonomy [20] based on the self assessment of the user.<sup>5</sup> The occupation is used to provide more context for the course recommendations.

### 3.4. Evaluation data

In this section, we present two datasets that we created for evaluating BrightFit: the BrightFit IT dataset and the BrightFit general skills dataset.

<sup>5</sup>Burning Glass was later merged into Lightcast. We still use the original Burning Glass taxonomy.

### 3.4.1. BrightFit IT dataset

The first dataset that we create is the BrightFit IT dataset, which is only focussed on IT skills. IT skills often have more courses available compared to other types of skills. This should give us a good dataset that can be used to see how the system behaves in cases where there are plenty of courses available for a skill.

**Query generation** The first step in creating the dataset is to select the queries we will use to evaluate the model. The course catalogue of BrightFit has many courses related to IT skills (because IT skills are relatively easy to learn online). In total we label data for 15 different skills. We combine each skill with 3 occupations that are common for that skill giving us a total of  $15 * 3 = 45$  queries for our dataset. We select the IT occupations from the Burning Glass Occupation Taxonomy. We improve the diversity of our set by filtering out the senior versions of other occupations that are in the taxonomy, e.g. "Senior Java Developer/Engineer" when "Java Developer/Engineer" also exists, and we filter out the very general occupation "Software Developer/Engineer". The resulting set contains 148 IT occupations. We then select for each of the 15 skills the 3 occupations that have the most mentions for the skill in the Burning Glass job posting data about skill occurrences in the United States [21] in 2022. This way, we create 45 skill-occupation pairs.

**Document pool creation** We manually label 50 documents for each query. Since one of the use cases for the annotated dataset is to compare the current BrightFit retriever with the newly proposed method, we need to create a fair dataset for both rankers. To accomplish this we obtain the top 25 from the two retrievers we discuss in Section 4.1. We interleave documents retrieved from the two retrievers to build a top 50 list. We remove duplicate documents for queries where both retrievers have retrieved the same document.

**Relevance assessment** We label the query-document pairs on three relevance levels:

- **2:** Course is relevant for the skill-occupation combination and specific to the occupation. E.g. with the query "Python for ML Engineer" and a course "Learn Python for Machine Learning".
- **1:** Course is relevant for the skill but it is generic. E.g. a course "Python for beginners" for the query "Python for ML Engineer".
- **0:** Course is not relevant for the skill or the course is specific for the skill and a different occupation. E.g. When the query is "Python for Database Engineer" and the course is "Learn Python for Machine Learning".

The idea behind the labels is as follows: In the ideal case we want to recommend courses to users that teach a specific skill, but that are also relevant to the occupation they are trying to close their skill gap to. Therefore we want to prioritize courses that teach a skill in a context that is relevant for the user. However, it will often be the case that there is no perfect course that exactly teaches a certain skill in the context of the specific occupation we are looking for. In this case, we need alternatives to recommend that still teach the skill. We assign label 0 to

courses that do not teach the skill we are searching for and courses that do teach the skill but in a context that is very different from the role the user is exploring. We do this as we believe that a generic course about a skill is more relevant than a course that teaches a skill in a context that is not relevant to the user. These labelling guidelines have also been discussed with a Learning and Development expert affiliated to BrightFit, to ensure that the guidelines align with what is expected from the recommender system.

### 3.4.2. BrightFit general skill dataset

Similar to the BrightFit IT dataset we first create a set of queries. For this dataset, we randomly sample 10 occupations from the full taxonomy. We then select a random skill from the top 10 most common skills for each occupation based on the Burning Glass job posting data [21]. We added as an additional constraint to the random skill/occupation pairs that the first-stage retriever should be able to at least retrieve 5 documents with a cosine similarity  $\geq 0.6$ . This additional constraint improves the quality of the queries and documents in the dataset, making the dataset more useful for evaluation. To obtain the documents to rate for each query we use the same method as for the BrightFit IT dataset. We also use the same relevance labelling rules.

Table 2 shows the statistics for the two datasets. On average, the BrightFit IT skills dataset has more relevant courses for each query than the general skills dataset. This is because there exists a large amount of online courses for IT-related skills as they are easier to teach and learn online.

**Table 2**

Overview of the two labelled BrightFit datasets. The total number of indexed documents in BrightFit is 66,966.

Dataset information	IT	general
Total number of unique documents with label	1,035	500
Total number of queries	45	10
Query information		
Lowest average relevance per query	0.20	0.26
Highest average relevance per query	1.68	1.20
Mean average relevance per query	0.84	0.74
Mean relevance count per query, label 0	19.3	24.0
Mean relevance count per query, label 1	19.3	14.9
Mean relevance count per query, label 2	11.4	11.1
Average number of labels per query	50	50

## 4. Methods

We follow a two-stage retrieval approach, with efficient first-stage retrievers (4.1), and a more effective re-ranker (4.2). We experiment with summarization of course descriptions (4.3) and quantization of the re-ranker for more efficient real-time ranking (4.4).

## 4.1. First-stage retrieval

The current in-production ranker in the BrightFit course recommendation system is BM25 with a weight of 2 for the title and 1 for the course description. Additionally, a score multiplier of 7 is applied when there is a perfect match with the skill text in the title. We compare this in-production ranker to a T5-based [19] retriever called GTR [22] which has shown good zero-shot performance on the BEIR benchmark. In this research, we use the GTR-Base<sup>6</sup> version of the retriever as a zero-shot first-stage retriever. The query we use for first-stage retrieval is the same query format as described in Section 3.3: “<skill> for <occupation>”. The documents are embedded using the format: “Title: <course title> Description: <course description>”. For a given query we retrieve the top  $k$  courses based on cosine similarity.

## 4.2. Re-ranking

As our second stage re-ranker model, we use RankT5 [3]. We choose the RankT5-Enc architecture since this has half the number of parameters compared to the RankT5-EncDec architecture while achieving comparable performance [3]. With fewer parameters, the model also uses less memory and has faster inference speed which is useful for the efficient deployment of the model in the BrightFit application.

We do not have access to labelled data that we can use for fine-tuning the RankT5 model to the BrightFit domain, but it was shown [3] that the model is capable of achieving good zero-shot performance by training it on the MSMARCO passage ranking dataset [23]. We use the version of the MSMARCO dataset in the BEIR benchmark [24] to finetune our model. Finetuning RankT5 requires hard negatives. We sample these hard negatives for each query in the MSMARCO dataset using the GTR-Base retriever to obtain the top 1000 documents for each query and consider each document that does not have a positive relevance label for the query as a hard negative.

We use the listwise softmax loss function with a list size of 36 for the softmax loss, as higher list sizes have shown to result in better zero-shot performance [3]. We train the model for 50,000 steps, similar to the RankT5 paper, and we evaluate the model every 5,000 steps and take the best-performing checkpoint. For training, we use the AdamW optimizer with a constant learning rate of  $10^{-4}$ . Due to hardware limitations, we are not able to run a batch size of 32 like the RankT5 authors, but instead, we run a batch size of 2 with 16 steps of gradient accumulation to emulate the batch size of 32. We implement our model in the PyTorch framework and use the T5-base checkpoint from HuggingFace<sup>7</sup> to initialize our encoder. We fine-tune our RankT5 model using an RTX 3090 GPU which takes up to 100 hours to fully train the model for 50,000 steps.

The input format for the re-ranker combines the query and document format that we use for the first-stage retriever and combines them using the format described by the RankT5 authors: “Query: <skill> for <occupation> Document: Title: <course title> Description: <course description>”. If the input to the re-ranker is longer than the maximum input size (512 tokens by default) the input is truncated.

---

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/gtr-t5-base>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/t5-base>



### 4.3. Summarization

Since a substantial proportion of the course descriptions in our collection are too long to fit the 512-token input length that T5 supports (see Figure 1), we investigate automatic summarization of the course descriptions as an alternative to truncating. We hope that a side effect of summarization is that we dispose of irrelevant information in the course descriptions that provides noise to the ranker. Examples of this noise are positive user reviews included by course instructor to promote their course on the platform, information about which well-known companies are using the course, and information about the Udemy 30-day money guarantee. Although this information can be relevant to users, it is noise to the ranker. By using summarization we aim to give the re-ranker a cleaner input, which will hopefully improve the ranking performance. The users will be presented with the full course descriptions in BrightFit.

We generate the summaries at index time, together with the embeddings used in first-stage retrieval. This means that we do not add any additional computation at query-time.

Transformer-based sequence-to-sequence models like T5 have shown strong performance on summarization tasks [19] and summarization techniques based on the Longformer encoder-decoder model (LED) [25] have effectively been applied to long documents in the context of case law retrieval [26, 27].

We experiment with two models for summarization: LongT5 [28] and Vicuna [29]. **LongT5** is a T5 model that has been adapted to work efficiently for longer input sequences. The model has shown good performance on summarization of long documents compared to standard T5 models. We use the `long-t5-tglobal-base`<sup>8</sup> checkpoint from HuggingFace as the base model. We fine-tune this model on 1,868 pairs of long and short course descriptions from the edX data. We chose the edX course descriptions since the short course descriptions from edX are of higher quality than the short descriptions from Udemy. We exclude from the training data the edX course descriptions that are part of our labelled test collection, to prevent data leakage from the train to the test set. We fine-tune the model for 2 epochs on the pairs of full and short descriptions. We use a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$  and a batch size of 1 with 16 gradient accumulation steps. We select the model with the highest *ROUGE* score which we evaluate at the end of each epoch. We limit the maximum input length to 2048 to keep it comparable with the Vicuna summaries.

The **Vicuna** models are a collection of LLMs that are adaptations of Llama [30], fine-tuned on ChatGPT conversations shared by users on the ShareGPT.com website. The Vicuna maximum input context length is 2048 tokens, which is useful for our summarization use-case. The Vicuna model that we use is one of the Vicuna 7B checkpoints<sup>9</sup> based on the 7B parameter Llama model. The main reason for selecting the 7B model is that it is still possible to fit this model in 8-bit format on a single 16GB GPU and perform inference with it. We use the Vicuna model as a zero-shot summarizer by providing a fixed input prompt along with a course title and a course description for generating the summary. The prompt that we used is shown in Figure 2. When the input is longer than the 2048 input window we truncate the input. We limit the number of generated tokens to 256 so that we are sure we are getting shorter course descriptions that easily fit into the input window of our re-ranker.

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/google/long-t5-tglobal-base>

<sup>9</sup><https://huggingface.co/lmsys/vicuna-7b-v1.3>

```
I will provide you with a course title and description of an online course that
I want you to summarize in 2 to 3 lines.
I want the summary to only include information about the content of the course.
You can leave out any information about the author, at which company the course
is used and information about a 30 day money back guarantee. You can also leave
out any student reviews about the course. I want you to write the summary as if
it were a new shortened course description.
Course title: [course_title]
Course description: [course_description]
```

**Figure 2:** Prompt used for Vicuna to summarize course descriptions

## 4.4. Quantization

The main bottleneck for inference speed in our approach is the re-ranker. To reduce this bottleneck, we experiment with 3 different quantization methods: dynamic quantization, static quantization [31], and SmoothQuant [32]. We use the implementation of SmoothQuant in the Neural Compressor package by Intel.<sup>10</sup> To perform the static quantization and quantization using the SmoothQuant algorithm we need to have a calibration dataset. To stay true to the zero-shot setting we use the *dev* partition of the MSMARCO dataset to randomly select samples for calibration instead of using BrightFit data. We use the version of SmoothQuant with the per-tensor dynamic quantization for the activations because the alternative versions have slower inference speed or lead to lower quality output according to the SmoothQuant paper [32].

## 5. Results

We use the BM25-based in-production ranker in the BrightFit course recommendation system as a baseline in our ranking evaluation.

### 5.1. Experiment 1: First-stage retrieval

Table 3 shows the results of the in-production BM25 baseline and the GTR first-stage retriever on the two BrightFit datasets. The table shows that GTR outperforms BM25 by a large margin. For the first-stage retrievers, the metric we are most interested in is recall, since we want the candidate list to have as many relevant documents as possible to obtain a better final ranking after re-ranking the candidate list using the second-stage re-ranker. The results for different levels of recall are shown in Table 4. The table shows that the GTR retriever is consistently better than the BM25 retriever for all tested values of  $k$ .

### 5.2. Experiment 2: Re-ranking

We evaluate RankT5 with different configurations to see what variation gives us the best performance on both the BrightFit IT dataset and the BrightFit general skills dataset. The first aspect of the model that we experiment with is the maximum input length. We experiment

---

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/intel/neural-compressor>

**Table 3**

Comparison between the BM25 and GTR-Base retriever on the two BrightFit datasets. BM25 is the current in-production ranker.

Ranker	Dataset	nDCG@10	MRR@10	MAP@10	R@20
BM25	IT	0.482	<b>0.931</b>	0.139	0.380
	General	0.447	0.778	0.150	0.400
GTR	IT	<b>0.648</b>	<b>0.931</b>	<b>0.221</b>	<b>0.512</b>
	General	<b>0.705</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.311</b>	<b>0.545</b>

**Table 4**

Recall@K scores for the BM25 and GTR retrievers on both BrightFit datasets for different values of k.

Dataset	Ranker	k=20	k=30	k=50
IT	BM25	0.380	0.504	0.555
	GTR	<b>0.512</b>	<b>0.661</b>	<b>0.739</b>
General	BM25	0.400	0.498	0.548
	GTR	<b>0.545</b>	<b>0.651</b>	<b>0.668</b>

**Table 5**

nDCG@10 scores of the second-stage re-ranker on both BrightFit datasets for different variations compared to the in-production BM25 ranker.

Dataset	BrightFit IT			BrightFit General		
	128	256	512	128	256	512
Max input length	128	256	512	128	256	512
W/ skill description	0.613	0.628	0.612	0.627	0.696	0.646
W/o skill description	<b>0.682</b>	0.660	0.626	<b>0.798</b>	0.758	0.729
<i>BM25 (in-production)</i>	0.482			0.447		

with three different values: 128, 256 and 512 tokens. The input that goes past this maximum input length is truncated. The second aspect we vary is whether we do or do not include the short skill description from the Burning Glass taxonomy in the query for re-ranking. By adding the skill description to the query we can add more context, but it can also confuse the model since the input queries become much longer. This also means that we have less space for the document text in the limited input window of the encoder which can also hurt performance.

During the training process, we observe that the RankT5 model obtains its best zero-shot performance at 25k training steps, so for this experiment and the following, we use that checkpoint. The results of this experiment are shown in Table 5. We observe that for both datasets the best-performing settings are the ones where we have a maximum input length of 128 and we do not include the skill descriptions. There is a substantial performance drop for all model lengths if we include the skill description in the query.

We also analyzed the impact of changing the re-ranking depth on the final ranking performance. We experiment with the following re-ranking depths: 50, 30 and 20, and compare the NDCG@10 scores after re-ranking for both BrightFit datasets. The results are shown in Table 6. For both datasets, we obtained the highest NDCG@10 score with a re-ranking depth of 30.

**Table 6**

NDCG@10 scores after re-ranking the top-k documents with RankT5 retrieved on both BrightFit datasets for different values of k.

Dataset	k=20	k=30	k=50
IT	0.675	<b>0.702</b>	0.677
General	0.778	<b>0.881</b>	0.844

**Table 7**

NDCG@10 scores of the RankT5 re-ranker on both BrightFit datasets for different summarization techniques.

Dataset	BrightFit IT			BrightFit General		
	128	256	512	128	256	512
Original	0.682	0.660	0.626	0.798	0.758	0.729
LongT5	0.680	<b>0.684</b>	0.683	0.814	0.801	0.798
Vicuna	0.669	0.676	0.677	0.806	<b>0.844</b>	<b>0.844</b>

### 5.3. Experiment 3: Summarization

We evaluate the effectiveness of ranking summarized versions of the course descriptions. We compare three settings: the default course description (truncated if needed), a summary generated by our fine-tuned LongT5 summarizer, and a summary generated by the zero-shot Vicuna model. We also explore how the effectiveness of the ranker with summarized descriptions changes when we vary the maximum input length of the ranker. We experiment with the values of 128, 256, and 512 for the maximum input length. The results of this experiment are shown in Table 7.

We find that on both BrightFit datasets the NDCG@10 score improves by summarizing the course descriptions. For the BrightFit IT dataset, we obtain the best results using the LongT5 summarizer for an input length of 256. Overall, we see that the improvement on the BrightFit IT dataset is very minimal compared to the default description with an input length of 128. Interestingly, we also observe that the Vicuna summaries on the BrightFit IT dataset do not directly outperform the 128 input length for the standard description. We do, however, notice that when the input lengths get longer the performance of the standard description starts to decrease, while the performance for the Vicuna summaries starts to increase. We think this is because Vicuna summaries are created to contain the essence of the course, leaving out irrelevant information; the ranker therefore benefits from including a longer summary. The original descriptions on the other hand are noisy and contain irrelevant information later in the text, so adding more of the description adds more irrelevant information.

We also see that the LongT5 summaries make an improvement over the standard description for this dataset but not as much as Vicuna. The improvement we get on the general skills dataset is much larger than the improvement we get on the IT dataset.

## 5.4. Experiment 4: Quantization

We evaluate the static, dynamic and SmoothQuant quantization methods on model size and inference speed. SmoothQuant has a single parameter  $\alpha$ , which is the smoothing factor. We experiment with three values of  $\alpha \in \{0.25, 0.50, 0.75\}$ , with 0.5 being recommended by the authors for most models. Since the results for the three values are very close to each other, we only report the results for  $\alpha = 0.5$ . The static and dynamic quantization algorithms do not have any parameters.

We look at how much space a model takes up after quantization compared to the full FP32 model and we look at how the inference speed is improved by measuring the throughput of the model. We use the built-in benchmarking tool from the Intel Neural Compressor package for this. We benchmark the models using 2 cores per model. For each quantization method, we run 8 repetitions. We use a batch size of 16. In each repetition, we use a warmup of 10 inference queries after which we run 200 inference query–document pairs from the BrightFit general skills dataset and measure the throughput of the model as the number of query–document pairs that are processed per second. Since measuring inference speed is very hardware- and sometimes even package-dependant we report all the used hardware and package versions in Table 8.

**Table 8**

Hardware and package version overview for the quantization experiments.

Hardware	Version
Google Cloud Platform VM	n1-standard-16 VM (16 vCpus, 60 GB RAM)
Packages	Version
intel-neural-compressor	2.3
onnxruntime	1.16.0
onnx	1.14.1
transformers	4.30.2

Table 9 shows the inference speed and model sizes of the different quantization methods and the non-quantized FP32 model. We see that the dynamic quantization method obtains the best throughput for both the 256 and 512 input lengths. We observe over 40% speed-up of the dynamic quantization method compared to the default FP32 model. In terms of throughput the static and SmoothQuant quantized models are not far behind the dynamically quantized model. For the dynamic and SmoothQuant methods, we also observe a close to 4x reduction in model size which is as expected since we convert the model weights from 32-bit to 8-bit values.

To evaluate if the quantization of the models does not negatively impact the quality of the ranking we also evaluate the NDCG@10 scores of the quantized models on both BrightFit datasets by re-ranking the top 50 candidates with the default descriptions. The results for this are in Table 10. The dynamic quantization method achieves the best scores of the quantization methods, and both SmoothQuant and dynamic quantization lead to results that are not significantly lower than the FP32 model. The static quantization method causes a notable and significant decrease in performance.

**Table 9**

Throughput in queries per second for different input length sizes (256 and 512) and model size (in MB) comparisons for different quantization methods. The standard deviations are shown in brackets.

Quantization	Throughput (256)	Throughput (512)	Model size
None (FP32)	2.573 ( $\pm 0.035$ )	1.226 ( $\pm 0.034$ )	418.4
Static	2.875 ( $\pm 0.079$ )	1.545 ( $\pm 0.043$ )	128.8
Dynamic	<b>3.420</b> ( $\pm 0.046$ )	<b>1.582</b> ( $\pm 0.029$ )	<b>105.2</b>
SmoothQuant	3.292 ( $\pm 0.050$ )	1.528 ( $\pm 0.023$ )	105.5

**Table 10**

NDCG@10 scores of various quantization methods on the BrightFit datasets compared to the standard, non-quantized FP32 model as a reference. \* indicates that the difference with the FP32 model is statistically significant according to a paired t-test with  $\alpha = 0.05$  and Bonferroni correction for multiple testing.

Dataset	BrightFit IT		BrightFit General	
	256	512	256	512
Max input length				
RankT5-FP32	<b>0.659</b>	0.623	0.754	0.725
RankT5-Static	0.503*	0.511	0.444*	0.389
RankT5-Dynamic	0.657	0.636	<b>0.775</b>	0.720
RankT5-SmoothQuant	0.626	0.597	0.737	0.691

## 5.5. Experiment 5: User evaluation

As per the recommendation by Knijnenburg and Willemsen [6] we perform both an A/B test and a questionnaire to effectively evaluate the user perception of our course ranking method.

### 5.5.1. A/B test

We implement an A/B test in the BrightFit production environment. We use this test to directly compare the in-production system (BM25-based) against our best ranking setup.

**Ranking model selected for test** We select a version of our RankT5 model that balances speed and quality: course descriptions summarized by the LongT5 model; dynamic quantization; a maximum input length of 256; and a re-ranking depth of 20. In Section 5.2 we have seen that a re-ranking depth of 30 achieves a higher NDCG@10 score. However, by reducing the number of processed documents from 30 to 20 we get close to a 150% speed-up. We are still happy with the quality of the recommendations at a depth of 20, which is why we decide to use a depth of 20 instead of 30.

**Experiment design** We use a between-subject randomization method as suggested by Knijnenburg and Willemsen [6]. If a user’s id is even-numbered, we use the in-production (BM25-based) ranker to select the presented recommendations and if the user’s id is an odd number we use our RankT5-based system described above. We deploy the A/B test in the United States and Australia. The United States is the largest market for BrightFit and Australia uses the exact


same skills taxonomy and course catalogue as the United States version, allowing us to easily deploy it in Australia.

To track user behaviour during the experiment we use Google Analytics.<sup>11</sup> We track the following three events related to the course recommendations in BrightFit:

1. *Open skill card*: A skill card is a small component presented to the user on the self-assessment report page (see Section 3.3), showing the recommended skills. The user can click a skill card to get more information on a skill. Opening a skill card will also show them the list of courses that are recommended for that skill. This is the starting point for the recommender.
2. *Open course card*: Once a user has opened a skill card they will be presented with some information about the skill and a list of courses that are recommended to learn that skill. Each course is shown as a small card with some basic information like the title, the level, the rating and a thumbnail image. When a user is interested in a course they can open this course card to get more information about the course. For this event, we track if a user clicks on the course card to learn more about a course.
3. *Go to course*: Once a user has opened a course card and they are presented with the full description of the course they will have the option to go to the actual course on the course provider's website, which is what we track with this event.


We ran the experiment for 66 days in the United States and for 46 days in Australia.

**Results** We show the combined results for both countries in Figure 3. Overall we find that the BM25-based recommender achieves higher click-through rates between the different parts of the BrightFit application. In Figure 3 we can see that, after a user opened a skill card and was shown course recommendations by the BM25-based recommender, they open a course card in 50% of the cases, compared to only 29% for the RankT5-based recommendations. This contrasts our offline evaluation results in Table 5. We discuss this contrast in Section 6.



**Figure 3:** Funnel diagram for the events recorded during the BrightFit A/B test combined for the USA and Australia. The first value in each box indicates the total number of recorded events, the percentage indicates how many events of that type were recorded compared to the previous stage in the funnel.

<sup>11</sup><https://marketingplatform.google.com/about/analytics/>



**Figure 4:** An example of the two lists a user is shown for the query *Customer Service for Front Desk Employee* in the questionnaire.

### 5.5.2. User questionnaire

Again per the recommendation by Knijnenburg and Willemsen [6] we use an additional user questionnaire to get more insight into user preferences.


**Study design** We present users with the 10 queries from the BrightFit general skills dataset with their top recommended courses. We have to be careful about how we present the recommendations as this can have a significant influence on the user’s choices [6]. We also do not want to overwhelm the users with choices to prevent so-called “choice overload” [33]. After careful consideration and discussing options with test users, we opted for 5 courses per list. We show the two lists below each other for mobile-friendliness and we randomize which system’s recommendations are first [34].

To make the questionnaire as representative as possible of the way recommendations are served to the user in BrightFit, we show them only information that is also available in BrightFit: the course title, course thumbnail, course rating, course provider, and the course level. An example of two lists we generate for a query in the questionnaire is shown in Figure 4. Note that in this figure, the lists are laid out side by side while the lists in the survey are presented below each other.

For each of the 10 questions, we ask the user to indicate which list of recommendations they prefer or if they have no preference for one list over the other. We then ask them to elaborate on their reasoning for the choice they made to get an understanding of what users find important when getting recommendations. This has the additional benefit that it improves the accuracy of the responses given, as the users are forced to think more about their answer [6].

**Results** In total, we have collected responses from 29 different participants (M:19, F:9, X:1; mean age:28). Figure 5 shows the user preferences for each question in the questionnaire. We can see that in 8 out of 10 cases, the results from the two-stage retrieval approach using GTR retrieval and RankT5 re-ranking are preferred over the BM25-based in-production ranker. This result is in contrast with the results we observed in the A/B test, but aligns with our offline





**Figure 5:** Results of the conducted user questionnaire showing user preference for each of the 10 questions in the questionnaire. In total responses from 29 users were collected.

evaluation results. We will discuss this in Section 6.

Even though the new recommendation system gets preferred over the old recommendation system in the questionnaire, we still have the case that for each query there is at least a handful of users that have no preference or prefer the other system. This shows that there is a difference between users' perceptions of what makes a good recommendation. We looked at the motivations written by the users for the choices they made. As reasons were mentioned: higher course ratings, courses for different levels, diversity in course content, false positives, and courses taught within the job context.

## 6. Discussion

In this section, we further discuss the results of the experiments, focussing on the unexpected findings.

**Comparing datasets** We found that the scores on the general skills dataset are generally higher than the scores on the BrightFit IT dataset. This shows us that the BrightFit IT dataset is a harder problem compared to the general skills many more courses for IT-related skills available, which can make it harder to get a good ranking of these courses. This is also supported by the fact that the BrightFit IT skills dataset has more relevant documents per query compared to the

BrightFit general skills dataset.

**Quantization** We found the dynamically quantized model performs very similarly to the FP32 model, and in some settings even a bit better. This latter finding is surprising since quantization makes the model weights less precise, causing the model to have less information. We speculate that the model might be able to generalize better with the less specific weights after quantization, resulting in better scores.

**User studies** In the user evaluation, the results from the A/B test and the questionnaire contradict each other. The result of the A/B test shows better user interaction with the BM25-based recommender, while the users who have taken the questionnaire have clearly shown a preference for the RankT5-based recommendations, the latter confirming our offline ranking experiments. One of the factors in the A/B test might be the interpretability of the results. If we have the query *“Information Security for Security Specialist”* the BM25-based re-ranker will retrieve course titles that contain the words *“Information Security”*. On the other hand, we observe that in the RankT5-based recommendations there are many courses with the term *CISSP* which stands for *“Certified Information Systems Security Professional”*. For someone who does not know *CISSP* stands for, the recognizable course descriptions retrieved by BM25 might be more appealing to click on.

Another factor that can be an issue is the time it takes to generate recommendations, which is a relevant aspect given that efficiency was one of the aims of our approach. The BM25-based recommendations are much faster to generate than the recommendations by RankT5. During our testing of the A/B test setup, we found that in almost all cases, the recommendations for the courses by RankT5 would be done by the time a normal user would get to the part of the page where the skills are shown, which is near the bottom. However, despite our efforts to improve the inference time using quantization and summarization, we cannot be sure that this longer time to generate the recommendations is impacting how the users interact with the system. This difference in time is not a factor in the questionnaire, which can explain the difference in results between the A/B test and the questionnaire results.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, we addressed the problem of making good and efficient course recommendations for users who are looking to learn a certain skill. We evaluated a two-stage retrieval approach using GTR and RankT5 on two newly labelled datasets based on the commercial BrightFit course recommender. We experimented with improving the efficiency of the recommender by applying summarization and quantization techniques.

We found that the zero-shot GTR retriever outperforms the BM25-based retriever on both BrightFit datasets. We finetuned the RankT5 model on the MSMARCO dataset and showed that it can effectively perform course re-ranking despite not being trained on the course domain, and leads to a substantially better ranking for two labelled datasets than the in-production BM25 ranker. We compared two summarization models for improving ranking of long course descriptions: a LongT5 model fine-tuned on edX data for summarizing courses and a Vicuna

model that we prompted to generate summaries. We found that both models were able to get better performance than was achieved with the original course descriptions. We investigated the use of quantization to speed up model inference and we achieved a speed-up of up to 47% compared to inference with the original (FP32) model, while the performance was either very close or sometimes even better than the FP32 model.

Finally, we performed 2 user studies: an A/B test and a questionnaire. From the results of the A/B test, we saw that the BM25-based re-ranker had substantially higher click-through rates than our proposed two-step approach, which does not align with our findings that RankT5 was significantly better on both BrightFit benchmark datasets. Time to generate recommendations and transparency of relevance might be factors that play a role here. With the questionnaire, on the other hand, we found that in 8 out of 10 cases, the RankT5-based recommender was either equal to or preferred over the BM25-based recommender. Through the questionnaire, we gained insights into why users preferred one set of recommendations over another which is useful information when looking to extend the recommender in the future.

Future work could focus on differences between the preferences of individual users. An extension incorporating user preferences might provide a better user experience by being able to serve personalized recommendations. Another way to improve recommendations would be to construct a proper training dataset for BrightFit with enough ratings so that we can directly train on the task instead of using zero-shot methods.

## References

- [1] World Economic Forum, The future of jobs report 2023, 2023. URL: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/>.
- [2] Randstad Risesmart, skilling today: a randstad risesmart global survey, 2020. URL: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/>.
- [3] H. Zhuang, Z. Qin, R. Jagerman, K. Hui, J. Ma, J. Lu, J. Ni, X. Wang, M. Bendersky, Rankt5: Fine-tuning t5 for text ranking with ranking losses, 2022. [arXiv:2210.10634](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.10634).
- [4] Y. Guo, A survey on methods and theories of quantized neural networks, *CoRR* abs/1808.04752 (2018). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.04752>. [arXiv:1808.04752](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.04752).
- [5] F. J. Martin, Recsys'09 industrial keynote: Top 10 lessons learned developing deploying and operating real-world recommender systems, in: *Proceedings of the Third ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '09*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2009, p. 1–2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1639714.1639715>. doi:10.1145/1639714.1639715.
- [6] B. P. Knijnenburg, M. C. Willemsen, *Evaluating Recommender Systems with User Experiments*, Springer US, Boston, MA, 2015, pp. 309–352. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7637-6\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7637-6_9). doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-7637-6\_9.
- [7] H. Imran, M. Belghis-Zadeh, T.-W. Chang, Kinshuk, S. Graf, PLORS: a personalized learning object recommender system, *Vietnam Journal of Computer Science* 3 (2015) 3–13. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40595-015-0049-6>. doi:10.1007/s40595-015-0049-6.
- [8] X. Jing, J. Tang, Guess you like: course recommendation in moocs, in: *Proceedings of the international conference on web intelligence*, 2017, pp. 783–789.

- [9] R. Ahmed-Ouamer, A. Hammache, Ontology-based information retrieval for e-learning of computer science, in: 2010 International Conference on Machine and Web Intelligence, IEEE, 2010, pp. 250–257.
- [10] G. George, A. M. Lal, Review of ontology-based recommender systems in e-learning, *Computers & Education* 142 (2019) 103642. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131519301952>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103642>.
- [11] S. Shishehchi, S. Banihashem, N. A. Mat Zin, S. A. Mohd Noah, Ontological approach in knowledge based recommender system to develop the quality of e-learning system, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences* 6 (2012) 115–123.
- [12] B. Bouihi, M. Bahaj, An ontology-based architecture for context recommendation system in e-learning and mobile-learning applications, 2017, pp. 1–6. doi:[10.1109/EITech.2017.8255278](https://doi.org/10.1109/EITech.2017.8255278).
- [13] M. Tavakoli, A. Faraji, J. Vrolijk, M. Molavi, S. T. Mol, G. Kismihók, An AI-based open recommender system for personalized labor market driven education, *Advanced Engineering Informatics* 52 (2022) 101508. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2021.101508>. doi:[10.1016/j.aei.2021.101508](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2021.101508).
- [14] Y. Yang, Y. Qiao, T. Yang, Compact token representations with contextual quantization for efficient document re-ranking, in: *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 695–707.
- [15] V. Gil-Costa, F. Loor, R. Molina, F. M. Nardini, R. Perego, S. Trani, Ensemble model compression for fast and energy-efficient ranking on fpgas, in: *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, Springer, 2022, pp. 260–273.
- [16] H. Zeng, C. Luo, B. Jin, S. M. Sarwar, T. Wei, H. Zamani, Scalable and effective generative information retrieval, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09134* (2023).
- [17] R. Pradeep, K. Hui, J. Gupta, A. D. Lelkes, H. Zhuang, J. Lin, D. Metzler, V. Q. Tran, How does generative retrieval scale to millions of passages?, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11841* (2023).
- [18] C. Lassance, S. Lupart, H. Dejean, S. Clinchant, N. Tonello, A static pruning study on sparse neural retrievers, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12702* (2023).
- [19] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, P. J. Liu, Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer, *CoRR* (2019). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10683>. arXiv:1910.10683.
- [20] H. Bonella, Burning glass occupational taxonomy (bgot), 2020. URL: <https://economicmodeling.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/KA/pages/2602501773/Burning+Glass+Occupational+Taxonomy+BGOT>.
- [21] Lightcast™, 2023. URL: <https://docs.lightcast.dev/apis/job-postings>.
- [22] J. Ni, C. Qu, J. Lu, Z. Dai, G. H. Ábrege, J. Ma, V. Y. Zhao, Y. Luan, K. B. Hall, M.-W. Chang, Y. Yang, Large dual encoders are generalizable retrievers, 2021. arXiv:2112.07899.
- [23] P. Bajaj, D. Campos, N. Craswell, L. Deng, J. Gao, X. Liu, R. Majumder, A. McNamara, B. Mitra, T. Nguyen, M. Rosenberg, X. Song, A. Stoica, S. Tiwary, T. Wang, Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset, 2018. arXiv:1611.09268.
- [24] N. Thakur, N. Reimers, A. Rücklé, A. Srivastava, I. Gurevych, BEIR: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models, in: *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*

- (Round 2), 2021. URL: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wCu6T5xFjeJ>.
- [25] I. Beltagy, M. E. Peters, A. Cohan, Longformer: The long-document transformer, 2020. [arXiv:2004.05150](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.05150).
  - [26] S. Althammer, A. Askari, S. Verberne, A. Hanbury, Dossier@coliee 2021: Leveraging dense retrieval and summarization-based re-ranking for case law retrieval, 2021. [arXiv:2108.03937](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.03937).
  - [27] A. Askari, S. Verberne, Combining lexical and neural retrieval with longformer-based summarization for effective case law retrieval, in: Biennial Conference on Design of Experimental Search & Information Retrieval Systems, 2021. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:238207602>.
  - [28] M. Guo, J. Ainslie, D. Uthus, S. Ontanon, J. Ni, Y.-H. Sung, Y. Yang, LongT5: Efficient text-to-text transformer for long sequences, 2022. [arXiv:2112.07916](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.07916).
  - [29] W.-L. Chiang, Z. Li, Z. Lin, Y. Sheng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, L. Zheng, S. Zhuang, Y. Zhuang, J. E. Gonzalez, I. Stoica, E. P. Xing, Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality, 2023. URL: <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>.
  - [30] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, G. Lample, Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023. [arXiv:2302.13971](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971).
  - [31] A. Gholami, S. Kim, Z. Dong, Z. Yao, M. W. Mahoney, K. Keutzer, A survey of quantization methods for efficient neural network inference, CoRR abs/2103.13630 (2021). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.13630>. [arXiv:2103.13630](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.13630).
  - [32] G. Xiao, J. Lin, M. Seznec, H. Wu, J. Demouth, S. Han, Smoothquant: Accurate and efficient post-training quantization for large language models, 2023. [arXiv:2211.10438](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.10438).
  - [33] D. Bollen, B. P. Knijnenburg, M. C. Willemsen, M. Graus, Understanding choice overload in recommender systems, in: Proceedings of the Fourth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '10, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2010, p. 63–70. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1864708.1864724>. doi:10.1145/1864708.1864724.
  - [34] L. Chen, H. Tsoi, Users' decision behavior in recommender interfaces: Impact of layout design, CEUR Workshop Proceedings 811 (2011).