

Content-based Recommendation Engine for Video Streaming Platform

Puskal Khadka
Department of computer science
Texas intl college
(Tribhuvan University)
Kathmandu, Nepal
puskalkumar.khadka@texasintl.edu.np

Prabhav Lamichhane
Department of computer science
Texas intl college
(Tribhuvan University)
Kathmandu, Nepal
prabhav.lamichhane@texasintl.edu.np

Abstract— Recommendation engine suggest content, product or services to the user by using machine learning algorithm. This paper proposed a content-based recommendation engine for providing video suggestions to the user based on their previous interests and choices. We will use TF-IDF text vectorization method to determine the relevance of words in a document. Then we will find out the similarity between each content by calculating cosine similarity between them. Finally, engine will recommend videos to the user based on the obtained similarity score value. In addition, we will measure the engine's performance by computing precision, recall, and F1 score of the proposed system.

Keywords—content-based recommendation engine; cosine similarity; machine learning; tf-idf

I. INTRODUCTION

Video streaming platforms are drastically increased due to technological advancement and easy access of handheld devices in the recent years. Each platform consists of a huge amount of content of different genres, giving users a wide range of choices. Users are generally perplexed by the overwhelming content available on the platform so it is necessary to implement a proper recommendation engine. There are mainly three types of recommendation systems: collaborative filtering, content-based filtering, and hybrid recommendation system.

Content-based Filtering suggests results to the users based on their previous preferred interests and choices. It uses a machine learning algorithm to learn the similarity between different items and finally makes the prediction based on the similarity between them. This system generally creates a user's profile based on the types of items the user likes and then recommends by comparing items to the created user profile.

Collaborative filtering system collect and analyze data on user's behavior and predict results based on the similarity with other users. This system makes recommendations without having prior knowledge of the item to the current users. But if the item available in the system is itself new and also has not been rated by any users yet, then it will not be able to make the correct recommendations. This system has been used on many platforms such as Amazon [4], Netflix, and so on.

Hybrid recommendation system is the combined form of both collaborative and content-based filtering. This system significantly undermines the weakness of the individual

filtering system. They make predictions by taking consideration of users' previous preferences as well as comparing them with other users having similar traits.

In this research, we proposed content-based filtering for the design of a recommendation engine that predicts users' interest based on the feature of previous watch content such as cast, genre, and overview.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Video streaming platforms generally comprise a large amount of video content. In the maximum case, users are generally inclined towards a particular genre and there is a high tendency that users will consume similar types of content in the future. But without a recommendation engine on the platform, if the user wants to stream content of their own choices and preferences, each time they mostly have to manually search or filter content from the large pool of available videos. This process is generally tedious and repetitive. So, to solve this problem there is a need for an appropriate recommendation engine on the platform that provides accurate suggestions to the users based on their past watching choices and habits.

III. RELATED WORK

Different types of recommendation engines have been researched and developed over the last few decades. They are widely adopted on several platforms such as Amazon, Netflix, Facebook, etc.

Amazon's recommender system [4] uses item-to-item collaborative filtering which predicts user interest on the basis of visitors' recent purchase history and their browsing behavior, and ratings.

Reference [12] introduces a group recommendation system (GRS) for Facebook using a combination of hierarchical clustering technique and decision tree. Based on the number of experiment results, the author claims that the group recommendation system makes 73% accurate recommendations.

G. Shani and A. Gunawardana [7] evaluate the recommendation system by describing experimental settings appropriate for making choices between different recommendation algorithms. They review three types of experiments, starting with an offline setting, then reviewing user studies, and finally describing large-scale online experiments.

IV. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we will discuss various steps involved in the designing of a proposed video recommender system in detail. First of all, we need to get datasets representing different videos. Then we have to preprocess and clean our raw datasets. After that, we will use appropriate text vectorizer method to find out the relevance of each word in the corpus. And finally, we need to use a similarity measuring algorithm to find out the similarity between videos, and then the system will recommend videos to the user based on the similarity score.

A. Data Gathering and Preprocessing

Efficiency of the recommendation system is highly dependent on the amount and quality of data available in the system. So, we took the data from Kaggle [9] which consists of 4803 movie datasets. This movie data will act as video content for our proposed video streaming platform. In this paper, from the original dataset, we used five movies' data as sample video contents for showing the inner calculation and working of our recommendation engine from scratch. Each movie consists of several features such as genre, original language, release date, cast, overview, production company, and so on. Out of this, we took three major features: Genre, Cast, and Overview for each movie. Then we create a separate table including mentioned three features as given below

TABLE II. SAMPLE MOVIE/VIDEO DATASETS

Movie	Genre	Cast	Overview
Ironman	scifi	Rober Downey Jr	mcu, weaponed suit, super hero
Titanic	romance	Leonardo Dicarpio	sea disaster, romance
Avengers	scifi	Rober Downey Jr, chris evans	mcu, shield, super hero
Great Gatsby	romance, novel	Leonardo Dicarpio	social difference, obsession, novel
Forrest Gump	novel	Tom Hank	inspiration, low iq, romance

After creating sample datasets, several data cleaning and preprocessing steps were carried out such as removing stop words, null values, and special characters from each document. Then data from the three columns for each movie combine into a single filtered document corpus as given below

Ironman: scifi robertdowneyjr mcu weaponedsuit superhero

Titanic: romance leonardodicarpio seadisaster romance

Avengers: scifi robertdowneyjr chris evans mcu shield superhero

Great gatsby: romance novel leonardodicarpio socialdifference obsession novel

Forrest gump: novel tomhank inspirational romance

B. Text Vectorization

After getting filter dataset, we have to convert this corpus into numerical representation i.e. in the form of vectors. This vector plays an important role in building a recommendation model in the later stage. There are several text vectorization techniques [17] in natural language processing such as Bag of Words, TF-IDF (Term Frequency and Inverse Document Frequency), Word2Vec, and so on. In this paper, we used TF-IDF text vectorization method to convert our filtered corpus into vectors. TF-IDF shows how important a word is to a document. It is obtained by computing two metrics: TF and IDF.

1) *Term frequency (TF)*: Term frequency finds out the frequency of appearance of a particular term in the document. Suppose we have a document d, then term frequency of a word 'w' will be

$$TF = \frac{\text{Number of times word } 'w' \text{ appeared in document } 'd'}{\text{Total number of words in document } 'd'}$$

Using this formula, we calculate term frequency of each word in a corpus and obtained result is shown in the following table

TABLE II. TERM FREQUENCY OF WORD IN CORPUS

	Ironman	Titanic	Avengers	Great gatsby	Forrest gump
scifi	1/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
robertdowneyjr	1/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
mcu	1/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
weaponedsuit	1/5	0/4	0/6	0/6	0/4
superhero	1/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
romance	0/5	2/4	0/6	1/6	1/4
leonardodicarpio	0/5	1/4	0/6	1/6	0/4
seadisaster	0/5	1/4	0/6	0/6	0/4
chris evans	0/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
shield	0/5	0/4	1/6	0/6	0/4
novel	0/5	0/4	0/6	2/6	1/4
socialdifference	0/5	0/4	0/6	1/6	0/4
obsession	0/5	0/4	0/6	1/6	0/4
tomhank	0/5	0/4	0/6	0/6	1/4
inspirational	0/5	0/4	0/6	0/6	1/4

2) *Inverse document frequency (IDF)*: Higher the term frequency (TF), we can say that word has a significant meaning in the recommendation of the particular video. But this is not applicable in some cases such as stop words, or less meaningful words. For example, suppose a document has the word 'movie' four times. In that case, it doesn't mean the word 'movie' is significant while recommending because this word is less significant and doesn't play a vital role while recommending. So to overcome this issue, we have to calculate inverse document frequency.

$$IDF = \log \frac{\text{Total number of videos}}{\text{Number of videos whose document } 'd' \text{ contains word } 'w'}$$

We take logarithm while calculating IDF because sometimes the value of IDF without log is larger and more dominant over TF. So, to negate its dominance and make it have the same effect as TF, we use a log while calculating IDF. By using the above formula, we calculate the IDF for each word in the corpus as follows

TABLE III. IDF OF EACH WORD IN CORPUS

	IDF
scifi	log(5/2)
robertdowneyjr	log(5/2)
mcu	log(5/2)
weaponedsuit	log(5/1)
superhero	log(5/2)
romance	log(5/3)
leonardodicarpio	log(5/2)
seadisaster	log(5/1)
chris evans	log(5/1)
shield	log(5/1)
novel	log(5/2)
socialdifference	log(5/1)
obsession	log(5/1)
tomhank	log(5/1)
inspirational	log(5/1)

3) *TF-IDF*: Word in the document is most important when it occurs frequently in its own document but rarely in other documents. Since TF gives how frequent or common a word is in its own document, and IDF gives how rare a word is in other documents so we need to multiply both terms to find the actual relevance of the word in the document. Table I and Table II show TF and IDF respectively, thus we calculate the value from both tables to get TF-IDF.

$$\text{TF-IDF} = \text{TF} * \text{IDF}$$

TF-IDF value for each word is shown in the following table where each cell shows the multiplication of TF and IDF value.

TABLE IV. TF-IDF VALUE FOR EACH WORD

	scifi	robertdowneyjr	mcu	weaponedsuit	superhero
Ironman	$(1/5)*\log(5/2) = 0.0795880$	$(1/5)*\log(5/2) = 0.0795880$	$(1/5)*\log(5/2) = 0.0795880$	$(1/5)*\log(5/1) = 0.1397940$	$(1/5)*\log(5/2) = 0.0795880$
Titanic	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$
Avengers	$(1/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.0795880$	$(1/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.0663233$	$(1/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.0663233$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(1/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.0663233$
Great gatsby	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$
Forrest gump	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$

TABLE IV. (CONTINUED-1)

	romance	leonardodicarpio	seadisaster	chrisevans	shield
Ironman	$(0/5)*\log(5/3) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Titanic	$(2/4)*\log(5/3) = 0.1109244$	$(1/4)*\log(5/2) = 0.0994850$	$(1/4)*\log(5/1) = 0.1747425$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Avengers	$(0/6)*\log(5/3) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(1/6)*\log(5/1) = 0.1164950$	$(1/6)*\log(5/1) = 0.1164950$
Great gatsby	$(1/6)*\log(5/3) = 0.0369748$	$(1/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.0663233$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Forrest gump	$(1/4)*\log(5/3) = 0.0554622$	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$

TABLE IV. (CONTINUED-2)

	novel	socialdifference	obsession	tomhank	inspirational
Ironman	$(0/5)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/5)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Titanic	$(0/4)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Avengers	$(0/6)*\log(5/2) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Great gatsby	$(2/6)*\log(5/2) = 0.1326467$	$(1/6)*\log(5/1) = 0.1164950$	$(1/6)*\log(5/1) = 0.1164950$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/6)*\log(5/1) = 0$
Forrest gump	$(1/4)*\log(5/2) = 0.0994850$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(0/4)*\log(5/1) = 0$	$(1/4)*\log(5/1) = 0.1747425$	$(1/4)*\log(5/1) = 0.1747425$

Value in each cell in the above table represents the importance of a word in the document and each row in the table gives us a sequence of numbers. This sequence of numbers in order is known as numeric vector, which we will further compare to find the similarity [16] between them. The final combined sequence of values from each row of the TABLE IV which will act as a numeric vector for each movie is shown in the following table.

TABLE V. VECTOR FOR EACH MOVIE

Ironman	(0.0795880, 0.0795880, 0.0795880, 0.1397940, 0.0795880, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
Titanic	(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.1109244, 0.0994850, 0.1747425, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)
Avengers	(0.0795880, 0.0663233, 0.0663233, 0, 0.0663233, 0, 0, 0, 0.1164950, 0.1164950, 0, 0, 0)
Great gatsby	(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.0369748, 0.0663233, 0, 0, 0, 0.1326467, 0.1164950, 0.1164950, 0)
Forrest gump	(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.0554622, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0.0994850, 0, 0, 0.1747425, 0.1747425)

C. Cosine similarity

Cosine similarity measures the similarity between two vectors by computing the cosine of the angle between them. Table V shows the corresponding vectors for each movie. To calculate cosine similarity between them [18] we have to use the following formula.

$$\cos(\theta) = \frac{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}}{\|\mathbf{A}\| \|\mathbf{B}\|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n A_i^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i^2}}$$

where A_i and B_i are i^{th} components of two vectors A and B respectively.

By using the above formula, we calculate cosine similarity between every vector and obtained results which are plotted in the following heatmap diagram.




Fig. 1. Heatmap showing cosine similarity between movies

Here the range of cosine similarity lies between 0 and 1. Value 1 means the document is exactly similar to each other whereas 0 means two documents are completely dissimilar. In the diagonal, we can see that value is 1 because here both movies are the same movie.

Now we have a similarity score between each movie as shown in Fig. 1. Finally, our recommendation engine can suggest videos based on this similarity score. Before making suggestions, our engine will first look at the user's previous interests and history. Then at the time of auto-suggestion, this engine will traverse the cosine similarity value for the previously watched or searched movie and then suggest only those movies which have a maximum similarity score with the previous interest.

Suppose a user previously watched the movie 'Ironman' on our video streaming platform. The next time, while suggesting, our system will look only for those movies, which have high cosine similarity with the movie 'Ironman'. If we look at our heatmap in the Fig. 1, 'Avengers' has the highest cosine similarity value with 'Ironman' which is 0.48. So next time, our system will auto-recommend the movie 'Avengers' to the user. But it will not recommend movies such as 'Titanic', 'Great gatsby' because if we look at the cosine similarity table in the above heatmap, the similarity score of movies 'Titanic', 'Great gatsby' with the movie 'Ironman' is zero.

V. RESULT ANALYSIS

In this research paper, we calculate the precision, recall, and F1 score of our recommendation engine to evaluate its performance. For this, we select user 'A' and make a separate report about his interest in the video content of the platform. Then we use our recommender to predict the set of videos in which user 'A' may be interested based on his current search, history, and preferences. Finally, we compare these results with user's actual liking and obtain the four possible outcomes which are represented in the form of a confusion matrix as given below.

TABLE VI. CONFUSION MATRIX OF OUR RECOMMENDER

	Recommended	Not Recommended
Interested	True positive (TP): 10	False Negative (FN): 2
Not Interested	False Positive (FP): 1	True Negative (TN): 4

From the above table, we can see that, our engine made a total of 17 predictions for the user 'A'. Out of this, our recommendation engine recommends 10 items/movies in which the user is actually interested i.e., true positive of our system is 10. Similarly, the total number of items in which user 'A' is interested but not recommended by our system is 2 i.e., false negative is 2. There is a single item in which the user is not interested but recommended by our system i.e., false positive is 1. Finally, the total number of items in which user 'A' is not interested and also not recommended by our system is 4 i.e., the true negative of our recommendation engine is 4. With the help of the confusion matrix, shown in TABLE VI, we can calculate the performance of our proposed system.

A. Precision

Precision gives us an idea about out of all true predictions, how many of them were actually true. It shows the quality of the correct prediction of our system. Mathematically, precision of a system can be defined as follows:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{True positive}}{\text{True positive} + \text{False positive}}$$

In our recommendation system on the sample dataset for a user 'A', the number of videos which is recommended on which user is actually interested i.e., TP is 10 and the total recommended videos are TP+FP. Hence, the precision of our system will be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Precision} &= \frac{10}{10 + 1} \\ &= 0.90901 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

So, our video recommendation engine in this research paper has 0.90901 precision which means when this recommender suggests video to the user, the percentage of time on which users are actually interested in that suggested video is approximately 90.90%.

B. Recall

Recall gives us an idea about out of all actual true results, how many of them were predicted as true. It can be defined as follow:

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{True Positive}}{\text{True Positive} + \text{False Negative}}$$

In our recommendation engine, for user 'A', total number of videos on which user is actually interested i.e., sum of true positive and false positive is 12. But out of them, only 10 are recommended to the user. So, recall of our engine will be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Recall} &= \frac{10}{10 + 2} \\ &= 0.83333 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Thus, recall of our system is 0.83333. This means our system correctly recommends 83.33% of videos in which the user is actually interested.




Fig. 2. Venn diagram for Precision and recall terms

C. F1 Score

F1 score represents both precision and recall in a single metric and is calculated by taking the harmonic mean of precision and recall. It shows how many times our engine made a correct prediction across the entire dataset. Its value lies between 0 to 1. An F1 score of 1 means all recommendations are 100% accurate. Mathematically, F1 score can be defined as follow

$$\text{F1 score} = \frac{2 * \text{Precision} * \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$$

We already calculate precision and recall of our system as seen in (1) and (2) respectively. Now we substitute this value in the above formula to get the F1 score of our system as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{F1 score} &= \frac{2 * 0.90901 * 0.83333}{0.90901 + 0.83333} \\ &= 0.86952 \end{aligned}$$

So F1 score of our proposed recommendation engine is 0.86952. This means, out of 1, the ability of our engine to correctly suggest a video to the user as per his previous preferences is 0.86952.

VI. CONCLUSION

This research paper shows the adaptation of a content-based recommendation engine for the video streaming platform. Unlike Collaborative filtering, content-based filtering doesn't need data from other users to recommend videos to the users. So, Content-based filtering approach becomes more useful for our system where users get recommendations on the basis of their own previous watch and search history. The preliminary experiment done on some selective users shows that our engine provides correct recommendations to the user.

In the future, we will conduct experiments with a wide range of users having different tastes and watching traits to improve the accuracy level regarding the prediction of videos. Also, continuous research and development will be done in this engine to increase the efficiency level of our algorithm to provide a better user experience to the streaming platform's users.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by Texas Imaginology, R&D Department of Texas international college. We are deeply grateful to our reviewers for their review and suggestion to enhance the final version of this research paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Salton and M. J. McGill, *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*, McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- [2] G. Adomaviciu and A. Tuzhilin, "Toward the next generation of recommender systems: a survey of the state-of-the-art and possible extensions," *IEEE*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 734-749, 2005.
- [3] M. Balabanović and Y. Shoham, "Fab: Content-Based, Collaborative Recommendation," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 66-72, 1997.
- [4] G. Linden, B. Smith and J. York, "Amazon.com recommendations: item-to-item collaborative filtering," *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 76-80, 2003.
- [5] N. Belkin and W. B. Croft, "Information Filtering and Information Retrieval: Two Sides of the Same Coin?," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 29-38, 1992.
- [6] M. J. Pazzani and D. Billsus, "Content-Based Recommendation Systems," *The Adaptive Web*, vol. 4321, pp. 325-341, 2007.
- [7] G. Shani and A. Gunawardana, "Evaluating Recommendation Systems," in *Recommender Systems Handbook*, Springer US, 2011, pp. 257-297.
- [8] J. Lu, D. Wu and W. W. G. Z. Mingsong Mao, "Recommender system application developments: A survey," *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 74, pp. 12-32, 2015.
- [9] "Movie Dataset: Budgets, Genres, Insights," [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/utkarshx27/movies-dataset>. [Accessed 3 March 2023].
- [10] P. Lops, M. Degenmis and G. Semeraro, "Content-based Recommender Systems: State of the Art and Trends," in *Recommender System Handbook*, Springer US, 2011, pp. 73-105.
- [11] S. Prakash, A. Nautiyal and M. Prasad, "Machine Learning Algorithms for Recommender System - a comparative analysis," *International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 97-100, 2017.
- [12] E.-A. Baatarjav, S. Phithakitnukoon and R. Dantu, "Group Recommendation System for Facebook," in *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM 2008 Workshops*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 211-219.
- [13] A. K. Singh and M. Shashi, "Vectorization of Text Documents for Identifying Unifiable News Articles," *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, vol. 10, no. 7, 2019.
- [14] R. Feldman and J. Sanger, *The Text Mining Handbook: Advanced Approaches in Analyzing Unstructured Data*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [15] "Content-based Filtering," Google.com, [Online]. Available: <https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/recommendation/content-based/basics>. [Accessed 5 March 2023].
- [16] W. H. Gomaa and A. A. Fahmy, "A Survey of Text Similarity Approaches," *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 68, no. 13, pp. 13-18, 2013.
- [17] X. Yang, K. Yang, T. Cui, M. Chen and L. He, "A Study of Text Vectorization Method Combining Topic Model and Transfer Learning," *Processes*, vol. 10, p. 350, 2022.
- [18] G.-S. Victor, P. Antonia and S. Spyros, "CSMR: A Scalable Algorithm for Text Clustering with Cosine Similarity and MapReduce," *Springer*, vol. 437, pp. 211-220, 2014.