

Improvement Graph Convolution Collaborative Filtering with Weighted addition input

Tin T. Tran^{1,2}[0000–0003–4252–6898] and V. Snasel¹[0000–0002–9600–8319]

¹ Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, VŠB-Technical University of Ostrava, Ostrava-Poruba, Czech Republic
{[trung.tin.tran.st](mailto:trung.tin.tran.st@vsb.cz),[vaclav.snasel](mailto:vaclav.snasel@vsb.cz)}@vsb.cz

² Faculty of Information Technology, Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam
trantrungtin@tdtu.edu.vn

Abstract. Graph Neural Networks have been extensively applied in the field of machine learning to find features of graphs, and recommendation systems are no exception. The ratings of users on considered items can be represented by graphs which are input for many efficient models to find out the characteristics of the users and the items. From these insights, relevant items are recommended to users. However, user's decisions on the items have varying degrees of effects on different users, and this information should be learned so as not to be lost in the process of information mining.

In this publication, we propose to build an additional graph showing the recommended weight of an item to a target user to improve the accuracy of GNN models. Although the users' friendships were not recorded, their correlation was still evident through the commonalities in consumption behavior. We build a model WiGCN (Weighted input GCN) to describe and experiment on well-known datasets. Conclusions will be stated after comparing our results with state-of-the-art such as GCMC, NGCF and LightGCN. The source code is also included*.

Keywords: Recommender System · Collaborative signal · Graph Neural Network · Embedding Propagation.

1 Introduction

Recommendation systems are an important research area of Information Systems. They are widely used in e-commerce, advertising and social media to give suggestions to the target user, and thus, improve the user experience. Based on previous interactions, such as purchases or reviews, of multiple users on items, the system will look for features and point out similar users and similar items to offer a set of recommendations. combine products and recommendations to target customers. Collaborative filtering (CF) is a method of assessing the similarity between users based on a series of past behavior that has been applied

*<https://github.com/trantin84/WiGCN>

in [1,2]. In this method, the user and item features are represented by vectors. The distance of vectors in the calculating space represent how similar the users or items is. By this method, the items do not need to specify the attributes nor need to collect the user’s personal information.

The user-item relationship matrix is usually a sparse matrix, because the number of items a user has purchased or is interested in accounts for only a very small portion of all items. Reducing the number of matrix dimensions helps to create embedded matrices of much smaller size but without losing the features of users and items [3]. Furthermore, the Numpy [4] and TensorFlow libraries [5] can efficiently handle very large sparse matrices without taking up a lot of computer memory in execution.

In addition to traditional recommendations, social recommendations are systems that consider the social relation between users. Users can also be friends with each other in real life or on social networks, a friend’s advice is always taken with higher trust. The methods outlined in [6,7] mined a relational database of friends to enrich recommendation information. However, a friendship database is not always available. Social networking services exploit user relationships only, while e-commerce sites have item review data and treat users as independent entities.

On the other hand, the user and item relations can also be naturally represented by graphs, and can be exploited by Graph neural network [8]. The process of capturing collaborative signals can go through two stages, decomposer and combiner as suggested at [9], where decomposer will capture signals from graph and then combiner will combine them into one unified embedding. High-order connectivity is found in the NGCF model [10] where propagating embedding is used when mining the user-item relationship graph. Recently, the LightGCN model has removed the weights when receiving the signal from the graph into the embedded vectors but still retains the accuracy of the algorithm [11].

In this publication, we propose a model that uses Graph neural network to receive signals from two separate matrices, that is, the implicit matrix that records the user’s attention on the item and the weight matrix. number of interactions between users. Although there is no data on social relationships between users, mutual interest in a set of items also constitutes strong signals between users. We also implement this model and perform experiments on common data sets to evaluate and compare with state-of-the-art algorithms.

2 Related Works

2.1 Collaborative Filtering

From the beginning, recommendation systems exploited the characteristics of all items as well as the preferences of users to find suitable items and make recommendations to them [12]. For example, a movie can be categorized into action, comedy, romance, etc; a toy can have properties of color, shape, age, etc. With users, information such as age, gender, address of residence or education

could also be used to enrich the input data [13]. However, with a very large number of items and frequent additions, it is difficult to find out and give items attributes, the systems need additive filtering methods. Collaborative filtering approach algorithms were used to find similarity between users or items without attribute information from them [14].

Collaborative filtering can be implemented by memory-based models [15] or model-based models [16]. With memory-based model, the history of every user's rating on items will be recorded in a rating matrix. There are many ways to define a rating scale, which can be an integer value from 1 to 5, or an implicit rating. In a space made up of user set, item set, and rating values, each user is represented by a feature vector e_u , also as each item is represented by feature vector e_i . The algorithms will find out the distance between each pair of users (or pair of items for item-based algorithms) to find the neighbors and form the recommended results. The distance can be Cosine, Pearson, Euclidean similarity or Mean Squared Differences [17]. The weakness of these methods is that the input matrix is very large to be stored in the computer memory and the matrix is sparse because a user usually rates a few items.

In the model-based collaborative filtering systems, the algorithms will look for patterns in the learning data to create a model for future prediction [18]. Matrix analysis techniques can be applied to reduce the dimensional of the user rating data matrix on items. Rating matrix can be decomposed into user feature matrix and item feature matrix with smaller size; but still ensure the accuracy of distance between users as well as between items, and more accuracy on recommendation prediction results [19], scalability and easier data learning process.

The evaluative measure will be selected appropriately for each algorithm [20]. A commonly evaluating method is to extract part of the data set to make a test set, the rest as a training set. The algorithm is applied on the training set to make predictions that are evaluated on the test set. The difference between the learning result and the actual data value shows the accuracy of the algorithm. This difference can be expressed in mean absolute error (MAE) or root mean square error (RMSE). Besides accuracy, coverage, scalability, learning time, memory consumption or interpretability are also an important criteria in evaluating the recommended system.

$$MAE = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{y}_i - y_i| \quad \text{and} \quad RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\hat{y}_i - y_i}{\sigma_i}\right)^2} \quad (1)$$

where \hat{y}_i is predicted rating while y_i is the value of that rating in the test set.

For implicit data, interactions between the user and the item are recorded binary, rather than rated as a specific value. Then, the algorithms will use the accuracy measure for the classification. The commonly used metrics are Precision and Recall [21, 22]. Precision is the ratio between correct predictions on the test set, and Recall is the sensitivity of the algorithm, or the proportion of relational assertions that have been retrieved from the test set. The F1 score is used to balance accuracy and recall because the two are often opposite. Last but not

least, discounted cumulative gain score (DCG) [23] assumes that judges have assigned labels to each result, and accumulates across the result vector a gain function G applied to the label of each result, scaled by a discount function D of the rank of the result, and it's normalized by the dividing DCG of an ideal result vector I .

$$\begin{aligned}
 Precision &= \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \\
 Recall &= \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \\
 F1 &= \frac{2 * Precision * Recall}{Precision + Recall} \\
 NDGC_u &= \frac{DCG_u}{CDG_{max}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where TP is true positive set of correctly predicting interaction exists between user and item. FP is false positive set of missing prediction of interaction while FN (False negative) shows that the predicted interaction doesn't exist on the test set.

2.2 Graph Neural Networks

Neural networks have had great success in setting up hidden layers to extract input data and identify features of the output data set [24]. A graph is a data structure that represents the relationship between entities, people, data, and attributes using a set of vertices V to represent an object and an set of edges E to represent the relationship. An edge of a graph can be undirected, representing only the relationship, or specifying the weight of the relationship, or might be a directed edge. Publication [25] have applied neural networks with graph input data and obtained positive results when vertex features are propagated and aggregated into each other during the learning process [26]. Inheriting from Neural Network algorithms, GNN also uses multiple propagation layers and applies different aggregation and update solutions. The properties of the neighbor vertex are updated and the target vertex by pooling or attention mechanisms [27].

GCN is a method of collecting repeated information [28]. For example, when there is a similar item of interest to many of the target user's friends, it should be recommended with a higher degree than other items. GraphSAGE [29] embedded inductive for each vertex of the graph and learned the topological structure of the graph as well as the effect of vertices on neighboring vertices. This method not only focus on feature-rich graphs but also make use of structural features of all vertices.

Multi Component Graph Convolutional [9] viewed a two-component input graph by separating the vertices representing the user as one group and the vertices representing the item as the other group. The features of the users are calculated to embed each other and so are the features of the items. The learning process is divided into two main stages: decomposer and combiner. In which,

the decomposer component will obtain some M latent flows from the user-item relation matrix through M transformation matrices and aggregate into the user (or item) vertices. The combiner component will combine the feature vectors of the items on a particular user and those of the users on a particular item, and finally the system obtains a predictive rating on the output.

Assuming that the influence of the users is different depending on the distance between the vertices in the graph, Neural Graph Collaborative Filtering [10] generates hop-by-hop propagation classes in the input graph. The k^{th} layer of propagation, called k -order propagation, receives messages from items to a user as well as attention signals from that user's neighbors. The number of propagation layers k can be considered as the input parameter and the value $k = 3$ is considered to be the most optimal. The loss function is built from the difference of the predicted and actual evaluation values of the test set. The learning process to minimize the loss function takes place after a number of iterations depending on the learning rate, the size of the embedding matrices as well as the size of the learning data. In a subsequent version of NGCF, LightGCN [11] removed the characteristic transition weight matrices during propagation, and a non-linear activation function to remove negative effects on objects in the NGCF propagation process.

3 Proposed method

In this chapter, we will present a recommendation model to learn the user and item characteristics at the input, and then predict the recommended outcome at the output. We also suggest the metric for the recommended results and how to build functions in the hidden layers as well as the loss function in the learning process.

3.1 Adjacent graph and Weighted references matrix




Fig. 1. Bi-parties users-items graph and Graph of users' influences.

Due to history of interaction between users and items, we can model a bi-parties graph $G = \{V, E\}$, where set of vertices $V = \{U, I\}$ is union from set of users and set of items; the E contains edge $e_{i,j} = (u_i, i_j)$ if user u had interaction

on item i . From the bi-parties graph G , we can define a matrix $R \subseteq U \times I$ and it's elements has a value of

$$R_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{user } u_i \text{ has an interaction on item } i_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The weighted user references matrix $W_U = R \times R^T$ shows how many common items that user u_i and u_j have interaction by value of $W_{U_{i,j}}$. Because the number of interactive items of each user are different, matrix W should by normalized by least absolute deviations. Similarly, the weighted item references matrix $W_I = R^T \times R$ indicates how many users the same two items were referenced by.

According to [10], the Laplacian matrices for user-item relation should be formed in propagation rule because all embedding vectors could be updated simultaneously. The first input Γ is a square matrix whose dimensions each are the sum of the number of users and the number of items.

$$\Gamma = D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & R \\ R^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

where 0 is all-zero matrix and D is the diagonal degree matrix, the i^{th} element $D_{i,i} = |N_i|$. The second input is matrix Δ , which has the same size with Γ , collects Weighted references values of both users and items.

$$\Delta = D^{-\frac{1}{2}}BD^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} W_U & 0 \\ 0 & W_I \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

3.2 Embedding layers

In publication [30], authors used two vector for user's latent and item's latent, the size of the vectors for each user and each item can be taken as an input parameter. Thus, we define users embeddings and items embeddings as $e_u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with d is size of embeddings vector. In the first loop of propagation, embedding layer $E^{(0)}$ need an initial state of He normal weight initialization method which has good performance with Rectified Linear Unit activation function [31].

$$\begin{aligned} E_{user} &= [e_{u_1}, \dots, e_{u_n}] \\ E_{item} &= [e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_m}] \\ E &= [E_{user} | E_{item}] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

With input matrices in (4) Adjacent graph and Weighted references matrix equation.1.3.4) and (5) Adjacent graph and Weighted references matrix equation.1.3.5), the embedding should be trained though each round of propagation as

$$E^{(k)} = \text{LeakyReLU} \left[\Gamma E^{(k-1)} W_1^{(k-1)} + \Delta \Gamma E^{(k-1)} W_2^{(k-1)} + b^{(k-1)} \right] \quad (7)$$

where $W_1^{(k-1)}$, $W_2^{(k-1)}$ are the trainable transformation matrices and b^{k-1} is bias vector.

3.3 Propagation process

Collaborative filtering method will capture signals inside the graphs' structure and training the embeddings of both users and items. As message-passing model of GNN [32, 33], we extract the signals and then make an aggregation for the embedding at output.

Extract signals With a user-item pair, the the signals sent out by an users and an item into target user is respectively

$$m_{u \leftarrow u} = W_1 e_u \quad (8)$$

$$m_{u \leftarrow i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|N_u||N_i|}} * (W_1 e_i + \Delta W_2 e_i) \quad (9)$$

where W_1 and W_2 are trainable weight matrices. Δ is the Weighted addition matrix at the input. $|N_i|$ and $|N_u|$ are is the force of the user and item set, respectively.

Aggregate signal With messages received from neighborhood of a user u , we aggregate all of them to refine representation of u .

$$e_u^{(1)} = \text{LeakyReLU}(m_{u \leftarrow u} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} m_{u \leftarrow i}) \quad (10)$$

where $e_u^{(1)}$ present embedded latent of user u after the first propagation layer. LeakyReLU is the activation function allows messages to encode both positive and a little negative signals [34]. The relation of users is taken into consideration by two sources that are $m_{u \leftarrow u}$ and matrix Δ .

3.4 Prediction and optimization

After a number of propagation iterations, the embedding vector E^* will be acquired, the predicting score between user u_i on item i_j can be calculated by $\hat{y}_{ui} = e_{u_i}^{*T} e_{i_j}^*$. We build the loss function with Bayesian Personalized Ranking because it is the best suitable method from implicit feedback datasets [35]. With two pooling observable sets, we have Ω_{ui}^+ is observed relations and Ω_{uj}^- is unobserved relations. Thus,

$$\text{Loss}_{bpr} = \sum_{\Omega_{ui}^+} \sum_{\Omega_{uj}^-} -\ln \sigma(\hat{y}_{ui} - \hat{y}_{uj}) + \lambda \| \Phi \|^2_2 \quad (11)$$

where Φ is embedding E^* and all of trainable weight W_1, W_2 , bias b ; $\sigma(\cdot)$ is sigmoid function and λ controls the regularization.

We generalize the propagation process from the two input matrices, through the output embedding and stack layers to calculate a predicted rating value in Figure 2 The proposed framework with bi-parties graph and Weighted influence users as additional input figure




Fig. 2. The proposed framework with bi-parties graph and Weighted influence users as additional input.

4 Experiments

We make experiments with our proposed model on three well-known datasets which are Gowalla, Amazon-book and Yelp2018; and compare the result with three state-of-the-art models which are GCMC, NGCF and LightGCN.

4.1 Datasets Description

We use setting 10-core with all datasets to ensure that each user has at least ten interactions. For each dataset, 20% of interactions were random selected as test set and the remaining (80% interaction) is used for training process. We present a summary of the data sets in **Table 1** **Statistic of the experiment dataset** **table.1.1**.

- **Gowalla**: Gowalla was a location-based social networking service and users were able to check in at their current location.
- **Amazon-book**: This dataset contains product reviews and metadata from Amazon books.
- **Yelp2018**: Yelp is a popular online directory for discovering local businesses such are hotels, bars, restaurants, and cafes.

4.2 Experimental Settings

Setting parameters We configure our model with embedding fixed-size to 64 for all models and the embedding parameters and Weighted matrix W_1, W_2 are

Table 1. Statistic of the experiment datasets.

Dataset	#Users	#Items	#Relations	Density
Gowalla	29,858	40,981	1,027,370	0.000084
Amazon-book	52,643	91,599	2,984,108	0.00062
Yelp2018	31,668	38,048	1,561,406	0.00130

initialized with the He normal weight method. The optimization process was done with Adam algorithm [36]. In the settings, 3 – *layers* give the best results.

Baseline. To demonstrate the result, we compare our proposed model with the following state-of-the-art methods:

- **GCMC** [9] designed with two modules, decomposer and combiner, this method distinguishes the underlying ranking motives underlying the clearly observed interactions between the user and the item. The first module decomposes rating values to extract the interactions and the second one combines all signals into a unified embeddings for prediction.
- **NGCF** [10] conducts propagation processes on embeddings with several iterations. The stacked embeddings on output contains high-order connectivity in interactions graph. The collaborative signal is encoded into the latent vectors and it make the model more sufficient.
- **LightGCN** [11]: focus on the neighborhood aggregation component for collaborative filtering. This model uses linearly propagating to learn users and items embeddings for interaction graph. The final embedding is weighted sum of all learned embeddings.

4.3 Results

The overall performance comparison shows in **Table 2 Overall Performance Comparison stable.1.2**. Our proposed model gives out the better scores, both precision, recall and NGCD.

Table 2. Overall Performance Comparisons

Dataset	Gowalla			Amazon-book			Yelp2018		
	precision	recall	ndcg@20	precision	recall	ndcg@20	precision	recall	ndcg@20
GCMC	0.03690	0.11799	0.09042	0.01122	0.02539	0.02033	0.02320	0.05114	0.04141
NGCF	0.04080	0.13123	0.11149	0.01713	0.41160	0.03045	0.02192	0.04865	0.03917
LightGCN	0.03961	0.12637	0.11032	0.01181	0.02657	0.02114	0.01975	0.04262	0.03462
Our model	0.04167	0.13503	0.11648	0.01772	0.04335	0.031619	0.02225	0.04894	0.03954

The only worse case is when compared to GCMC with the Yelp2018 dataset. We suspect that Yelp2018 clustered users into categories database, which is an

advantage for GCMC, as a cluster becomes a component in decomposition and combination. In this case, NGCF and LightGCN also give worse results than GCMC.

Figure 3 Test performance of each epoch of MF and NGCF **figure.1.3** shows the comparison of all methods in loss by epoch. Our proposed model reduces the loss faster others. It shows that the propagation process that has been effective recorded after each mini batch.




Fig. 3. Test performance of each epoch of MF and NGCF.

5 Conclusion and future works

5.1 Conclusion

In this work, we have proposed a method of weighting the influence among users, which can be considered equivalent to the Social Relation of Trust in the item recommendation problem. The input complement matrix has been calculated to enrich the interactions between the user and the item, and it serves as a moderator of the signals during the extraction and synthesis of messages. By contributing a machine learning model, we believe we have created an inspiration for future studies on the Recommender systems.

5.2 Future works

Trust weight graphs between users, which were prepared and send into the proposed computational model, based on the interactions of many users on the

same item. This is not a graph that represents real social relationships between users. Future works might be to find out if a social relation graph, by replace with (either collaborative filtering with) the weighted trust graph, will result in better recommendation results. The problem of clustering users according to interests, habits or behaviors also needs to be explored for more effective collaborative filtering.

Last but not least, the tuning parameters for the learning model are difficult to determine optimally, as well as the problem of initializing the embedded layer value at the first step that needs to be considered. We hope that the proposed WGCN model has provided a perspective on data preparation and learning methods from multiple sources of information.

References

1. Zhang, J., Lin, Z., Xiao, B. & Zhang, C. An optimized item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithm. *2009 IEEE International Conference On Network Infrastructure And Digital Content*. pp. 414-418 (2009)
2. Tewari, A., Kumar, A. & Barman, A. Book recommendation system based on combine features of content based filtering, collaborative filtering and association rule mining. *2014 IEEE International Advance Computing Conference (IACC)*. pp. 500-503 (2014)
3. Shi, Y., Larson, M. & Hanjalic, A. Collaborative Filtering beyond the User-Item Matrix: A Survey of the State of the Art and Future Challenges. *ACM Comput. Surv.* **47** (2014,5), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556270>
4. Walt, S., Colbert, S. & Varoquaux, G. The NumPy Array: A Structure for Efficient Numerical Computation. *Computing In Science Engineering*. **13**, 22-30 (2011)
5. Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard, M., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D., Steiner, B., Tucker, P., Vasudevan, V., Warden, P., Wicke, M., Yu, Y. & Zheng, X. TensorFlow: A System for Large-Scale Machine Learning. *12th USENIX Symposium On Operating Systems Design And Implementation (OSDI 16)*. pp. 265-283 (2016,11), <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi16/technical-sessions/presentation/abadi>
6. Ma, H., Yang, H., Lyu, M. & King, I. SoRec: Social Recommendation Using Probabilistic Matrix Factorization. *Proceedings Of The 17th ACM Conference On Information And Knowledge Management*. pp. 931-940 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1458082.1458205>
7. Ma, H., Zhou, D., Liu, C., Lyu, M. & King, I. Recommender systems with social regularization. *WSDM*. pp. 287-296 (2011,1)
8. Scarselli, F., Gori, M., Tsoi, A., Hagenbuchner, M. & Monfardini, G. The Graph Neural Network Model. *IEEE Transactions On Neural Networks*. **20**, 61-80 (2009)
9. Wang, X., Wang, R., Shi, C., Song, G. & Li, Q. Multi-component graph convolutional collaborative filtering. *Proceedings Of The AAAI Conference On Artificial Intelligence*. **34**, 6267-6274 (2020)
10. Wang, X., He, X., Wang, M., Feng, F. & Chua, T. Neural Graph Collaborative Filtering. *CoRR*. **abs/1905.08108** (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.08108>
11. He, X., Deng, K., Wang, X., Li, Y., Zhang, Y. & Wang, M. LightGCN: Simplifying and Powering Graph Convolution Network for Recommendation. (2020)

12. Jalili, M., Ahmadian, S., Izadi, M., Moradi, P. & Salehi, M. Evaluating Collaborative Filtering Recommender Algorithms: A Survey. *IEEE Access*. **6** pp. 74003-74024 (2018)
13. Pazzani, M. A Framework for Collaborative, Content-Based and Demographic Filtering. *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE REVIEW*. **13** pp. 393-408 (1999)
14. Adomavicius, G., Sankaranarayanan, R., Sen, S. & Tuzhilin, A. Incorporating contextual information in recommender systems using a multidimensional approach. *ACM Transactions On Information Systems (TOIS)*. **23**, 103-145 (2005)
15. Bojnordi, E. & Moradi, P. A novel collaborative filtering model based on combination of correlation method with matrix completion technique. *The 16th CSI International Symposium On Artificial Intelligence And Signal Processing (AISP 2012)*. pp. 191-194 (2012)
16. Goldberg, D., Nichols, D., Oki, B. & Terry, D. Using Collaborative Filtering to Weave an Information Tapestry. *Commun. ACM*. **35**, 61-70 (1992,12), <https://doi.org/10.1145/138859.138867>
17. Candillier, L., Meyer, F. & Boullé, M. Comparing State-of-the-Art Collaborative Filtering Systems. *MLDM*. (2007)
18. Yu, K., Xu, X., Tao, J., Ester, M. & Kriegel, H. Instance Selection Techniques for Memory-Based Collaborative Filtering. *Proceedings Of The 2002 SIAM International Conference On Data Mining (SDM)*. pp. 59-74, <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611972726.4>
19. Koren, Y., Bell, R. & Volinsky, C. Matrix Factorization Techniques for Recommender Systems. *Computer*. **42**, 30-37 (2009)
20. Herlocker, J., Konstan, J., Terveen, L. & Riedl, J. Evaluating Collaborative Filtering Recommender Systems. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*. **22**, 5-53 (2004,1), <https://doi.org/10.1145/963770.963772>
21. Sarwar, B., Karypis, G., Konstan, J. & Riedl, J. Application of Dimensionality Reduction in Recommender System – A Case Study. (2000,8)
22. Sarwar, B., Karypis, G., Konstan, J. & Riedl, J. Analysis of Recommendation Algorithms for E-Commerce. *Proceedings Of The 2nd ACM Conference On Electronic Commerce*. pp. 158-167 (2000), <https://doi.org/10.1145/352871.352887>
23. Najork, M. & McSherry, F. Computing Information Retrieval Performance Measures Efficiently in the Presence of Tied Scores. *30th European Conference On IR Research (ECIR)*. (2008,4), <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/computing-information-retrieval-performance-measures-efficiently-in-the-presence-of-tied-scores/>
24. Gao, Y., Li, Y., Lin, Y., Gao, H. & Khan, L. Deep Learning on Knowledge Graph for Recommender System: A Survey. (2020)
25. Wu, S., Sun, F., Zhang, W. & Cui, B. Graph Neural Networks in Recommender Systems: A Survey. (2021)
26. Wu, Z., Pan, S., Chen, F., Long, G., Zhang, C. & Yu, P. A Comprehensive Survey on Graph Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions On Neural Networks And Learning Systems*. **32**, 4-24 (2021,1), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2020.2978386>
27. Wang, X., Ji, H., Shi, C., Wang, B., Cui, P., Yu, P. & Ye, Y. Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network. *CoRR*. **abs/1903.07293** (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.07293>
28. Ying, R., He, R., Chen, K., Eksombatchai, P., Hamilton, W. & Leskovec, J. Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for Web-Scale Recommender Systems. *Proceedings Of The 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference On Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. pp. 974-983 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219890>

29. Hamilton, W., Ying, R. & Leskovec, J. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. *CoRR*. **abs/1706.02216** (2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.02216>
30. He, X., Liao, L., Zhang, H., Nie, L., Hu, X. & Chua, T. Neural Collaborative Filtering. (2017)
31. Datta, L. A Survey on Activation Functions and their relation with Xavier and He Normal Initialization. *CoRR*. **abs/2004.06632** (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06632>
32. Xu, K., Li, C., Tian, Y., Sonobe, T., Kawarabayashi, K. & Jegelka, S. Representation Learning on Graphs with Jumping Knowledge Networks. *Proceedings Of The 35th International Conference On Machine Learning*. **80** pp. 5453-5462 (2018), <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/xu18c.html>
33. Hamilton, W., Ying, Z. & Leskovec, J. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. *Advances In Neural Information Processing Systems*. **30** (2017), <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/5dd9db5e033da9c6fb5ba83c7a7ebea9-Paper.pdf>
34. Maas, A. Rectifier Nonlinearities Improve Neural Network Acoustic Models. *ICML Workshop On Deep Learning For Audio, Speech, And Language Processing (WDLASL)*. (2013)
35. Rendle, S., Freudenthaler, C., Gantner, Z. & Schmidt-Thieme, L. BPR: Bayesian Personalized Ranking from Implicit Feedback. (2012)
36. Kingma, D. & Ba, J. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. (2017)