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Abstract

Dealing with sparse, long-tailed datasets, and cold-start problems is always a challenge for recommender systems. These issues can partly be dealt with by making predictions not in isolation, but by leveraging information from related events; such information could include signals from social relationships or from the sequence of recent activities. Both types of additional information can be used to improve the performance of state-of-the-art matrix factorization-based techniques. In this paper, we propose new methods to combine both social and sequential information simultaneously, in order to further improve recommendation performance. We show these techniques to be particularly effective when dealing with sparsity and cold-start issues in several large, real-world datasets.

1 Introduction

Cold-start problems are a barrier to the performance of recommender systems that depend on learning high-dimensional user and item representations from historical feedback. In the one-class collaborative filtering setting, two types of techniques are commonly used to deal with such issues: sequential recommender systems and social recommender systems. The former assume that users’ actions are similar to those they performed recently, while the latter assume that users’ actions can be predicted from those of their friends. In both cases, these related activities act as a form of ‘regularization,’ improving predictions when users and items have too few observations to model them in isolation.

Two existing models of interest are Factorized Personalized Markov Chains (FPMC) [Rendle et al., 2010] and Social Bayesian Personalized Ranking (SBPR) [Zhao et al., 2014]. In FPMC, the authors make use of ‘personalized’ Markov chains to train on sequences of users’ baskets; FPMC is shown to enhance overall performance, though does little to address cold-start issues, due to the large number of parameters that need to be included to handle sequential recommendation. Among a wide variety of work that makes use of social factors, SBPR uses a ranking formulation to assume that items considered by a user’s friends are more important than items not viewed by the user or their friends, but less important than items the user viewed themselves. This is a natural extension of standard ranking-based objectives, such as Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [Rendle et al., 2009], and leads to increases in accuracy in cold-start settings. Similar techniques have also been used to rank and regularize based on other factors, such as groups of users who behave similarly [Pan and Chen, 2013].

In this paper we propose a new model, SPMC (Socially-aware Personalized Markov Chain) that leverages feedback from sequences, as well as social interactions in the same model. The model is based on the assumption that a user can be affected both by their own feedback sequence as well as that of their friends’ (Figure 1). Our goal in doing so is to improve upon existing models, especially when dealing with user cold-start issues in sparse datasets.

In essence, our model is a combination of FPMC and SBPR, such that users’ actions are assumed to be determined by (1) their preferences; (2) their recent activities; and (3) their friends’ recent activities. We make several simplifying
assumptions to deal with the otherwise prohibitive number of parameters introduced by such a general formulation, especially when dealing with sparse datasets. Experiments on four real-world datasets reveal that the model is capable of beating state-of-the-art recommendation techniques that consider sequential and social factors in isolation.

2 Related Work

The most closely related works to ours are (1) Item recommendation methods that model user preferences in terms of latent factors; (2) Works that model sequential dynamics (and more broadly temporal information); and (3) Socially-regularized recommender systems.

Item recommendation. Item recommendation usually relies on Collaborative Filtering (CF) to learn from explicit feedback like star-ratings [Ricci et al., 2011]. Although several paradigms for explicit feedback exist, of most relevance to us are model-based methods, including Bayesian methods [Miyahara and Pazzani, 2000] [Breeze et al., 1998], Restricted Boltzmann Machines [Salakhutdinov et al., 2007], and in particular Matrix Factorization (MF) methods (the basis of many state-of-the-art recommendation approaches such as [Bell et al., 2007] [Bennett and Lanning, 2007] [Pатерек, 2007]).

Such models have been extended in order to tackle implicit feedback data where only positive signals (e.g. purchases, clicks, thumbs-up) are observed (i.e., the so-called ‘one-class’ recommendation setting). Most relevant here are pair-wise methods like BPR-MF [Rendle et al., 2009] that make an assumption that positive feedback instances are simply ‘more preferable’ than non-observed feedback. These are the same types of assumptions that have previously been adapted to handle implicit social signals, in systems like SBPR [Zhao et al., 2014].

Sequential recommendation. Markov chains are powerful methods for modeling stochastic transitions; they have been leveraged to model decision processes (e.g. [Shani et al., 2005]) and more generally uncover sequential patterns (e.g. [Zimdars et al., 2001] [Mobasher et al., 2002]). In the sequential recommendation domain, Rendle et al. proposed FPMC that combines MF and (factorized) Markov chains to be able to capture personalization and sequential patterns simultaneously [Rendle et al., 2010b]. Our work follows this thread but extends these ideas by making use of social, in addition to sequential, dynamics.

Social recommendation. In the recommender systems literature, there has been a large body of work that models social networks for mitigating cold-start issues in recommender systems, e.g. [Chaney et al., 2015] [Zhao et al., 2014] [Ma et al., 2009] [Ma et al., 2008] [Guo et al., 2015]. For example, regularization-based methods (e.g. [Jamali and Es‐ ter, 2010] [Ma et al., 2011]) assume that users’ preferences should be similar to those of their social circles. Given the social network information $F_u$ of user $u$, this framework uses regularization to force $u$’s preference factors $\gamma_u$ to be close to those users in $F_u$. Finally, feedback and social regularization are optimized simultaneously. Likewise, joint factorization-based methods (e.g. [Tang et al., 2013]; Ma et al., 2008) try to find a factorization of the social network matrix such that the resulting user representation can be directly used to explain users’ preferences.

Our work differs from such socially-aware recommendation models mainly in that our method is sequentially-aware which not only makes it good at making predictions in a sequential manner—a desirable feature of recommender systems, but also perform well in cold-start settings. On the other hand, we propose to model the impact of the recent activities of a user’s friends on his/her own future activities, instead of assuming the closeness amongst social circles in terms of long-term preferences. In this paper, we also empirically compare against several state-of-the-art socially-aware recommendation methods and demonstrate the effectiveness of modeling such socio-temporal dynamics.

3 The SPMC Model

In this paper, we focus on modeling implicit feedback, e.g. clicks, purchases, or thumbs-up. In addition to the feedback itself, we assume that timestamps are also available for each action, as well as the social relations (or trust relationships) of each user.

Let $U$ denote the user set and $I$ the item set. For each user $u \in U$, we use $I_u$ to denote the set of items toward which the user $u$ has expressed positive feedback. $F_u$ is used to denote the set of users that user $u$ trusts, or the set of $u$’s friends. The objective of our task is to predict the sequential behavior of users given the above information on sparse datasets, where dealing with user cold-start issues is paramount.

Notation used throughout this paper is summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1: Notation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$U, I$</td>
<td>user set, item set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u, i$</td>
<td>user $u \in U$; item $i \in I$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_u^+$</td>
<td>‘positive’ item set for user $u$; $I_u^+ \subseteq I$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_u$</td>
<td>the friend set of user $u$; $F_u \subseteq U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{x}_{u,i,l}$</td>
<td>predicted score $u$ gives to $i$ given last item $l$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_i$</td>
<td>bias term associated with $i$; $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_i$, $\gamma_i^U$</td>
<td>latent factors of $u$; $\gamma^U_i, \gamma_i^L \in \mathbb{R}^{K_1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_i$, $\theta_i^L$</td>
<td>latent factors of item $i$; $\theta_i, \theta_i^L \in \mathbb{R}^{K_2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_i$, $N_i$</td>
<td>latent factors of item $i$; $M_i, N_i \in \mathbb{R}^{K_3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_u$, $V_u$</td>
<td>latent factors of user $u$; $W_u, V_u \in \mathbb{R}^{K_4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_1$, $K_2$, $K_3$</td>
<td>dimensionality of different latent factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Theta$</td>
<td>parameter set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>hyperparameter weighting the influence of the friend set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(\cdot)$</td>
<td>sigmoid function; $\sigma(z) = 1/(1 + e^{-z})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1(\cdot)$</td>
<td>indicator function; $1(b) = 1$ iff $b$ is true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the last item they interacted with \( l \in I_u^+ \), the probability that \( u \) transitions to another item \( i \) is proportional to

\[
\hat{p}_{u,i} = \frac{\langle \gamma_{u,i}^l, \gamma_i^l \rangle + \langle \theta_{u,i}^l, \theta_i^l \rangle}{\sum_{u' \in \mathcal{F}_u} \sigma(\langle W_{u,u'}, V_{u'} \rangle) \cdot \langle M_i, M_{u'} \rangle + \beta_i}, \tag{2}
\]

where the first inner product models the ‘affinity’ between latent user factors \( \gamma_{u,i}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{K_u} \) and latent item factors \( \gamma_i^l \in \mathbb{R}^{K_i} \) and the second models the ‘continuity’ between item \( i \) and the previous item \( l \). \( \theta_{u,i}^l, \theta_i^l \in \mathbb{R}^{K_x} \) are latent representations of item \( i \) and the last item \( l \) respectively.

The above predictor is capable of capturing both personalization and sequential dynamics. However it is unaware of the social signals in the system which are potentially important side information especially in cold-start scenarios. In particular, we argue that the recent actions of a user’s friends could be influential when determining which action a user is likely to perform next.

Our SPMC model is a combination of personalization, sequential dynamics, as well as socio-temporal dynamics. The predictor of our model is simply the sum of three such components (see Eq. (1)), where \( i' \) is the item viewed by one of \( u \)’s friends \( u' \) most recent to \( u \)’s feedback on item \( i \). The inner product of the latent factors of \( i \) and \( i' \) (\( M_i, N_i' \in \mathbb{R}^{K_z} \)) models the impact from friends’ recent actions.

Note that intuitively different friends could have a different amount of impact on a user. Therefore we measure the ‘closeness’ between two users by the inner products of their latent representations \( \langle W_{u,u'}, V_{u'} \rangle \), which are normalized via a sigmoid function \( \sigma(\cdot) \) to be between 0 (no influence) and 1 (high influence).

Finally, a bias term \( \beta_i \in \mathbb{R} \) is added to the formulation to capture the overall popularity of item \( i \). \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \) is a parameter that balances social effects against other factors.

### 3.2 Merging the Embeddings

Our goal is to deal with user cold-start issues (i.e., users who have performed few previous actions), which requires us to reduce the number of parameters to be inferred. To this end, we merge the embeddings in Eq. (1) and obtain the following predictor:

\[
\hat{p}_{u,i} = \frac{\langle \gamma_{u,i}^l, \gamma_i^l \rangle + \langle \theta_{u,i}^l, \theta_i^l \rangle}{\sum_{u' \in \mathcal{F}_u} \sigma(\langle W_{u,u'}, V_{u'} \rangle) \cdot \langle M_i, M_{u'} \rangle + \beta_i}. \tag{3}
\]

Note that the above equation merges (1) \( \theta^l \) and \( \theta^L \) into the same space \( \theta^l \), (2) \( W \) and \( V \) into the same space \( W \), and (3) \( M \) and \( N \) into the same space \( M \). Further merges are possible but avoided here as they empirically resulted in degraded performance, presumably because they sacrifice too much of the model’s expressive power.

### 3.3 Learning the Model

An advantage of SPMC is that the same training framework from FPMC can be used to optimize the personalized total order \( >_{u,l} \). In particular, Maximum a Posteriori (MAP) estimation of our parameters can be formulated as:

\[
\arg \max_{\Theta} \ln \prod_{u \in U} \prod_{i \in I_u} \prod_{j \in I_u^j} p(i >_{u,l} j | \Theta) p(\Theta) \tag{4}
\]

where \( l \) is the item preceding \( i \) in user \( u \)’s feedback sequence. The probability that user \( u \) prefers item \( i \) over item \( j \) given \( u \)’s last item \( l \) is given by

\[
p(i >_{u,l} j | \Theta) = \sigma(x_{u,i,l} - x_{u,j,l}). \tag{5}
\]

The full set of parameters of SPMC is \( \Theta = \{ \beta_i \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma_{u,i}^l, \gamma_i^l, \theta_{u,i}^l, \theta_i^l \}_{u \in U, i \in I_u} \}. \) We uniformly sample from the dataset a user \( u \), a positive item \( i \) and an item \( j \) that is different from the positive item, following the same negative-item selection protocol used in FPMC. Since the last item \( l \) and the relevant actions from the friends \( \mathcal{F}_u \) are determined by the pair \((u,i)\), we can apply standard stochastic gradient ascent to optimize Eq. (4) and update the parameters as

\[
\Theta^{t+1} \leftarrow \Theta^t + \eta \cdot \left( \sigma(x_{u,j,l} - x_{u,i,l}) \frac{\partial (x_{u,i,l} - x_{u,j,l})}{\partial \Theta} - \lambda_{\Theta} \Theta \right), \tag{6}
\]

where \( \eta \) is the learning rate and \( \lambda_{\Theta} \) is a regularization hyper-parameter. For completeness, we list the partial derivative of \( x_{u,i,l} - x_{u,j,l} \) with respect to our parameters in Appendix A.

### 4 Experiments

To fully evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed model, we perform extensive experiments on a series of real-world datasets and compare against state-of-the-art sequentially- and socially-aware methods.

#### 4.1 Datasets

We experiment on four datasets, each comprising a large corpus of user feedback, timestamps, as well as social relations (i.e. ‘trusts’). All datasets are available online.

**Ciao.** Ciao is a review website where users give ratings and opinions on various products. This dataset was crawled by [Tang et al., 2012] from Ciao’s official site[1]. The feedback was given in the month of May, 2011. The dataset is available online[2].


---

**Note:**

\( \mathcal{F}_u \) is the set of friends which interacted with \( u \) in the last \( k \) steps, \( \mathbb{R} \) is the set of all real numbers, and \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is the set of all real vectors of length \( n \).

\( W \) is a \( K_u \times K_u \) matrix, \( V \) is a \( K_i \times K_i \) matrix, \( M \) is a \( K_x \times K_x \) matrix, \( N \) is a \( K_x \times K_x \) matrix, \( \gamma \) is a \( K_u \times 1 \) vector, \( \theta \) is a \( K_x \times 1 \) vector, \( \alpha \) is a \( K_x \times 1 \) vector, \( \beta \) is a \( K_x \times 1 \) vector, \( \sigma(\cdot) \) is the sigmoid function and \( \| \cdot \| \) is the Euclidean norm.

\( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) denotes the inner product of two vectors.

\( \hat{p}_{u,i} \) is the predicted probability that user \( u \) prefers item \( i \) over item \( j \) given \( u \)’s last item \( l \).
Foursquare. This dataset is from Foursquare.com and consists of check-ins of users at different venues, spanning December 2011 to April 2012. While the dataset includes features other than just social and sequential signals (such as geographical data), these are beyond the scope of this paper.

Epinions. Epinions is a popular online consumer review website. Collected by [Zhao et al., 2014], this dataset also contains trust relationships amongst users and spans more than a decade, from January 2001 to November 2013.

Flixster. Flixster is a social movie website where users can rate movies and share their reviews. This dataset is available online.

In our experiments, we treat all observed interactions (i.e., ratings etc.) as positive instances, such that our goal is to rank items that a user would be likely to interact with.

4.2 Evaluation Protocol

The evaluation protocol we adopt is similar to previous works on sequential predictions, e.g. [He et al., 2016]. From each user one positive item $T_u \in N_u$ is held out for testing, and another item $V_u \in \mathbb{N}_{N_u}$ is held out for validation. The test item $T_u$ is chosen to be the most recent item according to user $u$’s feedback history, while the validation item $V_u$ is the second most recent one. The rest of the data is used as the training set. We report the accuracies of all models in terms of the AUC (Area Under the ROC Curve) metric on the test set:

\[
AUC = \frac{1}{|U|} \sum_{u \in U} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_u \setminus \mathcal{I}_u^+|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_u \setminus \mathcal{I}_u^+} 1(\hat{x}_{u,T_u,l_T,u} > \hat{x}_{u,j,l_T,u}),
\]

where $1(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, and $l_T,u$ is the item preceding the test item $T_u$ in $u$’s feedback history.

4.3 Baselines

We compare against state-of-the-art recommendation models, i.e. BPR-MF and FPMC, as well as the socially-aware methods including GBPR and SBPR.

- BPR-MF: This model is described in [Rendle et al., 2009], which is a state-of-the-art matrix factorization method that focuses on modeling user preferences.

- FPMC: This model is described in [Rendle et al., 2010a], which is a state-of-the-art sequential prediction model. It unifies the power of matrix factorization at modeling users’ preferences and the strength of Markov chains at capturing sequential continuity. Its predictor is presented in Eq. (2).

- SBPR: This is a state-of-the-art recommendation model that benefits from modeling social relations. Introduced by [Zhao et al., 2014], the model is based on the assumption that users and their social circles should have similar tastes/preferences towards items.

- GBPR: A well-known model introduced by [Pan and Chen, 2013]. It makes use of group information, where users in a group have positive feedback on the same item.

Note that all methods optimize the AUC metric on the training set and the best hyperparameters are selected with grid search using the validation set.

The above baselines are selected to demonstrate that SPMC can outperform (1) state-of-the-art matrix factorization models that are unaware of sequential and social signals (i.e., BPR-MF); (2) methods that model both user preferences and sequential dynamics but no social signals (i.e., FPMC); and (3) models that are aware of social signals but ignore sequential dynamics (i.e., SBPR and GBPR).

4.4 Performance Analysis

Our goal is to mitigate the user cold-start problem which is present in many real-world datasets. To this end, for each of the four datasets introduced earlier, we obtain a series of user cold-start datasets by varying a threshold $N$. $N$ is the maximum number of recent feedback instances each user can keep in his/her feedback history. In other words, if the number of user $u$’s observed interactions exceeds the threshold $N$ in the original dataset, only the most recent $N$ instances will be kept. The threshold $N$ is no less than 4 since we need at least 4 feedback instances for a user to form a sequence in the training set. This protocol allows us to measure the performance improvements as the level of ‘coolness’ varies.

For fair comparison, we set the dimensions of latent factors in all models to 20, i.e., for SPMC $K_1 = K_2 = K_3 = 20$. Empirically, using larger dimensionality did not yield significant improvements for any of the methods being compared, presumably because these datasets are sparse and a large number of parameters would be unaffordable. We experimented with learning rates $\eta \in \{0.5, 0.05, 0.005\}$ and regularization hyperparameters $\lambda \in \{1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$, selecting the values that resulted in the best performance on the validation set. We set $\alpha = 1$ for all datasets (the sensitivity of $\alpha$ will be discussed later). For GBPR, the group size is set to 3 and $\rho$ is set to 0.8. We implemented SBPR-2 as described in the original paper [Zhao et al., 2014].

Table 3 shows the average AUCs of all models on the test sets as we vary the threshold $N$. We give the percentage improvement of our model over FPMC as well as the best performing baselines in the last two columns of this table. Figure 3 shows the trends of average AUCs with the thresholds. From these results, we find that:

If the number of $u$’s feedback instances is less than the threshold $N$, all the feedback will be used.
Figure 3: Average AUCs on Ciao, Foursquare, Epinions and Flixster as dataset sparsity varies. The x-axis is the threshold $N$ controlling the amount of feedback used. Each dataset is filtered according to $N$, resulting in datasets where the amount of feedback per user does not exceed the threshold. Dashed green lines show the average number of social relations for the users, while dashed red lines show the average amount of feedback used. Each dataset is filtered according to settings.

- As shown in Table 3 in very cold settings where thresholds are set to 5, SPMC always outperforms baselines.
- Figure 3 and Table 5 both show that SPMC can outperform other models in cold-start regions (e.g. threshold from 5 to 10) on most datasets.
- Figure 3 also shows that SPMC can significantly outperform other baselines on Foursquare and Epinions even when the threshold is set to large values. By comparing Foursquare and Epinions with the other datasets, we can see that the average number of items per user is comparatively much lower on these two datasets. This means that the majority of users on Foursquare and Epinions are actually ‘cold’ and thus they favor models that are strong in handling such cases.
- SPMC can always outperform state-of-the-art socially-unaware sequential method—FPMC. This means that it is important to model social signals in order to benefit from such auxiliary information especially in cold-start settings.

In conclusion, by combining personalization, sequential dynamics, and socio-temporal information carefully, our proposed model SPMC considerably outperforms all baselines that model these signals in isolation in user cold-start settings.

4.5 Convergence

We proceed by demonstrating comparison of convergence rates of all methods on the four datasets. Figure 4 shows the AUCs of SPMC and baselines on the test sets when the thresholds are set to 5. As we can see from this figure, the convergence efficiency of SPMC is comparable to all baselines (converging in fewer than 100 iterations), although it is the integration of multiple sources of signals and is comparatively complicated in its form.

4.6 Sensitivity

Next we demonstrate the sensitivity of SPMC to different hyperparameters. Figure 5 shows the changes in AUC of SPMC.

Note that each training iteration (of all methods) is a sweep of all positive feedback in the training set.
In this paper, we proposed a new method, SPMC, to improve the performance of collaborative filtering methods. The best performing method is boldfaced (higher is better).

Table 3: AUCs of all models on the test sets as the threshold \(N\) varies. The last two columns compare SPMC to FPMC as well as the best performing baseline. The best performing method is boldfaced (higher is better).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Threshold ((N))</th>
<th>(a) BPR-MF</th>
<th>(b) FPMC</th>
<th>(c) SBPR</th>
<th>(d) GBPR</th>
<th>(e) SPMC</th>
<th>Improvement (e vs. b)</th>
<th>Improvement (e vs. best)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciao</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.504614</td>
<td>0.491940</td>
<td>0.509185</td>
<td>0.507940</td>
<td>0.593383</td>
<td>20.62%</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.576186</td>
<td>0.551231</td>
<td>0.548679</td>
<td>0.584891</td>
<td>0.588934</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.610123</td>
<td>0.569248</td>
<td>0.562466</td>
<td>0.612324</td>
<td>0.591179</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>-3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foursquare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.878899</td>
<td>0.848644</td>
<td>0.870693</td>
<td>0.877121</td>
<td>0.887596</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.888771</td>
<td>0.876997</td>
<td>0.883340</td>
<td>0.881735</td>
<td>0.909859</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.890104</td>
<td>0.878499</td>
<td>0.889350</td>
<td>0.883149</td>
<td>0.911066</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epinions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.514541</td>
<td>0.503011</td>
<td>0.525640</td>
<td>0.515770</td>
<td>0.595317</td>
<td>18.35%</td>
<td>13.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.532994</td>
<td>0.519503</td>
<td>0.526204</td>
<td>0.544611</td>
<td>0.589500</td>
<td>13.47%</td>
<td>8.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.545447</td>
<td>0.527076</td>
<td>0.538011</td>
<td>0.540879</td>
<td>0.580287</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flixster</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.898370</td>
<td>0.887483</td>
<td>0.894095</td>
<td>0.897095</td>
<td>0.904164</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.929493</td>
<td>0.927250</td>
<td>0.939176</td>
<td>0.929899</td>
<td>0.939046</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: AUCs on the four datasets achieved by SPMC as we vary the hyperparameter \(\alpha\). Note that \(\alpha\) seems to be the best when it is around 1.0, which essentially means that we are simply averaging the impacts from all friends.

Conclusion

By combining different sources of signals carefully, our method beats state-of-the-art recommendation methods especially in user cold-start settings. We evaluated our model on four large, real-world datasets—Ciao, Foursquare, Epinions, and Flixster. Our experiments demonstrate that the model is capable of taking different levels of cold-start issues.

Appendix A

Partial derivatives of \(\hat{x}_{u,i,t} - \hat{x}_{u,j,t}\) with respect to our parameters are given by:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_i} = 1; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_j} = -1
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i^U} = \gamma_i^U; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_j^U} = -\gamma_j^U; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_i^I} = \gamma_i^I - \gamma_j^I
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i^I} = \theta_i^I; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_j^I} = -\theta_j^I; \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_i^J} = \theta_i^J - \theta_j^J
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial M_i} = \frac{2}{[F_u]^{\alpha}} \sum_{u \in F_u,i} \sigma ((W_u, W_{u'})) \cdot M_{i'}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial M_j} = \frac{2}{[F_u]^{\alpha}} \sum_{u \in F_u,j} \sigma ((W_u, W_{u'})) \cdot M_{i'}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial M_{i'}} = \frac{2}{[F_u]^{\alpha}} \sigma ((W_u, W_{u'})) \cdot (M_{i} - M_{j})
\]

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial W_{u'}} = \frac{2}{[F_u]^{\alpha}} \sum_{u \in F_u,u'} \sigma'((W_u, W_{u'})) \cdot (M_{i} - M_{j}, M_{i'}, W_u)
\]

where \(\sigma'(z)\) is the derivative of the sigmoid function, i.e., \(\sigma(z) \cdot \sigma(-z)\).
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