

Weighted-SVD: Matrix Factorization with Weights on the Latent Factors

Hung-Hsuan Chen

hhchen@ncu.edu.tw

Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering
National Central University

November 24, 2021

Abstract

The Matrix Factorization models, sometimes called the latent factor models, are a family of methods in the recommender system research area to (1) generate the latent factors for the users and the items and (2) predict users' ratings on items based on their latent factors. However, current Matrix Factorization models presume that all the latent factors are equally weighted, which may not always be a reasonable assumption in practice. In this paper, we propose a new model, called Weighted-SVD, to integrate the linear regression model with the SVD model such that each latent factor accompanies with a corresponding weight parameter. This mechanism allows the latent factors have different weights to influence the final ratings. The complexity of the Weighted-SVD model is slightly larger than the SVD model but much smaller than the SVD++ model. We compared the Weighted-SVD model with several latent factor models on five public datasets based on the Root-Mean-Squared-Errors (RMSEs). The results show that the Weighted-SVD model outperforms the baseline methods in all the experimental datasets under almost all settings.

1 Introduction

Recommender systems are widely used in modern days [Liu et al.(2010), Huang et al.(2014), Chen et al.(2011), Chen et al.(2015), Tang et al.(2008)]. Among various techniques in recommender systems, Matrix Factorization (MF), also known as the latent factor model, is one popular family of methods to predict users' preferences on items based on users' historical

actions on the items. Compared to the traditional collaborative filtering approaches, which typically based on the concept of k -nearest-neighbors, MF discovers the vector of the latent factors for each user i and each item j and assumes that their interaction (i.e., the inner-dot operation) influences i 's final rating on j . Additionally, MF can incorporate other information, such as user i 's bias and item j 's bias, the implicit feedback of i on j , and the temporal dynamics, to improve the quality of the predictions [Koren(2008), Koren et al.(2009), Mnih and Salakhutdinov(2008)]. Moreover, we may apply various optimization techniques, such as stochastic gradient descent (SGD), AdaGrad, Adam, or Nadam, to obtain the latent factors and other parameters. As a result, MF and its extensions are efficient, effective, easy to implement, and domain-independent.

Despite of the various advantages, we found that MF-based approaches have one fundamental assumption that might be too naïve – each latent factor has equal influence power to the final rating. Although we cannot ensure the essential meaning of each latent factor, it seems more possible that some latent factors have larger impacts to users' preferences on items compared to the other latent factors. This motivates us to develop the Weighted-SVD (WSVD) model, which integrates the linear regression model with the SVD model, a popular method in the family of the latent factor models. The WSVD model assigns a weight parameter to each latent factor. During the training process, WSVD learns not only the latent factors for users and items but also the corresponding weights of the hidden factors. We conducted extensive comparison on the WSVD model with several latent factor models as baselines – the SVD model, the SVD++ model, and the PMF (Probabilistic Matrix Factorization) model. We found that the WSVD model outperforms all the baselines under all the experimental datasets, including three MovieLens datasets (MovieLens-100K, MovieLens-1M, MovieLens-10M), FilmTrust dataset, and the Epinions dataset. Additionally, we compared various settings of the hyper-parameters on various latent factor models based on the MovieLens-100K dataset. The results demonstrate that WSVD consistently beat the other methods under different settings.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show the formulation of the WSVD model, the parameter learning process, and the complexity of the model. Section 3 reports the experiments to compare the prediction performance and the training time of WSVD and other methods. Section 4 shows the related works on recommender systems and latent factor models. Finally, we discuss the limitations of WSVD and future research directions in Section 5.

2 Methodology

This section shows the WSVD formula, the learning process, the algorithm of the WSVD model, and analyze the complexity of the WSVD model.

2.1 Preliminaries

The simplest rating prediction method is probably the average model – setting each un-rated score as the average of all the known ratings. Thus, the average model set \hat{r}_{ij} the predicted rating of user i on item j as $\hat{r}_{ij} = \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{K}} r_{xy} / |\mathcal{K}|$, in which r_{ij} is the rating of user i on item j , \mathcal{K} is the set of all known (i.e., rated) (user, item) pairs, and $|\mathcal{K}|$ is the size of the set \mathcal{K} , i.e., the number of rated pairs.

The bias model enhances the average model by adding the user and the item biases. A user who tends to rate scores higher than average would have a positive user bias. Similarly, an item has a positive item bias if the received ratings are usually higher than average. Equation 1 shows the formula of the bias model.

$$\hat{r}_{ij} = \bar{r} + b_i^{(U)} + b_j^{(I)}, \quad (1)$$

in which \bar{r} is the average of all the rated scores, $b_i^{(U)}$ is the user bias of user i , and $b_j^{(I)}$ is the item bias of item j . Specifically, $b_i^{(U)}$ is set as user i 's average ratings on items subtracts \bar{r} the average scores of all known ratings, and $b_j^{(I)}$ is set as the average ratings received by the item j subtracts \bar{r} . Thus, the bias model includes each user's rating tendency (i.e., tend to over-rate or under-rate the items) and each item's overall quality compared to other items (i.e., an item tends to receive ratings higher or lower than the average).

The SVD model introduced in [Koren(2008)] further improves the bias model by introducing the inner-product term of user's and item's latent factors. Specifically, a user i is associated with \mathbf{p}_i a vector of user i 's latent factors, and an item j is associated with \mathbf{q}_j a vector of item j 's latent factors. Both \mathbf{p}_i and \mathbf{q}_j are column vectors of size k , which represents the number of the latent factors and needs to be specified beforehand. The model presumes that the product of each latent factor in \mathbf{p}_i and the corresponding latent factor in \mathbf{q}_j also affects user i 's ratings on item j , as shown in Equation 2.

$$\hat{r}_{ij} = \bar{r} + b_i^{(U)} + b_j^{(I)} + \mathbf{p}_i^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j. \quad (2)$$

The SVD model can further be improved by including the implicit feedback, users' features, temporal dynamics, etc. Many of these techniques are

discussed in [Koren et al.(2009)]. Here we introduce the SVD++ model – a model incorporates the implicit feedback that indirectly reveals users’ opinions on the items. Equation 3 shows the equation to predict user i ’s rating on item j .

$$\hat{r}_{ij} = \bar{r} + b_i^{(U)} + b_j^{(I)} + \mathbf{q}_j^T \cdot \left(\mathbf{p}_i + |R^{(U)}(i)|^{-1/2} \sum_{g \in R^{(U)}(i)} \mathbf{y}_g \right), \quad (3)$$

where $R^{(U)}(i)$ returns the implicit feedback (i.e., the set of rated items) from user i , and $\mathbf{y}_g \in R^{k \times 1}$ denotes the latent factors of item g . The idea of incorporating the implicit feedback is that users’ implicit feedback on the items (e.g., browsed an item or rated an item) should also reflect her preferences on the target item j . The interaction between the implicit feedback and the target item j is again modeled by the inner product of their corresponding latent factors. Since the number of a user’s implicit feedback is often much larger, SVD++ introduces a normalization term $|R^{(U)}(i)|^{-1/2}$ so that the latent factors of the implicit feedback will not dominate the result.

2.2 The Weighted-SVD model

The SVD model essentially assumes that each latent factor has equal weight, which may not always be a reasonable assumption. For example, to predict users’ ratings on the movies, the latent factor that (implicitly) represents the genre of a movie is probably more important than the latent factor that represents the number of actors/actresses in the movie. Unfortunately, the simple inner product operation in Equation 2 and Equation 3 cannot assign different weights to different latent factors. This motivates the Weighted-SVD (WSVD) model, which introduces the weights of each latent factor into the model, as shown in Equation 4.

$$\hat{r}_{ij} = \bar{r} + b_i^{(U)} + b_j^{(I)} + (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{w} \in R^{k \times 1}$ is the vector of weights of the latent factors, and the \odot operator denotes the Hadamard product (i.e., element-wise multiplication) on the two column vectors \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{p}_i .

Compared with the SVD model, in the Weighted-SVD model each latent factor is multiplied by a weight. Thus, different latent factors have distinct weights to influence user i ’s rating on item j .

Algorithm 1: The Weighted-SVD learning model based on SGD

Data: The rated (user, item) pairs \mathcal{K} , the regularization coefficients $\lambda = (\lambda_w, \lambda_p, \lambda_q, \lambda_U, \lambda_I)$, the learning rates $\eta = (\eta_w, \eta_p, \eta_q, \eta_U, \eta_I)$, the learning decay rate γ
Result: Model parameters $\Theta = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{b}^{(U)}, \mathbf{b}^{(I)})$
1 $\mathbf{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}); \mathbf{Q} \leftarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}); \mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{b}^{(U)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{b}^{(I)} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}; epoch \leftarrow 0;$
2 **repeat**
3 **for** $(i, j) \in \mathcal{K}$ **do**
4 $b_i^{(U)} \leftarrow b_i^{(U)} - \gamma^{epoch} \eta_U \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial b_i^{(U)}}$ (based on Equation 6);
5 $b_j^{(I)} \leftarrow b_j^{(I)} - \gamma^{epoch} \eta_I \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial b_j^{(I)}}$ (based on Equation 7);
6 $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{w} - \gamma^{epoch} \eta_w \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{w}}$ (based on Equation 8);
7 $\mathbf{p}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{p}_i - \gamma^{epoch} \eta_p \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{p}_i}$ (based on Equation 9);
8 $\mathbf{q}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{q}_j - \gamma^{epoch} \eta_q \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{q}_j}$ (based on Equation 10);
9 **end**
10 $epoch \leftarrow epoch + 1;$
11 **until** *termination condition is met;*

2.2.1 Learning the Weighted-SVD model

The learning process can be modeled as an optimization problem: obtaining the parameters Θ that minimize the loss function \mathcal{L} , which can be defined by Equation 5.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\Theta) &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{K}} (r_{ij} - \hat{r}_{ij})^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\Theta\|_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{K}} \left(r_{ij} - \left(\bar{r} + b_i^{(U)} + b_j^{(I)} + (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\lambda_w}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2 + \frac{\lambda_p}{2} \|\mathbf{P}\|_2 + \frac{\lambda_q}{2} \|\mathbf{Q}\|_2 + \frac{\lambda_U}{2} \|\mathbf{b}^{(U)}\|_2 + \frac{\lambda_I}{2} \|\mathbf{b}^{(I)}\|_2 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where r_{ij} is the real rating of user i on item j , $\mathbf{P} = [\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m]^T \in R^{m \times k}$, $\mathbf{Q} = [\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \mathbf{q}_n] \in R^{k \times n}$, $\mathbf{b}^{(U)} = [b_1^{(U)}, b_2^{(U)}, \dots, b_m^{(U)}]^T \in R^{m \times 1}$, $\mathbf{b}^{(I)} = [b_1^{(I)}, b_2^{(I)}, \dots, b_n^{(I)}]^T \in R^{n \times 1}$, $\Theta = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{b}^{(U)}, \mathbf{b}^{(I)})$ is the set of unknown parameters to learn, $\lambda = (\lambda_w, \lambda_p, \lambda_q, \lambda_U, \lambda_I)$ is the set of the regularization

coefficients, m and n are the number of users and items respectively, and k is the pre-defined number of latent factors. The Frobenius norm ($\|\cdot\|_2$) is used on the parameters for regularization.

We apply the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) approach to obtain the parameters. Let $\mathbf{w} = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k]^T$, $\mathbf{p}_i = [p_{i1}, p_{i2}, \dots, p_{ik}]^T$, and $\mathbf{q}_j = [q_{1j}, q_{2j}, \dots, q_{kj}]^T$, the partial derivatives of the loss function with respect to the parameters based on user i 's rating on item j are given in Equation 6 to Equation 10.

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial b_i^{(U)}} = - \left(r_{ij} - \bar{r} - b_i^{(U)} - b_j^{(I)} - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) + \lambda_U b_i^{(U)} \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial b_j^{(I)}} = - \left(r_{ij} - \bar{r} - b_i^{(U)} - b_j^{(I)} - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) + \lambda_I b_j^{(I)} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{w}} = - \left(r_{ij} - \bar{r} - b_i^{(U)} - b_j^{(I)} - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) (\mathbf{p}_i \odot \mathbf{q}_j) + \lambda_w \mathbf{w} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{p}_i} = - \left(r_{ij} - \bar{r} - b_i^{(U)} - b_j^{(I)} - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{q}_j) + \lambda_p \mathbf{p}_i \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\Theta)}{\partial \mathbf{q}_j} = - \left(r_{ij} - \bar{r} - b_i^{(U)} - b_j^{(I)} - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i)^T \cdot \mathbf{q}_j \right) (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{p}_i) + \lambda_q \mathbf{q}_j \quad (10)$$

Algorithm 1 shows the training algorithm based on SGD. The algorithm iterates over each (user, item) pair in \mathcal{K} and updates the parameters for multiple epochs until the termination condition (e.g., the parameters are converged, or the number of epochs reaches a specified threshold) is met.

2.2.2 Analysis of the Weighted-SVD model and the related methods

This section analyzes the number of learnable parameters of the WSVD, SVD, SVD++, and the PMF model along with their training costs.

For the PMF model, each user i is associated with a vector of latent factors \mathbf{p}_i of size k , and each item j is associated with a vector of latent factors \mathbf{q}_j of size k . Thus, the total number of learnable parameters is $mk + nk$.

In the SVD model, in addition to the vectors of latent factors for all the users and all the items, each user i also has a user bias $b_i^{(U)}$, and each item j has an item bias $b_j^{(I)}$. Therefore, the total number of parameters needs to learn is $m(k+1) + n(k+1)$.

In the Weighted-SVD model, in addition to the above parameters, each latent factor is also associated with a weight parameter. Therefore, the number of parameters need to learn becomes $m(k+1) + n(k+1) + k$. Since $k \ll m$ and $k \ll n$ in most settings, the parameters to learn in the Weighted-SVD model is only slightly larger than the original SVD model.

Another related model, SVD++, requires to learn not only $b_i^{(U)}$, $b_j^{(I)}$, \mathbf{p}_i , and \mathbf{q}_j for all user i and item j , but also \mathbf{y}_g the latent factors of the item g that the user i had rated (i.e., the implicit feedback). Even if each item only associates with one type of implicit feedback, the total number of parameters needs to learn is $m(k+1) + n(k+1) + nk$, which is much larger than the number of parameters in the SVD and the Weighted-SVD model. As a result, SVD++ may require a much larger dataset or stronger regularization terms to prevent overfitting.

We use Algorithm 1 to explain the required training time of the WSVD model. The parameter updating procedure, based on one observed rating r_{ij} , is shown from line 4 to line 8. Since the number of latent factors is usually not large, typically dozens to hundreds, the processing time of each parameter update is short. In addition, the algorithm typically takes only dozens of epochs for the parameters to converge. As a result, the required training time of the WSVD model grows linearly with the number of known ratings. For a similar reason, the training time of the SVD and the PMF models also grows linearly with the training data size. However, the running time of the SVD++ model grows super-linearly with the size of the dataset. This is because for each rating r_{ij} the SVD++ model needs to update not only the biases and the latent factors of user i and item j , but also the latent factors of user i 's rated items. As more ratings are available, the number of the items rated by user i may increase super-linearly. As a result, the computation time would dramatically rise.

3 Experiments

3.1 Experimental data and settings

We compared the Weighted-SVD model with several Matrix Factorization methods, including the PMF, SVD, and the SVD++ models [Mnih and Salakhutdinov(2008),

Table 1: Statistics of the experimental datasets

Dataset	# users	# items	# ratings	Density	Rating Scale
MovieLens-100K	943	1,682	100,000	6.3047%	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
MovieLens-1M	6,040	3,704	1,000,209	4.4684%	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
MovieLens-10M	69,878	10,677	10,000,054	1.3403%	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
FilmTrust	1,508	2,071	35,497	1.1366%	[0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4]
Epinions	40,163	139,738	664,824	0.0118%	[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

Koren(2008), Koren et al.(2009)]. We used the hyper-parameters suggested in [Ricci et al.(2015)]: for SVD, the initial learning rates are set to 0.005 and the regularization terms are set to 0.02; for SVD++, the initial learning rates are set to 0.007 and the regularization terms for the biases, latent factors, and implicit latent factors are set to 0.005, 0.015, and 0.015 respectively. The hyper-parameters for WSVD and PMF are the same as SVD. The learning decay rates, if required, are set to 0.9 in all models. We set the number of latent factors to 15.

We used the following datasets as experimental data: (1) MovieLens-100K [Harper and Konstan(2016)], (2) MovieLens-1M [Harper and Konstan(2016)], (3) MovieLens-10M [Harper and Konstan(2016)], (4) FilmTrust [Guo et al.(2013)], (5) Epinions [Massa and Avesani(2007)]. Statistics of these datasets are shown in Table 1. For each dataset, we took 80% of the ratings as the training data and the rest 20% of the ratings as the test data.

3.2 Comparing the prediction errors

We used the RMSE scores to compare different methods. The results are shown in Table 2. As highlighted, the SVD++ model performs best (i.e., the lowest RMSE score) for each of the training dataset. This is not surprising since the SVD++ model contains much more learnable parameters. Compared to the SVD model, the WSVD model slightly increases the number of learnable parameters. However, the test RMSE of the WSVD model is lower than the other models in all the experimented datasets. This suggests that assigning different weight values to different latent factors probably make the model closer to the real scenario. The performance of the PMF model is acceptable in the training data but much worse on the test data. This is probably because the PMF model does not include the average ratings, the user bias, and the test bias, which could be critical clues in the preference prediction task.

Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the training

Table 2: A comparison of the RMSEs of the latent factor models on several datasets

		WSVD	SVD	SVD++	PMF
MovieLens-100K	Training	0.9246	0.8912	0.8579	0.9326
	Test	0.9430	1.3076	1.2622	1.4109
MovieLens-1M	Training	0.8964	0.8739	0.8600	0.8761
	Test	0.9921	0.9927	0.9947	3.7888
MovieLens-10M	Training	0.8569	0.8532	0.8498	0.8530
	Test	0.9470	0.9472	0.9486	3.6673
FilmTrust	Training	0.7704	0.7635	0.7194	1.1306
	Test	0.8899	0.8935	0.8947	3.1617
Epinions	Training	0.9970	0.9654	0.8468	2.2092
	Test	1.0928	1.1072	1.1037	4.2170

and the test RMSE scores of the compared methods on the five experimental datasets as the number of epoch increases. As shown, the training and the test RMSE scores of all the methods on all the datasets gradually decrease and converge. In most cases, the RMSE scores converges in 10 to 20 epochs. Note that we do not include the performance of the PMF model in the figures, since it performs much worse than the other methods, as shown in Table 2. The WSVD model performs best in terms of the test RMSE score almost through the entire process on all the experimental datasets.

3.3 Comparing different hyper-parameters

In this section, we show the performance of various latent factor models based on different hyper-parameter values to ensure that the WSVD model performs consistently better than the other latent factor models. We modify two important hyper-parameters (k the number of latent factors and λ the regularization term) to several values and observe the corresponding RMSE scores. Specifically, we set the number of hidden factors to 10, 20, 40, and 80, and the regularization term to 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, and 1. We report the test RMSE scores on the MovieLens-100K dataset.

Table 3 shows the test RMSE scores of the four latent factor models under different hyper-parameter settings. Here are our observations. First, in all our tried hyper-parameter settings, WSVD outperforms the other models in terms of the test RMSE scores. This shows the effectiveness and generality of the WSVD model. Second, the PMF model always performs the worst. This is probably because PMF model does not incorporate the



Figure 1: The relationship between the RMSE scores and the epochs using the MovieLens-100K data.






Figure 2: The relationship between the RMSE scores and the epochs using the MovieLens-1M data.

average rating and the biases of the users and the items. Third, the RMSEs becomes larger as the value of k increases from 10, 20, 40, to 80. This seems to suggest that the number of latent factors to influence the ratings on the MovieLens-100K dataset is a small number. However, WSVD was influenced minimally among the compared methods. We will further discuss this observation in Section 3.4 Fourth, as the value of λ increases from 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, to 1, the test RMSEs of SVD and SVD++ decreases, but the test RMSEs of the WSVD model increases. This implies that we need to apply a larger regularization term to the SVD and SVD++ models to prevent the overfitting problem.



(a) The RMSE scores of the training data. (b) The RMSE scores of the test data.

Figure 3: The relationship between the RMSE scores and the epochs using the MovieLens-10M data.



(a) The RMSE scores of the training data. (b) The RMSE scores of the test data.

Figure 4: The relationship between the RMSE scores and the epochs using the FilmTrust data.


3.4 Learned weights

We report the learned weights of the latent factors in this section. We used the MovieLens-100K as the experimental dataset.

Figure 6 exhibits the learning process of the 15 weights on the 15 latent factors as the epoch goes from 1 to 50. To show the relative importance of each latent factor, we compute the relative importance r_i of each weight w_i by Equation 11.

$$r_i = w_i / \min_{\forall j} (|w_j|) \quad (11)$$

Table 4 lists the relative importance of the latent factors. As demonstrated, the important latent factors could be tens to hundreds of times



(a) The RMSE scores of the training data. (b) The RMSE scores of the test data.

Figure 5: The relationship between the RMSE scores and the epochs using the Epinions data.

more influential than the less important latent factors. This probably explains one observation in Section 3.3 – the RMSE scores become much worse as the value of k grows from 10, 20, 40, to 80 for the SVD, SVD++, and the PMF model, but the increment of the RMSE scores of the WSVD model (as k increases) is milder. Since the WSVD model automatically shrinks the influence of several latent factors, increasing the number of latent factors may have smaller impact on the overall performance.

3.5 Empirical training time

This section lists the empirical training time of the four compared methods. We used the MovieLens-100K, MovieLens-1M, and the MovieLens-10M as the benchmark datasets. All the experiments reported in this subsection were performed on a single computer with the Intel i7-6700 CPU 3.4GHz and 64GB RAM. The OS is Ubuntu Linux 16.04. We implemented all the methods in Python 3.6.2.

Table 5 lists the empirical training time. As shown, the training time of the WSVD, SVD, and the PMF models grows linearly with the size of the dataset, and the training time of the SVD++ model grows super-linearly with the size of the dataset. The empirical training periods of all the compared models follow our expectation, as analyzed in Section 2.2.2.




Figure 6: Weights vs epochs (using the MovieLens-100K dataset)

4 Related work

Recommender systems usually aim to solve one of the two types of tasks: the top- k recommendation task and the user preference prediction task.

For the top- k recommendation task, the recommender system is expected to suggest the k items that best fit the target user’s current needs based on various clues, such as the property of the user, the property the items, users’ previous interactions with the items, and the context information.

As for the preference prediction task, the system targets at predicting users’ preferences on *all* items. Thus, one may claim that the top- k recommendation is a subset problem of the preference prediction task, since we may always recommend the top- k items based on the preference scores of all items. However, [Cremonesi et al.(2010)] showed that utilizing the preference prediction task to perform the top- k recommendation may result in sub-optimal recommendations, because minimizing the preference of *all* ratings may not necessarily improve the precision of the top- k prediction. Therefore, we may require different types of methods to address the two types of tasks.

The preference prediction task becomes popular since the Netflix prize [Bennett, Lanning(2007), Bell and Koren(2007)], which is a challenge to predict users’ ratings on films. This competition popularized the family of the Matrix Factorization approaches, which generates the latent factors for each user and each item

and predict the preferences based on the inner product of the latent factors. The SVD model, SVD++ model, PMF model, and NMF (Non-Negative Matrix Factorization) model [Mnih and Salakhutdinov(2008), Koren(2008), Koren et al.(2009), Lee and Seung(2001)] are the typical representatives of this type of approach. In this paper, we did not include the NMF model into the experiments because in practice its performance on the preference prediction task is usually worse than the others [Kumar(2009)].

Since the preference score is a real number, some may argue that the preference prediction task can be modeled as a regression task. However, generating the features based on purely on the known ratings r_{ij} is not straightforward [Ma(2008)]. Recently, [Rendle(2010)] proposed Factorization Machines (FM) that models the interaction of the factorized parameters. As a result, the FM model can process the dataset that involves pairs of IDs (e.g., the user ID i and the item ID j) that produce sparse interactions (e.g., the rating r_{ij}). Therefore, many Matrix Factorization approaches are special cases of the Factorization Machines. [Juan et al.(2016)] proposed the Field-aware Factorization Machines (FFM) to further generalize the Factorization Machines such that the interactions among more than two IDs can be included into the model.

5 Discussion and future work

This paper proposed Weighted-SVD, a method to assign different weights to the latent factors generated by the SVD model. We showed the algorithms to learn the user biases, item biases, the latent factor vectors for users and items, and, perhaps more importantly, the weights of the latent factors. We found that, compared to several MF approaches, such a method can better predict users' preferences on items, based on the experiments on several open datasets. In addition, based on the learned weights, the relative importance of the significant latent factors could be tens to hundreds of times more influential than the less significant factors, which suggests previous MF methods probably over-simplified the scenario. Since the weights on the less important latent factors may shrink during the training, we may set the number of the latent factors to a large number and let the model automatically discover the appropriate dimensions of the latent factors. This could be very beneficial, since deciding an appropriate number of latent factor requires trial and error by the other MF approaches. We compared the model complexity and the training time of several MF approaches. The training time of the Weighted-SVD model is only slightly larger than the

SVD model, but the time complexity of training for both the Weighted-SVD and the SVD models both grow linearly with the training size.

While we mainly discussed to extend the SVD model into weighted-SVD in this paper, the weighting approach is very general. Therefore, we may apply the same technique to other MF methods, such as the SVD++ model and the PMF model.

So far we assume that each hidden factor is independent from the other factors. However, such an assumption may not always be correct. We are interested to investigate the approaches to include the dependency among the factors and the weighting technique. One possible direction is to integrate the Factorization Machines with the weighting technique.

The current MF approaches model the interaction between a user’s latent factors and an item’s latent factors by the inner product operation. However, it is possible that they are interacted in a different manner (e.g., with a series of higher order operations). Therefore, we are interested in designing and experimenting different types of operations among the latent factors. Deep learning and kernel methods are possible candidates.

Finally, we will open source a toolkit for the Weighted-SVD model so that the research community of the recommender systems can be benefited.

References

- [Bell and Koren(2007)] Robert M Bell and Yehuda Koren. Lessons from the netflix prize challenge. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 9(2): 75–79, 2007.
- [Bennett, Lanning(2007)] James Bennett, Stan Lanning. The netflix prize. In *Proceedings of KDD Cup and Workshop*, volume 2007, page 35. New York, NY, USA, 2007.
- [Chen et al.(2011)] Hung-Hsuan Chen, Liang Gou, Xiaolong Zhang, and C. Lee Giles. CollabSeer: a search engine for collaboration discovery. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual International ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, pages 231–240, Ottawa, Canada, 2011. ACM.
- [Chen et al.(2015)] Hung-Hsuan Chen, Alexander G. Ororbia II, and C. Lee Giles. ExpertSeer: a keyword based expert recommender for digital libraries. *arXiv:1511.02058*, 2015.

- [Cremonesi et al.(2010)] Paolo Cremonesi, Yehuda Koren, and Roberto Turrin. Performance of recommender algorithms on top-n recommendation tasks. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 39–46. ACM, 2010.
- [Guo et al.(2013)] G. Guo, J. Zhang, and N. Yorke-Smith. A novel bayesian similarity measure for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 2619–2625, 2013.
- [Harper and Konstan(2016)] F. Maxwell Harper and Joseph A. Konstan. The movielens datasets: History and context. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, 5(4):19, 2016.
- [Huang et al.(2014)] Wenyi Huang, Zhaohui Wu, Prasenjit Mitra, and C. Lee Giles. RefSeer: a citation recommendation system. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, pages 371–374, London, UK, 2014. IEEE Press.
- [Juan et al.(2016)] Yuchin Juan, Yong Zhuang, Wei-Sheng Chin, and Chih-Jen Lin. Field-aware factorization machines for ctr prediction. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 43–50. ACM, 2016.
- [Koren(2008)] Yehuda Koren. Factorization meets the neighborhood: a multifaceted collaborative filtering model. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 426–434. ACM, 2008.
- [Koren et al.(2009)] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *IEEE Computer*, 42(8), 2009.
- [Kumar(2009)] Aswani Ch Kumar. Analysis of unsupervised dimensionality reduction techniques. *Computer science and information systems*, 6(2): 217–227, 2009.
- [Lee and Seung(2001)] Daniel D Lee and H Sebastian Seung. Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 556–562, 2001.
- [Liu et al.(2010)] Jiahui Liu, Peter Dolan, and Elin Rønby Pedersen. Personalized news recommendation based on click behavior. In *Proceed-*

- ings of the 15th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pages 31–40, Hong Kong, China, 2010. ACM.
- [Ma(2008)] Chih-Chao Ma. A guide to singular value decomposition for collaborative filtering, 2008.
- [Massa and Avesani(2007)] Paolo Massa and Paolo Avesani. Trust-aware recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 17–24. ACM, 2007.
- [Mnih and Salakhutdinov(2008)] Andriy Mnih and Ruslan R. Salakhutdinov. Probabilistic matrix factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1257–1264, 2008.
- [Rendle(2010)] Steffen Rendle. Factorization machines. In *The 10th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 995–1000. IEEE, 2010.
- [Ricci et al.(2015)] Francesco Ricci, Lior Rokach, Bracha Shapira, and Paul B Kantor. *Recommender systems handbook*. Springer, 2015.
- [Tang et al.(2008)] Jie Tang, Jing Zhang, Limin Yao, Juanzi Li, Li Zhang, and Zhong Su. Arnetminer: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 990–998, Las Vegas, USA, 2008. ACM.

Table 3: Performance comparison with different hyper-parameters (using the Movielens-100K dataset)

Hyper-parameters		Test RMSE scores			
k	λ	WSVD	SVD	SVD++	PMF
10	0.001	0.9903	1.6765	1.6898	3.0223
10	0.005	0.9909	1.6852	1.6404	3.0990
10	0.01	0.9904	1.6672	1.6264	3.0204
10	0.05	0.9918	1.6400	1.6225	3.0919
10	0.1	0.9924	1.5816	1.5724	3.0098
10	0.5	1.0038	1.3315	1.3187	3.1695
10	1	1.0171	1.1735	1.1495	3.3384
20	0.001	0.9919	2.2516	2.3030	3.4681
20	0.005	0.9912	2.2248	2.1572	3.2964
20	0.01	0.9920	2.2352	2.1709	3.4595
20	0.05	0.9920	2.1471	2.0970	3.2526
20	0.1	0.9936	2.0836	2.0656	3.3871
20	0.5	1.0038	1.6077	1.5892	3.0832
20	1	1.0172	1.3249	1.3073	3.4214
40	0.001	0.9915	3.1927	3.3221	4.0514
40	0.005	0.9938	3.1454	3.1644	4.0885
40	0.01	0.9917	3.1646	3.0714	4.0278
40	0.05	0.9941	3.0098	2.9805	3.9757
40	0.1	0.9933	2.9046	2.8642	3.8154
40	0.5	1.0041	2.0719	2.0820	3.3267
40	1	1.0172	1.6053	1.5535	3.2051
80	0.001	0.9946	5.0289	5.5995	5.6352
80	0.005	0.9957	4.9873	5.1369	5.7221
80	0.01	0.9945	4.9739	4.9098	5.5846
80	0.05	0.9956	4.7275	4.6576	5.4775
80	0.1	0.9950	4.4705	4.3577	5.1277
80	0.5	1.0041	2.9904	2.9675	3.9644
80	1	1.0172	2.0566	2.0208	3.3470

Table 4: The relative importance of the learned weights

r_i	r_1	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5	r_6	r_7	r_8	r_9	r_{10}	r_{11}	r_{12}	r_{13}	r_{14}	r_{15}
val	-10.9	1	61.7	58.9	-43.7	-114.2	55.7	12.3	-38.1	81.9	-29.6	-52.3	-6.1	67.3	107.6

Table 5: The average training time (in seconds) of one epoch of the compared methods

	WSVD	SVD	SVD++	PMF
MovieLens-100K	1.499	1.019	94.353	0.897
MovieLens-1M	15.957	10.975	2001.905	9.685
MovieLens-10M	157.736	107.029	21752.219	88.417