Exploiting Rich Contents for Personalized Video Recommendation

ABSTRACT
Video recommendation has become an essential way of helping people explore the video world and discover the ones that may be of interest to them. However, mainstream collaborative filtering techniques usually suffer from limited performance due to the sparsity of user-video interactions, and hence are ineffective for new video recommendation. Although some recent recommender models such as CTR and CDL, have integrated text information to boost performance, user-generated videos typically include scarce or low-quality text information, which seriously degenerates performance. In this paper, we investigate how to leverage the non-textual content contained in videos to improve the quality of recommendations. We propose to extract and encode the diverse audio, visual and action information that rich video content provides, then effectively incorporate these features with collaborative filtering using a collaborative embedding regression model (CER). We also study how to fuse multiple types of content features to further improve video recommendation using a novel fusion method that unifies both non-textual and textual features. We conducted extensive experiments on a large video dataset collected from multiple sources. The experimental results reveal that our proposed recommender model and fusion method outperform the state-of-the-art methods.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Watching online videos has become one of the indispensable entertainment activities in daily life. Many famous websites, such as YouTube, Netflix and Hulu, host a tremendous number of videos to meet such demand. However, these massive video repositories place an enormous burden on users when trying to find videos of interest[1, 31]. To improve this situation, most video websites have adopted recommender systems, as an effective way to help users explore the world of videos[10, 12]. Existing recommendation methods can be categorized into three classes[1, 5]: content-based methods, collaborative filtering (CF)-based methods, and hybrid methods. Content-based methods make use of user profiles and item descriptions, e.g., item contents, for recommendations. CF-based methods use the historical user activity or feedback, such as user ratings, but not user or item content information. Hybrid methods[2, 16] seek the best of both worlds by combining both content and CF-based methods.

With the rapid expansion of video websites and platforms, and a dramatic increase in the amount of available videos, existing video recommendation systems are confronted with two critical problems: data sparsity and cold start. The number of videos a user can watch is limited, and most videos receive a small number of ratings. The user-video interaction/rating matrix is thus extremely sparse, which significantly limits the performance of CF-based methods. Moreover, thousands of new videos are uploaded to video websites every day. Collaborative filtering and matrix factorization methods, which use only user-video matrix information without any content information, are not effective for recommending new videos. These new videos are called cold-start videos or out-of-matrix videos. To tackle these problems, hybrid recommendation methods, which combine collaborative filtering and auxiliary information such as item content, can usually achieve more accurate recommendation results and have gained increasing popularity in recent years.

Most existing hybrid recommender systems[16, 24, 38, 40] integrate textual content to improve recommendations. However, the scarcity of textual content, especially for user-generated videos, makes these hybrid recommendation methods ineffective. For example, plenty of videos on Youtube only have titles. A few recent works[11, 15, 25, 43] have tried to exploit non-textual content features (i.e., multimedia features) for video, music and product recommendation, but have only focused on in-matrix recommendation scenarios. In these cases, the user-item interaction matrix information actually dominates the model learning process, and the effect of non-textual content is not significant. As such, whether non-textual features can really benefit out-of-matrix recommendations, is still unexplored, and is an important issue for video recommendation given the fast pace of today’s video generation.

Given traditional video features such as normalized color histogram and aural tempos, have proven to be unhelpful for improving the video recommendation[11, 43], we first introduce several new non-textual content features to represent videos. Intuitively, users might be interested in a video for many reasons. We thus propose to use MFCC [3], SIFT [7, 37], improved dense trajectory (IDT) [39] and convolutional neural network (CNN) [21] to extract and quantize the audio, scene and action information contained in the videos. Encoding these non-textual content features with the state-of-the-art methods[18, 20, 28] will enable generation of more effective and expressive content features[3, 39, 42].

Using both the widely used textual content features and these new non-textual content features, we first reproduced and tested the state-of-the-art hybrid recommendation methods[15, 25, 38, 40] in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix scenarios. The results showed that none of these methods achieved high recommendation accuracy in both scenarios. In particular, we observed that weighted matrix factorization (WMF)-based methods achieved better performance in
the in-matrix scenario, while Bayesian personalized ranking (BPR)-based methods generated more accurate recommendations in the out-of-matrix scenario. To improve that, we propose a collaborative embedding regression model (CER) based on WMF in this paper. Unlike existing WMF-based methods[25, 38, 40] which apply non-linear learning on the content features, CER applies linear learning instead, considering that (1) the non-textual content features are encoded to work with the linear learning models[18, 20, 28]; and (2) the content features are usually of high dimensionality, and linear learning is more efficient than the non-linear learning. The experimental results show that, for any individual content feature (either non-textual or textual), CER performs slightly better than other WMF-based methods in the in-matrix scenario, and significantly outperforms both WMF and BPR-based methods in the out-of-matrix scenario. Moreover, CER’s model training is more efficient and more scalable to large datasets than the other methods.

In addition, observing that different content features have significantly diverse performance in out-of-matrix recommendation, we have also studied how to use multiple content features of videos to further improve top-k recommendations in the out-of-matrix scenario. In recent years, designing fusion strategies of multiple features has become a major research trend and different techniques have been proposed. There are two widely accepted yet independent strategies to fuse multiple features[9]: early fusion and late fusion. Most works on early fusion try to map multiple feature spaces to a unified one. For example, in[35, 41, 45], multiple original features are mapped to a latent space with lower dimensionality based on neural networks. Although some interactions among features can be captured by such a framework, a number of problems exist. First, a unified feature space is often built according to global statistical information using deep learning models, which incurs extremely high computational costs for large-scale video databases, each with tens of thousands dimensions. Second, the textual, audio, visual and action information contained in videos are widely diverse and heterogeneous. It is almost infeasible to construct a shared latent space for recommendation without losing some important and meaningful feature information.

The other line of research focuses on the late fusion of multiple features. This fusion strategy uses separate result lists derived from different features, and carries out fusion using the candidate results[29, 36]. Learning-to-rank techniques (e.g., ranking SVM) represent the state-of-the-art of late fusion mechanisms[3, 22, 42]; however, as supervised learning techniques, learning-to-rank models can only be trained based on user-video interaction matrix in our problem. The feature weights learned in in-matrix setting are not suitable for out-of-matrix setting, as these two settings have disparate characteristics and intrinsically different. Also, training learning-to-rank models is time-consuming. Instead, we propose a novel unsupervised late fusion method to compute the feature weights that do not depend on user-video interaction information.

To summarize, the contributions of this paper include:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first effort to leverage MFCC, SIFT, IDT as well as CNN features for video recommendations and to study their effect in improving out-of-matrix recommendations.
- We propose a novel hybrid video recommender model, CER, to effectively combine collaborative filtering with both textual and non-textual content features in a unified way. We also study how to fuse multiple types of content features to further improve out-of-matrix recommendation and propose a novel fusion method.
- We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate both the proposed CER and the unsupervised late fusion method. The results reveal that our approaches significantly outperform competitor methods.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

The basic elements of a video recommender system are users and videos. Assume there are m users and n videos in total. As shown in Figure 1, we use $r_{ij} \in \{?, +\}$ to denote the $i^{th}$ user’s implicit rating/feedback on the $j^{th}$ video; $r_{ij} = +$ means the $i^{th}$ user likes the $j^{th}$ video; $r_{ij} = ?$ means the $i^{th}$ user dislikes the $j^{th}$ video or is not aware of the $j^{th}$ video. As a convention[30], we map $\{?, +\}$ to $\{0, 1\}$.

Given a target user, the video recommender system aims to find the top-k videos that the user is potentially interested in. The video recommendation can be further divided into two settings: in-matrix and out-of-matrix recommendations. In the in-matrix setting, the recommender system recommends the top-k videos which have not been rated by the target user but have been rated by other users[38]. Based on the co-rating behaviors of similar users, state-of-the-art methods[17, 25, 38, 40] use collaborative filtering (CF) to generate recommendations. In out-of-matrix setting, the recommender system suggests top-k new videos that have not been rated by any user[38] (i.e., cold-start recommendation). In this setting, CF-based methods become ineffective, whereas content-based methods perform well.

Weighted matrix factorization (WMF)[19] and Bayesian personalized ranking (BPR)[30] represent the state-of-the-art recommendation techniques in in-matrix setting. Both of them are matrix factorization models and are derived from collaborative filtering (CF). They learn a latent vector to predict each user’s rating on each item, for each user and item in turn, and then select the top ranked items with the highest predicted ratings. The major difference between them is the optimization objective. The WMF model[19] learns the latent factors by minimizing the rating prediction loss on
the training data, while the BPR model[30] learns the latent factors by preserving the personalized rankings.

Recently, both WMF and BPR were extended to incorporate content features, so they can learn a latent vector to represent both in-matrix and out-of-matrix items, and hence be applied to both in-matrix and out-of-matrix recommendation scenarios. The representative WMF-based models include collaborative topic regression (CTR)[38], deep content-based music recommendation model (DPM)[25] and collaborative deep learning (CDL)[40]. CTR and CDL only integrate the textual features of items, while DPM only considers non-textual features. The representative BPR-based models are visual Bayesian personalized ranking (VBPR)[15], collaborative knowledge base embedding (CKE)[45] and Visual-CLiMF[32]. VBPR and Visual-CLiMF are designed to incorporate with single feature, while CKE works with both structural and non-structural features from the knowledge base by adding them up. Visual-CLiMF enhances VBPR by optimizing the approximate reciprocal rank instead of pair-wise rank.

3 VIDEO CONTENT FEATURES

This section describes how the content features, including both textual and non-textual, are extracted for video recommendation. They are used for content-based inference in Figure 2.

3.1 Textual Content Features

Traditional content-based video recommender systems[10, 12, 40] capture the video contents by texts. The textual contents often include titles, descriptions, reviews as well as meta information for the videos. Based on these texts, we extract two kinds of textual features: word features and meta features. That is, we construct both a word vector and a meta vector for each video. To construct the word vector, the title, description and reviews associated with the given video are concatenated into one virtual document. After removing stop words and stemming[40], the top discriminative and meaningful words are selected by TF-IDF value to compose the word vectors. The meta vector stores the meta data about the video such as its producers, countries, languages, release dates, actors, genres and so on. The top discriminative meta items are selected by global frequency to form the codebook. Unlike the word vector where a word may appear more than once, the meta item in the meta vector just appears once. Accordingly, the meta vector is binary and usually very sparse.

3.2 Non-Textual Content Features

In addition to the textual features, videos themselves also contain rich content information. Yang et. al[43] extract the normalized color histogram and aural tempos to represent the videos. However, the experimental results reported in[43] show that these features are not significantly effective in improving video recommendation. This is because these features fail to distinguish between videos that share similar colors but are unrelated in content. For example, given a video about the sky and another video about the sea, the normalized color histogram will result in a high similarity between the two videos due to the common color blue. In this case, it is very likely that a recommender system would recommend sky-related videos to users who like seas.

However, the limitations of the normalized color histogram and aural tempos do not mean that all non-textual video features are useless for video recommendation. Intuitively, users are attracted to particular videos for multiple aspects of their contents. Thus, we propose to extract diverse non-textual content features from videos in terms of audio, scenes and actions. Motivated by the excellent performance of the multimedia features MFCC, SIFT, IDT and CNN in many recent applications, such as event detection[3], action recognition[39], scene classification[37] and object classification[34], we will explore whether they are also effective in video recommendation. We present how to extract these features as follows.

1. MFCC (mel-frequency cepstral coefficients)

MFCC measure audio changes in sound. MFCC features can be extracted through the following steps[3]: 1) down-sampling the audio track of a video to 16 kHz with 16 bit resolution; 2)
using a window size of 25 ms and a step size of 10 ms to set the MFCC extractor and setting the number of channels to 13; and 3) concatenating the first and second derivatives and the energy of the MFCC during the extraction to form a 40 dimensional feature. Thus, the whole audio track of a video will be transformed into a feature array.

2. SIFT (scale invariant feature transform)

SIFT [23] captures the texture information of images. Since SIFT features can match the same visual objects of different scales [23], it has been widely applied to scene classification [37] and image retrieval [18]. In this paper, we use two variants of SIFT to extract texture information from sampled frames in videos. They are OSIFT (opponent SIFT) [37] and MoSIFT (motion SIFT) [7]. OSIFT transforms the original RGB color space by light color change and shift, which provides more robust SIFT features. An OSIFT feature has 384 dimensions. MoSIFT leverages the optical flow between frames to select SIFT features. A MoSIFT feature has 256 dimensions.

3. IDT (improved dense trajectory)

IDT [39] captures motion information in videos. It leverages dense sampling and camera motions removing to extract the state-of-the-art motion features. An IDT feature has 426 dimensions.

4. CNN (convolutional neural network)

CNN captures the semantic information in images. Recently, CNN has shown its advantage over the other models in the object classification competition[33]. Some recent research shows that using a pre-trained CNN on ImageNet to extract features from images is beneficial for video retrieval[42]. Inspired by its superior performance in video search, we first sample frames from a video and then use the pre-trained CNN model from the VGG group[34] to extract visual features from the pool3 layer. The original pool3 features are tensors. In order to transform them into vectors, we apply spatial pooling, following[14]. Thus, each sampled frame has 49 CNN features with 512 dimensions.

Unlike MFCC, MoSIFT and IDT which take the whole audio or video file as input, OSIFT and CNN are applied to the frames sampled from the video. Following[3, 42], we fetch 5 frames per second from the video. There is usually a normalization process on the raw features. We apply SSR (signed squared root) to normalize all the raw features[3, 4].

We obtain a group of vectors for each non-textual content feature. These feature vectors need to be transformed into one feature vector to be incorporated into collaborative filtering[15, 25, 38, 40]. An intuitive transformation method is to simply average the feature vectors by dimension. But this is not a good choice due to its limited representative capacity[26]. Recent studies show that it is better to transform the feature vectors using an encoding process[3, 26, 28, 42]. As a result, we apply two state-of-the-art encoding methods, Fisher vector (FV)[28] and VLAD[18], to transform a group of feature vectors to one vector. The encoding methods and the resulting dimensions for each non-textual feature in Table 1. We notice that the dimensions of all the encoded feature vectors are very high. This high dimensionality makes it infeasible to integrate with collaborative filtering (i.e., latent factor models). Thus, we apply PCA to reduce the dimension of each feature to 4000, following[27].

4 VIDEO RECOMMENDATION

In this section, we first reproduce existing recommender models and analyze their performance in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix settings. Based on the results, we study the possible reasons why these state-of-the-art recommender models cannot deliver effective video recommendations with non-textual features. Inspired by the results, we propose an improved recommender model, CER, followed by a novel late fusion strategy to fuse the recommendation lists from different content features to further improve recommendation accuracy.

4.1 Recent Methods on Various Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WMF, BPR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL, VBPR, CTR</td>
<td>WORD, META</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL, VBPR, DPM</td>
<td>MFCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL, VBPR</td>
<td>CNNFV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The state-of-the-art recommender models and the corresponding content features in use.

Given the set of extracted content features associated with videos, an interesting question naturally arises: how do state-of-the-art recommender models perform with these features in top-k recommendations. To answer this question, we reproduce the WMF and BPR-based recommender models using the MovieLens 10M dataset[13]. We adopt the optimal parameter settings proposed in[15, 17, 25, 30, 38, 40]. Additionally, we extend CDL[40] and VBPR[15] to work with vectors from MFCC and CNNFV. The recommender models and the corresponding content features are listed in Table 2.

The recommender models listed in Table 2 were tested in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix settings with their optimal parameters. More details about the dataset splits and evaluation metrics are discussed in the experiments section. The results are presented in Figure 3 where the subscripts of the models denote the content features in use. To clearly show the differences between these methods, we use the evaluation metric Accuracy@30. Figure 3 provides the following observations:

1) WMF-based recommender models yielded more accurate recommendation than BPR-based models in the in-matrix test. In Figure 3, all the WMF-based models (i.e. WMF, CTR, DPM and CDL) are located to the right

Table 1: The dimensions of the encoded non-textual content vectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Encoder</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFCC</td>
<td>FV</td>
<td>10240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>98304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSIFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>68608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDT</td>
<td></td>
<td>128304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>VLAD</td>
<td>131072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


of the BPR-based models (i.e. BPR and VBPR). Additionally, the performance of the WMF-based models (e.g., CDL) in the in-matrix test do not vary significantly with respect to the different types of content features, while the introduction of content features improves the basic WMF. All these facts indicate that the WMF-based models in the in-matrix scenario are mainly dominated by their collaborative filtering component WMF, and they are insensitive to feature types.

(2) VBPR achieved the best performance in the out-of-matrix test. In Figure 3, given a particular content feature, the position of VBPR is always higher than that of all the other methods. This shows that VBPR is the most effective method in the out-of-matrix scenario, and the content-based components in the existing WMF-based models are not suitable for out-of-matrix recommendations.

In summary, our reproduction experiment shows that none of the existing recommender models achieve high recommendation accuracy in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix scenarios. To address this problem, we propose a new WMF-based recommender model CER in this paper.

### 4.2 Collaborative Embedding Regression

All recent WMF-based models[25, 38, 40] follow a similar rating generation process. The major difference among them is the way they generate content latent vectors. CTR[38] incorporates textual features with WMF and generates the content latent vectors using latent Dirichlet allocation (LDA). Since the optimization of LDA is based on word count only, CTR naturally fails to support non-textual features that are real values. Compared to CTR, DPM[25] and CDL[40] can generate various content latent vectors from both textual and non-textual features. They achieve this by respectively applying multiple layer perception (MLP) and stacked de-nosing auto-encoder (SDAE) as generation functions. However, the results in Figure 3 show that neither of them perform well in out-of-matrix setting, especially those with non-textual features. This is because the non-textual features are encoded for linear learning[18, 20, 28]. Thus, MLP and SDAE that perform non-linear learning degrade the performance of the encoded non-textual features. On the other hand, the excellent performance of VBPR actually benefits from its adoption of the linear embedding method[15]. Based on above analysis, we propose a novel recommender model, collaborative embedding regression (CER), to work with both textual and non-textual features. Let $d$ denote the dimension of the content feature and $k$ denote the dimension of the latent vector. The whole generation process of CER with an individual content feature is described below.

1. For each user $i$, draw a user latent vector $w_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_u^{-1} I)$.  
   \begin{equation}
   w_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_u^{-1} I).
   \end{equation}

2. Generate an embedding matrix $E \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_e^{-1} I)$.  

3. For each video $j$:  
   (a) Generate a content latent vector $h_j^c \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_c^{-1} I)$, and then set the video latent vector as:  
   \begin{equation}
   h_j = h_j^c + \epsilon_j.
   \end{equation}

4. For each user-video pair $(i,j)$, draw the rating:  
   \begin{equation}
   r_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(w_i^T h_j, c_{ij}^2).
   \end{equation}

where $I$ is an identity matrix, $f_j \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times 1}$ is a feature vector, $E \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ is an embedding matrix, and $c_{ij}$ is the confidence parameter for the user-item pair $(i,j)$. Following[38, 40], the value of $c_{ij}$ is defined below:  
   \begin{equation}
   c_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
   1, & \text{if } r_{ij} \geq 1 \\
   0.01, & \text{if } r_{ij} = 0 
   \end{cases}
   \end{equation}

Note that, in step 3(a), we use linear embedding instead of non-linear learning adopted by CTR, DPM and CDL. This is more suitable for learning the content latent vectors from the non-textual features[3, 28, 39]. In step 3(b), $h_j^c$ serves as the bridge between the implicit feedback preference and the video content features.

**Learning the parameters.** To predict the rating, the latent vectors and the embedding matrix need to be learned. As computing the full posterior of the parameters is intractable and maximizing the posterior probability of $W, H$ and $E$ is equivalent to maximizing the log-likelihood, we follow[38] to minimize the negative log-likelihood as follows:

\begin{equation}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_{ij} (w_i^T h_j - r_{ij})^2 + \frac{\lambda_u}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^T w_i + \frac{\lambda_e}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (h_j - E^T f_j)^T (h_j - E^T f_j) + \frac{\lambda_c}{2} ||E||_F^2,
\end{equation}

where $\lambda_u, \lambda_e$ and $\lambda_c$ are the hyper parameters and $|| \cdot ||_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. When these hyper parameters are fixed, the optimal latent vectors $w_i$ and $h_j$ as well as the embedding matrix $E$ are obtained by performing the alternating least squares (ALS), following[38, 40]. Specifically, in each iteration, given the current estimation of $E$, the derivatives with respect to $w_i$ and $h_j$ are computed and set to zero. We then derive the following updating formulas for $w_i$ and $h_j$:

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
    w_i &\leftarrow (HC_i H^T + \lambda_u I_k)^{-1} HC_i R_j \\
    h_j &\leftarrow (WC_j W^T + \lambda_e I_k)^{-1} (WC_j R_j + \lambda_c E^T f_j)
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}
where \( W = (w_{ij})^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m} \) is the matrix formed by user latent vectors, \( H = (h_{ij})^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n} \) is the matrix formed by video latent vectors, and \( F = (f_{ij})^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n} \) is the content matrix. For user \( i \), \( C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) is a diagonal matrix with \( c_{ij} \), \( j = 1 \cdots n \) as the diagonal elements, \( R_j \in \{0,1\}^{n \times 1} \) is a vector with \( r_{ij} \), \( j = 1 \cdots n \) as its elements. For video \( j \), \( C_j \) and \( R_j \) are similarly defined.

Then, we fix the current estimation of \( H \), and the derivatives with respect to \( E \) are computed and set to zero. We derive the following updating formula for \( E \):

\[
E \leftarrow (\lambda_v F F^T + \lambda_d L_d)^{-1}(\lambda_v F H^T).
\]  

(8)

Similar to CTR and CDL, CER supports both in-matrix and out-of-matrix rating prediction. For in-matrix predictions, given a user-video pair \((i, j)\), the rating \( \hat{r}_{ij} \) is estimated as \( w_{ij}^T (E^T f_j + e_j) \). For out-of-matrix prediction, the rating \( \hat{r}_{ij} \) is predicted as \( w_{ij}^T E^T f_j \) since no offset is observed. In summary, the rating predictor is defined as:

\[
\hat{r}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
    w_{ij}^T h_j, & \text{in-matrix setting} \\
    w_{ij}^T E^T f_j, & \text{out-of-matrix setting} 
\end{cases}
\]  

(9)

### 4.3 Multiple Feature Fusion

The CER model presented in the previous subsection is designed to work with a single type of feature, just like most of the recent hybrid recommender models[15, 25, 38, 40]. In this subsection, we will study how to leverage rich and diverse content features to further improve the video recommendation. Specially, we present three feature fusion methods to facilitate CER to work with multiple types of features.

The first method concatenates all the feature vectors associated with a video into one big vector and then feeds the big vectors into CER. Assuming there are \( L \) features in total, the concatenation is performed as follow:

\[
f_j \leftarrow [f_j^1, f_j^2, \ldots, f_j^L].
\]  

(10)

This fusion method is expected to learn the shared latent factors among the concatenated features. It does not introduce any modification on the objective function of CER, but it will significantly increase the training time of the CER because the time complexity of CER’s optimization is proportional to the dimension of the feature vector \( f_j \).

The second method adds all the content latent vectors \( h_j^l \) together, as done in CKE[45]. The content latent vectors in the generation process of CER are redefined as:

\[
h_j^l = \sum_{l=1}^{L} h_j^l = \sum_{l=1}^{L} e^l f_j^l.
\]  

(11)

Compared to the first method, the second method compresses the dimension so that the training is faster, but it needs to modify the objective function of the CER by adding the regularization terms of all the embedding matrices, and the updating formulas of the model parameters also need to change accordingly.

The above two methods are early fusion methods. They try to map multiple feature spaces to a unified one. However, the textual, audio, visual and action information contained in videos are widely diverse and heterogeneous. It is almost infeasible to construct a shared latent space for recommendation without losing some important and meaningful feature information. Besides, early fusion methods require re-training models when the features in use are changed (e.g., adding new features). From these two perspectives, the early fusion tends to be inferior to the late fusion which directly works on the results obtained from each type of feature.

As shown in Figure 3, the performance of WMF-based models in the out-of-matrix scenario varies greatly with respect to the different types of content features. In a recent video retrieval system[3], such divergence is leveraged by fusing multiple ranking lists to obtain a more relevant ranking list. Inspired by[3], we consider the late fusion has the potential to improve the video recommender system as well. We thus propose the third method to fuse the top-\( k \) recommendations generated from multiple content features.

Inspired by the success of learning-to-rank techniques[3, 42], in the third method, we first compute a weight for each feature and then apply the weighted sum strategy to implement the late fusion. The fused estimation rating is computed as follows:

\[
\hat{r}_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \pi_l f_{lj}.
\]  

(12)

where \( L \) is the number of content features; \( \pi_l \) is the weight of the \( l \)th content feature; \( f_{lj} \) is the predicted rating based on the \( l \)th content feature. The challenge of the above fusion mechanism is how to compute the weights.

A naive solution is to treat each content feature equally, namely average fusion. Recall that Figure 3 shows a large performance divergence between different content features. The average fusion method neglects this divergence, which would lead to inferior performance. Another solution is to learn the weights using a learning-to-rank method[6]. However, learning-to-rank models are supervised learning and can only be on a user-video interaction matrix in our problem. Thus, the feature weights are learned in the in-matrix setting, which are not suitable for the out-of-matrix setting, as these two settings are intrinsically different. Moreover, training learning-to-rank models is time-consuming. In this paper, we propose an efficient unsupervised method to decide the weights. We first rank all content features based on their performances in the in-matrix or out-of-matrix settings on the validation dataset, then the weight of \( l \)th content feature is computed as \( \pi_l = \rho (1 - \rho)^{l-1} \) where \( \rho \in [0.5, 1] \) is a hyper parameter. Note that, for any rank position \( t \) (i.e., \( \forall t > 0 \)), the inequality \( \sum_{l=t+1}^{L} \pi_l \leq \pi_t \) holds in our method. This strategy ensures that the \( l \)th content feature has higher weight than the total weight of the remaining less powerful content features. In other words, the proposed method allows the more effective features have much more impact in the final rating which is consistent with the observation in Figure 3.

To clearly illustrate the calculation of the weights, we present an example in Table 3 where four features are given and ranked. Note that, as WMF-based models (including our CER) with different content features achieve almost the same recommendation results in the in-matrix setting, as shown in the experiment section, we only apply our proposed fusion method to the out-of-matrix recommendation.
Table 3: An example of the weights generated in the late fusion method when p is set to 0.5.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we first describe the setup of experiments and then demonstrate the experimental results.

5.1 Dataset Description

We used the MovieLens 10M [13] as the base dataset for our empirical studies. The Movielens dataset does not itself contain videos or links for downloading. So we attempted to collect the videos from YouTube by ourselves. However, as most full-length videos are not available to download for free due to copyright restrictions, we downloaded the trailers according to the movie titles with the dataset. After a manual check to ensure the trailers matched the original full-length videos, a small fraction of the movies still did not have trailers sourced from YouTube and we used other available clips instead. By these means, we collected 10380 videos of the 10682 movies in the Movielens 10M dataset. The ratings associated with the missing 302 videos were removed, which slightly decreased the number of ratings from 10,000,054 to 9,988,676. The collected videos are resized to accelerate the content feature extraction: their widths were reduced to 240 pixels and their heights were adjusted proportionally.

The Movielens dataset also provides the movie IDs that correspond to IMDB1. Based on these IDs, we crawled the movie plots, actors, directors, companies, languages and genres. Each movie’s title and plot were concatenated into a document. The top 20000 words were selected as the vocabulary according to global TF-IDF values, following[38, 40]. Then, a word vector for each movie was generated by word frequency. The other textual information including actors, directors, languages, companies, genres and other meta items formed another meta vector. To make the textual features of the videos have the same dimensions, the top 20000 meta items are selected as the codebook of meta vectors.

Similar to[38, 40], to be consistent with an implicit feedback setting, we transformed the ratings in the dataset into {0, 1}. Specifically, we mapped rating 5 to 1 and all the other ratings to 0. As a result, 1, 543, 593 positive ratings were generated, which only used 0.2% of all elements in the rating matrix. To make our experiment repeatable, both our collected dataset and the code is publicly available 2.

5.2 Experimental Settings

5.2.1 Comparison Methods. We compared our proposed CER model with the following six state-of-the-art recommender models.

- **Collaborative Topic Regression (CTR)[38]** learns the content latent vectors from word vectors using LDA. We trained CTR with both word and meta vectors. CTR achieves its best performance with $\lambda_u = 0.1, \lambda_v = 10$.

- **DeepMusic (DPM)[25]** uses MLP to learn content latent vectors from MFCC. We extended DPM[25] to work with all the content features proposed in this paper. DPM achieves its best performance with $\lambda_u = 0.1$ and $\lambda_v = 10$.

- **Collaborative Deep Learning (CDL)[40]** learns content latent vectors using SDAE from word vectors. Replacing the binary visible layer with Gaussian visible layer, SDAE can accept non-textual content vectors as input. We therefore extend CDL to work with both textual and non-textual features. CDL achieves its best performance with $\lambda_u = 0.1, \lambda_v = 10$ and $\lambda_a = 1000$.

- **Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR)[30]** can be only applied to in-matrix recommendation setting, and its best performance is obtained with $\lambda_u = 0.0025, \lambda_i = 0.0025, \lambda_j = 0.00025$ and $\lambda_b = 0.0$.

- **Visual Bayesian Personalized Ranking (VBPR)[15]** is an extension of BPR to combine visual contents with the CF. VBPR can work with all content features. Its optimal parameter settings are $\lambda_u = 0.0025, \lambda_p = 0.0025, \lambda_i = 0.0025, \lambda_j = 0.00025, \lambda_b = 0.0$ and $\lambda_e = 0.0$.

- **EFS** is the second early fusion method presented in Section 4.3 that concatenates all the feature vectors.

5.2.2 Data Split. Following the previous works [38, 40], we applied 5-fold cross validation to test the recommendation accuracy of each method in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix settings. Specifically, we divided the dataset into the training set, in-matrix test set and out-of-matrix test set with a split of 60%, 20%, 20% of the total positive ratings, respectively. To achieve this, all videos were first split into five folds randomly and uniformly. Then, the corresponding ratings are also split into five folds. When one fold of videos was used to simulate new videos, its corresponding rating fold was chosen as the out-of-matrix test set, and the rest of the four rating folds were mixed together and re-split into four folds uniformly and randomly. Three of the re-split rating folds were used as the training set and the rest of the rating fold was used as the in-matrix

1http://www.imdb.com/
2https://github.com/domainxz/top-k-rec
test set. Note that we randomly chose 5% of the ratings from each test set as validation data to tune the model hyper-parameters.

In previous works [38], the in-matrix and out-of-matrix tests were conducted separately. The training data would change when the test scenario switches, which actually makes the two recommendation scenarios incomparable. Our proposed split protocol improves this situation so we can exactly compare the performance of each recommendation method in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix settings.

5.2.3 Evaluation Protocol. We adopt the evaluation methodology and measurement Accuracy@k in [8, 44] to evaluate the top-k video recommendation accuracy. According to our data and the split protocol described in Section 5.2.2, each user will have roughly 8000 unrated videos in the in-matrix test and 2000 unrated videos in the out-of-matrix test. We computed the ratings based on the latent vectors or the content vectors, then generated a ranking list of the unrated videos for each user according to the predicted ratings. The top-k videos from the ranking list were returned as the personalized recommendation. For each user-video pair (i, j) in the test set D_test, if video j is in user i’s recommendation, we have a hit (i.e., the ground truth video is recommended to the user), otherwise we have a miss.

All the methods were evaluated by Accuracy@k where a higher value means better performance. Its calculation proceeds as follows. We define Hit@k for a single test case as either the value 1, if the ground truth video is in a user’s top-k video recommendation, or the value 0 if otherwise, if otherwise. The overall Accuracy@k is defined by averaging all the test cases:

\[
\text{Accuracy@k} = \frac{\text{\#Hit@k}}{|D_{\text{test}}|}
\]

where \(\text{\#Hit@k}\) denotes the total number of hits in the test set, and \(|D_{\text{test}}|\) is the number of all test cases. The experimental results were validated by means of a standard 5-fold cross validation. In previous works [38] [40], the value of k was selected from \{50, 100, 150, 200, 250, 300\}. However, such values of k were too large for a user to receive at once in a real world recommender system[12]. Therefore, k was selected from \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30\} in this paper.

5.3 Experimental Results and Analysis

In this subsection, we evaluate the performance of our proposed CER in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix settings. We also study whether our proposed feature fusion method can improve the out-of-matrix recommendation. Recommendation efficiency is also studied.

5.3.1 In-matrix Recommendation Effectiveness. In this experiment, we study recommendation effectiveness in the in-matrix setting and present the experimental results in Figure 4. For each recommender model, we notice that the performance difference incurred by using different content features can be ignorable. Therefore, we only present the one with the highest accuracy. Overall, our proposed CER achieved the highest recommendation accuracy, although its superiority is not visually obvious in Figure 4. Another observation is that the performance gap between the BPR-based models and WMF-based models is significant. This indicates the WMF-based models are more effective for top-k recommendation in in-matrix setting. Additionally, the differences between pure WMF and its variants (CTR, DPM, CDL, CER) are non-negligible. This indicates content information is beneficial for the in-matrix recommendation.

5.3.2 Out-of-matrix Recommendation Effectiveness. In this experiment, we study the performance of all recommendation methods in out-of-matrix setting. Since out-of-matrix recommendation accuracy is heavily dependent on the types of content features, we show the performance of all recommendation methods with different types of content features in Figure 5. The sub-figures are sorted in descending order according to the performance of our CER. From the results, we observe that our CER model significantly outperformed the other WMF-based models consistently with each feature. Moreover, our CER also achieves higher recommendation accuracy than VBPR which is the most effective baseline method in the out-of-matrix setting. This indicates that linear embedding is more suitable for generating latent content vectors in the video recommendation. However, the results in these figures also indicate that textual features (i.e. Figure 5(a) & 5(b)) are still the most powerful for out-of-matrix recommendation, while our introduced non-textual feature CNNFV (i.e. Figure 5(c)) achieves comparable performance. This finding suggests that, for user generated/uploaded videos without sufficient textual contents, the video recommender system is still able to produce accurate recommendations if the effective non-textual features are exploited and leveraged. Another observation is that recommendation accuracy in out-of-matrix setting is not as high as in in-matrix setting. This is because out-of-matrix recommendation is more challenging than in-matrix recommendation[15, 38, 40].

5.3.3 Test of Multiple Feature Fusion. In this experiment, we study whether fusing multiple types of features can further improve the out-of-matrix recommendations. We report the recommendation accuracy of each fusion method with different feature combinations in Table 4. Since our CER achieved the best performance on all types of features, all the fusion methods were performed based on our CER. To clearly illustrate the improvement, we also present the highest recommendation accuracy achieved by our CER on a single feature in the last row.
As shown in Table 4, AF and BF fail to improve the recommendation accuracy with the combination of either the non-textual features or all the features. SF improves out-of-matrix accuracy with all the features, but it does not improve the accuracy with non-textual features. The only method that improves recommendation accuracy with both feature combinations is our proposed PF. The failure of AF is due to the huge performance gap among different content features. In Figure 5, the highest out-of-matrix accuracy of CER is achieved with META vectors, while the lowest accuracy of CER is achieved with MoSIFT vectors. The highest accuracy is three times of the lowest accuracy. In this situation, averaging the ratings weakens the predictability of the most powerful feature. Both BF and SF are learning-to-rank methods and they learn the feature weights in a supervised way. In other words, the weights can only be learned based on user-video interaction matrix (i.e., in the in-matrix setting). The feature weights learned in the in-matrix setting, however, are not applicable to the out-of-matrix setting, as the importance of the same feature is different in these two different settings. In contrast, our proposed PF computes the weights in an unsupervised manner, thus the weights can still be computed even in the out-of-matrix setting.

The early fusion method EFS achieves the consistent performance in both feature combination settings. It performs better than the late fusion methods AF, BF and SF but worse than our proposed late fusion method PF. On the contrary, EFC achieves different performance in different feature combination settings. It achieves higher recommendation accuracy than AF, BF, SF and EFS when the fusion is applied on the non-textual features, but lower accuracy than all the methods when the fusion is performed on all the features. The results show that concatenating feature vectors then learning the shared latent vectors may be infeasible when the input features are heterogeneous. Summing up the latent vectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy@5</th>
<th>Accuracy@10</th>
<th>Accuracy@15</th>
<th>Accuracy@20</th>
<th>Accuracy@25</th>
<th>Accuracy@30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.021243</td>
<td>0.0357600</td>
<td>0.051699</td>
<td>0.064683</td>
<td>0.076871</td>
<td>0.088040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>0.021241</td>
<td>0.035602</td>
<td>0.051707</td>
<td>0.064690</td>
<td>0.076864</td>
<td>0.088044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.021498</td>
<td>0.037748</td>
<td>0.051894</td>
<td>0.064918</td>
<td>0.077049</td>
<td>0.088096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFC</td>
<td>0.021830</td>
<td>0.038222</td>
<td>0.051606</td>
<td>0.065720</td>
<td>0.077664</td>
<td>0.089460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFS</td>
<td>0.021439</td>
<td>0.037826</td>
<td>0.051994</td>
<td>0.064998</td>
<td>0.077119</td>
<td>0.088350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF (p=0.5)</td>
<td><strong>0.023090</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.040390</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.055746</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.069401</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.081788</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.093239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNFV</td>
<td>0.022809</td>
<td>0.039488</td>
<td>0.054017</td>
<td>0.067184</td>
<td>0.078983</td>
<td>0.089915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy@5</th>
<th>Accuracy@10</th>
<th>Accuracy@15</th>
<th>Accuracy@20</th>
<th>Accuracy@25</th>
<th>Accuracy@30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>0.063132</td>
<td>0.093990</td>
<td>0.118933</td>
<td>0.140554</td>
<td>0.159595</td>
<td>0.176996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>0.061949</td>
<td>0.092322</td>
<td>0.116883</td>
<td>0.138128</td>
<td>0.156966</td>
<td>0.174059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>0.067023</td>
<td>0.100991</td>
<td>0.127185</td>
<td>0.149112</td>
<td>0.168508</td>
<td>0.186059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFC</td>
<td>0.041733</td>
<td>0.063908</td>
<td>0.081737</td>
<td>0.097422</td>
<td>0.111366</td>
<td>0.124557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFS</td>
<td>0.068546</td>
<td>0.101244</td>
<td>0.127280</td>
<td>0.149542</td>
<td>0.169221</td>
<td>0.187168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF (p=0.5)</td>
<td><strong>0.070157</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.104109</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.130914</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.153513</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.173169</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.190906</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>META</td>
<td>0.065530</td>
<td>0.098272</td>
<td>0.123640</td>
<td>0.145093</td>
<td>0.163806</td>
<td>0.180630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Fusion results on different feature combinations
We first extracted and encoded multiple content features including word vectors, meta vectors, MFCC, SIFT, IDT, and CNN. Then, we proposed a collaborative embedding regression model (CER) to incorporate these content features with collaborative filtering. We also studied how to fuse multiple content features to further improve video recommendation and proposed a novel late fusion strategy to fuse both non-textual and textual features. To evaluate the performance of our proposed recommender model CER and feature fusion method, extensive experiments were conducted on a large video dataset collected through multiple sources. The results show that our CER achieved the best performance in both in-matrix and out-of-matrix recommendation settings, and our proposed unsupervised feature fusion method significantly outperforms existing both early fusion and late fusion methods.
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