

# A Serendipity-Oriented Greedy Algorithm for Recommendations

Denis Kotkov<sup>1</sup>, Jari Veijalainen<sup>1</sup> and Shuaiqiang Wang<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Jyväskylä, Faculty of Information Technology,

P.O.Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

<sup>2</sup>Manchester Business School, The University of Manchester, Manchester, U.K.

**Keywords:** Recommender Systems, Learning to Rank, Serendipity, Novelty, Unexpectedness, Algorithms, Evaluation.

**Abstract:** Most recommender systems suggest items to a user that are popular among all users and similar to items the user usually consumes. As a result, a user receives recommendations that she/he is already familiar with or would find anyway, leading to low satisfaction. To overcome this problem, a recommender system should suggest novel, relevant and unexpected, i.e. serendipitous items. In this paper, we propose a serendipity-oriented algorithm, which improves serendipity through feature diversification and helps overcome the overspecialization problem. To evaluate our algorithm and compare it with others, we employ a serendipity metric that captures each component of serendipity, unlike the most common metric.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems are software tools that suggest items of use to users (Ricci et al., 2011; Kotkov et al., 2016a). An item is “a piece of information that refers to a tangible or digital object, such as a good, a service or a process that a recommender system suggests to the user in an interaction through the Web, email or text message” (Kotkov et al., 2016a). For example, an item could refer to a movie, a song or a new friend.

To increase the number of items that will receive high ratings most recommender systems tend to suggest items that are (1) popular, as these items are consumed by many individuals and often of high quality in many domains (Celma Herrada, 2009) and (2) similar to which the user has assigned high ratings, as these items correspond to user’s preferences (Tacchini, 2012; Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). As a result, users might become bored with the suggestions provided, as (1) users are likely to be familiar with popular items, while the main reason these users would use a recommender system is to find novel and relevant items (Celma Herrada, 2009) and (2) users often lose interest in using the system when they are offered only items similar to highly rated ones from their profiles (the so-called overspecialization problem) (Tacchini, 2012; Kotkov et al.,

2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). Here the term *user profile* refers to the set of items rated by the target user, though it might include information, such as name, ID and age in other papers.

To suggest novel and interesting items and overcome the overspecialization problem, recommender systems should suggest serendipitous items. Some researchers consider novel and unexpected items serendipitous (Zhang et al., 2012), while others suggest that serendipitous items are relevant and unexpected (Maksai et al., 2015). Although there is no agreement on the definition of serendipity (Kotkov et al., 2016b), in this paper, the term *serendipitous items* refers to items relevant, novel and unexpected to a user (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b):

- An item is *relevant* to a user if the user has expressed or will express preference for the item. The user might express his/her preference by liking or consuming the item depending on the application scenario of a particular recommender system (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). In different scenarios, ways to express preference might vary. For example, we might regard a movie relevant to a user if the user gave it more than 3 stars out of 5 (Zheng et al., 2015; Lu et al., ), while we might regard a song relevant to a user if the user listened to it more than twice. The system is aware that a particular item is relevant to a user if the user rates the item, and unaware of this

\*The research was conducted while the author was working for the University of Jyväskylä, Finland

relevance otherwise.

- An item is *novel* to a user if the user has not consumed it yet (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). Items novel to a user are usually unpopular, as users are often familiar with popular items, where popularity can be measured by the number of ratings given in a recommender system (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b; Celma Herada, 2009). Novel items also have to be relatively dissimilar to a user profile, as the user is likely to be familiar with items similar to the ones she/he has rated (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b).
- An item is *unexpected* to a user if the user does not anticipate this item to be recommended to him/her (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). The user does not expect items that are dissimilar to the ones usually recommended to him/her. Generally, recommender systems suggest items similar to items rated by the user (Tacchini, 2012; Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). Consequently, an item dissimilar to the rated ones is regarded as unexpected (Kotkov et al., 2016a; Kotkov et al., 2016b). The measure of dissimilarity could be based on user ratings or item attributes depending on the application scenario of a recommender system (Kaminskas and Bridge, 2014).

State-of-the-art serendipity-oriented recommendation algorithms are barely compared with one another and often employ different serendipity metrics and definitions of the concept, as there is no agreement on the definition of serendipity in recommender systems (Zhang et al., 2012; Lu et al., ; Kotkov et al., 2016b).

In this paper, we propose a serendipity-oriented recommendation algorithm based on our definition above. We compare our algorithm with state-of-the-art serendipity-oriented algorithms. We also show that the serendipity metric we use in the experiments includes each of the three components of serendipity, unlike the most common serendipity metric.

Our serendipity-oriented algorithm reranks recommendations provided by an accuracy-oriented algorithm and improves serendipity through feature diversification. The proposed algorithm is based on an existing reranking algorithm and outperforms this algorithm in terms of accuracy and serendipity. Our algorithm also outperforms the state-of-the-art serendipity-oriented algorithms in terms of serendipity and diversity.

The paper has the following contributions:

- We propose a serendipity-oriented recommendation algorithm.

Table 1: Notations.

$I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n_I}\}$	the set of items
$I_u, I_u \subseteq I$	the set of items rated by user $u$ (user profile)
$F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n_F}\}$	the set of features
$F_i, F_i \subseteq F$	the set of features of item $i$
$U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n_U}\}$	the set of users
$U_i, U_i \subseteq U$	the set of users who rated item $i$
$RS_u(n), RS_u(n) \subseteq I$	the set of top- $n$ recommendations provided by an algorithm to user $u$
$r_{u,i}$	the rating given by user $u$ to item $i$
$\hat{r}_{u,i}$	the prediction of the rating given by user $u$ to item $i$

- We evaluate existing serendipity-oriented recommendation algorithms.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the proposed algorithm. Section 3 is dedicated to experimental setting, while section 4 reports the results of the experiments. Finally, section 5 draws conclusions and indicates future work.

## 2 A SERENDIPITY-ORIENTED GREEDY ALGORITHM

To describe the proposed algorithm, we present the notation in Table 1. Let  $I$  be a set of available items and  $U$  be a set of users. User  $u$  rates or interacts with items  $I_u, I_u \subseteq I$ . A recommender system suggests  $RS_u(n)$  items to user  $u$ . Each item can have a number of features  $F_i = \{f_{i,1}, f_{i,2}, \dots, f_{i,n_F,i}\}$ . The rating user  $u$  has given to item  $i$  is represented by  $r_{u,i}$ , while the predicted rating is represented by  $\hat{r}_{u,i}$ .

### 2.1 Description

We propose a serendipity-oriented greedy (SOG) algorithm, which is based on a topic diversification algorithm (TD) (Ziegler et al., 2005). The objective of TD is to increase the diversity of a recommendation list. Both SOG and TD belong to the group of greedy reranking algorithms (Castells et al., 2015). According to the classification provided in (Kotkov et al., 2016b), we propose a hybrid reranking algorithm following the post-filtering paradigm and considering unpopularity and dissimilarity.

Algorithm 1 describes the proposed approach. An accuracy-oriented algorithm predicts item ratings  $\hat{r}_{u,i}$

**Input** :  $RS_u(n)$ : top- $n$  recommendation set,  
 $\Theta_F$ : damping factor  
**Output**:  $Res$ : picked item list  
 $B'$ : candidate set,  
 $\hat{r}_{u,i}$ : predicted rating of an item,  
 $\hat{r}_{u,f}$ : predicted rating of a feature;  
 $Res[0] \leftarrow i$  with max  $\hat{r}_{u,i}$ ;  
**for**  $z \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  **do**  
      $B \leftarrow set(Res)$ ; // set converts a list to a set  
      $B' \leftarrow RS_u(n) \setminus B$ ;  
     calculate  $c_{u,B,i}, i \in B'$ ;  
     normalize  $c_{u,B,i}, \hat{r}_{u,f}$  and  $\hat{r}_{u,i}, i \in B'$  to  $[0, 1]$ ;  
     **forall the**  $i \in B'$  **do**  
         | calculate  $score_{u,i}$   
     **end**  
      $Res[z] \leftarrow i$  with max  $score_{u,i}$ ;  
**end**

Algorithm 1: Description of SOG.

and generates top- $n$  suggestions  $RS_u(n)$  for user  $u$ . SOG iteratively picks items from set  $RS_u(n)$  to fill diversified list  $Res$ . In each iteration the algorithm generates a candidate set  $B'$  which contains top- $n$  recommendations  $RS_u(n)$  except picked items from list  $Res$  (or from set  $B$ ). A candidate item with the highest score is added to diversified list  $Res$ . The score is calculated as follows:

$$score_{u,i} = (1 - \Theta_F) \cdot \hat{r}_{u,i} + \Theta_F \cdot c_{u,B,i}, \quad (1)$$

$$c_{u,B,i} = d_{u,B} + \Theta_S \cdot \left( \max_{f \in (F_i \setminus F_u)} (\hat{r}_{u,f}) + unexp_{u,i} \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\Theta_S$  is a serendipity weight, while  $\Theta_F$  is a damping factor, which is responsible for diversity of reranked recommendation list  $Res$ . The predicted rating of feature  $f$  for user  $u$  is represented by  $\hat{r}_{u,f}$ ,  $\hat{r}_{u,f} \in [0, 1]$ . Feature rating indicates how likely a user is to like an item that has a particular feature. As an item might have several features, we select the rating of a feature that is novel and most relevant to a user. If an item does not have any novel features  $F_i \setminus F_u = \emptyset$  then  $\max_{f \in (F_i \setminus F_u)} (\hat{r}_{u,f}) = 0$ . Unexpectedness is based on the number of new features of an item for a user:

$$unexp_{u,i} = \frac{\|F_i \setminus F_u\|}{\|F \setminus F_u\|}, \quad (3)$$

where  $F$  corresponds to the set of all features,  $F_i$  corresponds to features of item  $i$ , and  $F_u$  corresponds to features of items rated by user  $u$ . Suppose selected features correspond to movie genres  $F = \{comedy, drama, horror, adventure, crime\}$ , the movie ‘‘The Shawshank Redemption’’ could be represented as follows  $F_{shawshank} = \{drama, crime\}$ , while the user might rate comedies and dramas  $F_u = \{comedy, drama\}$ . For

**user-item matrix**    **user-feature matrix**

	i1	i2	i3	i4		f1	f2	f3			
u1	5	4			;	u1	4.5	5		;	F <sub>i1</sub> ={f1, f2}
u2	2	2		5		u2	2	2	5		F <sub>i2</sub> ={f1}
u3	4		4			u3	4	4			F <sub>i3</sub> ={f2}
u4	4	3				u4	3.5	4			F <sub>i4</sub> ={f3}
u5	2		5	5		u5	2	3.5	5		

Figure 1: An example of user-item and user-feature matrices.

user  $u$  the movie ‘‘The Shawshank Redemption’’ has the following unexpectedness:  $unexp_{u,shawshank} = \frac{\| \{drama, crime\} \setminus \{comedy, drama\} \|}{\| \{comedy, drama, horror, adventure, crime\} \setminus \{comedy, drama\} \|} = \frac{1}{3}$ . If the user rates items of all features  $F$ , we regard the feature that is the least familiar to the user as novel. If the user has not rated any features  $F_u = \emptyset$ , all the features are regarded as novel.

Dissimilarity of an item to picked items is calculated as follows:

$$d_{i,B} = \frac{1}{\|B\|} \sum_{j \in B} 1 - sim_{i,j}, \quad (4)$$

where similarity  $sim_{i,j}$  can be any kind of similarity measure. In our experiments we used content-based Jaccard similarity:

$$sim_{i,j} = \frac{\|F_i \cap F_j\|}{\|F_i \cup F_j\|}. \quad (5)$$

To predict feature ratings  $\hat{r}_{u,f}$ , we apply an accuracy-oriented algorithm to a user-feature matrix. A user-feature matrix is based on user-item matrix, where a rating given by a user to a feature corresponds to the mean rating given to items having this feature by this user:

$$r_{u,f} = \frac{1}{\|I_{u,f}\|} \sum_{i \in I_{u,f}} r_{u,i}, \quad (6)$$

where  $I_{u,f}$  is a set of items having feature  $f$  and rated by user  $u$ .

Figure 1 demonstrates an example of user-item and user-feature matrices. Suppose users have rated items  $i1$ ,  $i2$ ,  $i3$  and  $i4$  on the scale from 1 to 5 (user-item matrix). Each item has a number of features. For example, item  $i1$  has features  $f1$  and  $f2$ , while item  $i2$  only has feature  $f1$ . User-feature matrix contains feature ratings based on user-item matrix (eq. 6). For example, the rating of feature  $f1$  for user  $u1$  is 4.5, as items  $i1$  and  $i2$  have feature  $f1$  and the user gave a 5 to item  $i1$  and a 4 to item  $i2$ .

## 2.2 Analysis

Our algorithm considers each component of serendipity:

- Ratings  $\hat{r}_{u,i}$  and  $\hat{r}_{u,f}$  correspond to relevance.
- $unexp_{u,i}$  corresponds to unexpectedness.
- Novelty is handled implicitly. SOG suggests items with features novel to users, leading to the relative unpopularity of the items, as they have unpopular features.

Although SOG is based on TD, our algorithm has three key differences with respect to TD:

- SOG considers item scores instead of positions of items in lists, which leads to more accurate scores ( $score_{u,i}$ ).
- SOG employs a serendipity weight that controls how likely the algorithm is to suggest an item with a novel feature.
- SOG predicts features a user will like.

Our algorithm has four main advantages:

- The algorithm considers each component of serendipity.
- As our algorithm is based on the diversification algorithm, SOG improves both serendipity and diversity.
- As SOG is a reranking algorithm, it can be applied to any accuracy-oriented algorithm, which might be useful for a live recommender system (reranking can be conducted on the client's side of a client-server application).
- Our algorithm has two parameters, which adjust the algorithm according to different requirements. The parameters could be different for each user and be adjusted as the user becomes familiar with the system.

The computational complexity of the algorithm is  $O(n^3)$  (excluding pre-calculation), where  $n$  is a number of items in input set  $RS_u(n)$  (in our experiments  $n = 20$ ).

### 3 EXPERIMENTS

To evaluate existing algorithms and test the proposed serendipity metric, we conducted experiments using two datasets: HetRec (Harper and Konstan, 2015) and 100K MovieLens. The HetRec dataset contains 855,598 ratings given by 2,113 users to 10,197 movies (density 3.97%). The 100K MovieLens (100K ML) dataset contains 100,000 ratings given by 943 users to 1,682 movies (density 6.3%). The HetRec dataset is based on the MovieLens10M

dataset published by grouplens<sup>2</sup>. Movies in the HetRec dataset are linked with movies on IMDb<sup>3</sup> and Rotten Tomatoes<sup>4</sup> websites.

In our experimental setting, we hid 20 ratings of each evaluated user and regarded the rest of the ratings as training data. We performed a 5-fold cross-validation. Each evaluated algorithm ranked test items for a particular user based on training data.

This experimental setting was chosen due to the evaluation task. Other settings either let an algorithm rank all the items in the system or a limited number of them assuming that items unknown by a user are irrelevant. This assumption is not suitable for evaluation of serendipity, as serendipitous items are novel by definition (Iaquinta et al., 2010; Adamopoulos and Tuzhilin, 2014; Kotkov et al., 2016a). The experiments were conducted using Lenskit framework (Ekstrand et al., 2011).

#### 3.1 Baselines

We implemented the following baseline algorithms:

- **POP** ranks items according to the number of ratings each item received in descending order.
- **SVD** is a singular value decomposition algorithm which ranks items according to generated scores (Zheng et al., 2015). The objective function of the algorithm is the following:

$$\min \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{i \in I_u} (r_{u,i} - p_u q_i^T)^2 + \beta(\|p_u\|^2 + \|q_i\|^2), \quad (7)$$

where  $p_u$  and  $q_i$  are user-factor vector and item-factor vector, respectively, while  $\beta(\|p_u\|^2 + \|q_i\|^2)$  represents the regularization term.

- **SPR** (serendipitous personalized ranking) is an algorithm based on SVD that maximizes the serendipitous area under the ROC (receiver operating characteristic) curve (Lu et al., ):

$$\max \sum_{u \in U} f(u), \quad (8)$$

$$f(u) = \sum_{i \in I_u^+} \sum_{j \in I_u \setminus I_u^+} z_u \cdot \sigma(0, \hat{r}_{u,i} - \hat{r}_{u,j}) (\|U_j\|)^\alpha, \quad (9)$$

where  $I_u^+$  is a set of items a user likes. We considered that a user likes items that she/he rates higher than threshold  $\theta$  (in our experiments  $\theta = 3$ ). Normalization term  $z_u$  is calculated as follows:  $z_u = \frac{1}{\|I_u^+ \| \|I_u \setminus I_u^+\|}$ . We used hinge loss function to calculate  $\sigma(x)$  and set popularity weight  $\alpha$  to 0.5, as the

<sup>2</sup><http://www.grouplens.org>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.imdb.com>

<sup>4</sup><http://www.rottentomatoes.com>

algorithm performs the best with these parameters according to (Lu et al., ).

- **Zheng's** is an algorithm based on SVD that considers observed and unobserved ratings and weights the error with unexpectedness (Zheng et al., 2015):

$$\min \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{i \in I_u} (\tilde{r}_{u,i} - p_u q_i^T)^2 \cdot w_{u,i} + \beta (\|p_u\|^2 + \|q_i\|^2), \quad (10)$$

where  $\tilde{r}_{u,i}$  corresponds to observed and unobserved ratings a user  $u$  gave to item  $i$ . The unobserved ratings equal to 0. The weight  $w$  is calculated as follows:

$$w_{ui} = \left(1 - \frac{\|U_i\|}{\max_{j \in I} (\|U_j\|)}\right) + \frac{\sum_{j \in I_u} \text{diff}(i, j)}{\|I_u\|}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\max_{j \in I} (\|U_j\|)$  is the maximum number of ratings given to an item. A collaborative dissimilarity between items  $i$  and  $j$  is represented by  $\text{diff}(i, j)$ . The dissimilarity is calculated as follows  $\text{diff}(i, j) = 1 - \rho_{i,j}$ , where similarity  $\rho_{i,j}$  corresponds to the Pearson correlation coefficient:

$$\rho_{i,j} = \frac{\sum_{u \in S_{i,j}} (r_{u,i} - \bar{r}_u)(r_{u,j} - \bar{r}_u)}{\sqrt{\sum_{u \in S_{i,j}} (r_{u,i} - \bar{r}_u)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{u \in S_{i,j}} (r_{u,j} - \bar{r}_u)^2}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $S_{i,j}$  is the set of users rated both items  $i$  and  $j$ , while  $\bar{r}_u$  corresponds to an average rating for user  $u$ .

- **TD** is a topic diversification algorithm, where dissimilarity corresponds to eq. 4. Similarly to (Ziegler et al., 2005), we set  $\Theta_F = 0.9$ .
- **SOG** is the proposed serendipity-oriented greedy algorithm ( $\Theta_F = 0.9$ ,  $\Theta_S = 0.6$ ). We set  $\Theta_F$  similarly to (Ziegler et al., 2005) and  $\Theta_S$  slightly higher than 0.5 to emphasize the difference between SOG and TD. To predict feature ratings we used SVD, which received user-genre matrix. User ratings in the matrix correspond to mean ratings given by a user to items with those genres.
- **SOGBasic** is SOG algorithm without predicting genre ratings ( $\hat{r}_{uf} = 0$ ).

### 3.2 Evaluation Metrics

The main objective of our algorithm is to improve serendipity of a recommender system. A change of serendipity might affect other properties of a recommender system. To demonstrate the dependence of different properties and features of the baselines, we

employed evaluation metrics to measure four properties of recommender systems: (1) accuracy, as it is a common property (Kotkov et al., 2016b), (2) serendipity, as SPR, Zheng's, SOG and SOGBasic are designed to improve this property (Lu et al., ; Zheng et al., 2015), (3) diversity, as this is one of the objectives of TD, SOG and SOGBasic (Ziegler et al., 2005) and (4) novelty, as SPR, Zheng's, SOG and SOGBasic are designed to improve this property (Lu et al., ; Zheng et al., 2015).

To measure serendipity, we employed two metrics: traditional serendipity metric and our serendipity metric. The traditional serendipity metric disregards unexpectedness of items to a user, while our serendipity metric takes into account each component of serendipity. We provided results for both metrics to demonstrate their difference. Overall, we used five metrics:

- To measure a ranking ability of an algorithm, we use normalized discounted cumulative gain (NDCG), which, in turn, is based on discounted cumulative gain (DCG) (Järvelin and Kekäläinen, 2000):

$$DCG_u@n = rel_u(1) + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{rel_u(i)}{\log_2(i)}, \quad (13)$$

where  $rel_u(i)$  indicates relevance of an item with rank  $i$  for user  $u$ , while  $n$  indicates the number of top recommendations selected. The NDCG metric is calculated as follows:

$$NDCG_u@n = \frac{DCG_u@n}{IDCG_u@n}, \quad (14)$$

where  $IDCG_u@n$  is  $DCG_u@n$  value calculated for a recommendation list with an ideal order according to relevance.

- The traditional serendipity metric is based on a primitive recommender system which suggests items known and expected by a user. Evaluated recommendation algorithms are penalized for suggesting items that are irrelevant or generated by a primitive recommender system. Similarly to (Zheng et al., 2015), we used a slight modification of the serendipity metric:

$$SerPop_u@n = \frac{RS_u(n) \setminus PM \cap REL_u}{n}, \quad (15)$$

where  $PM$  is a set of items generated by the primitive recommender system. We selected the 100 most popular items for  $PM$  following one of the most common strategies (Zheng et al., 2015; Lu et al., ). Items relevant to user  $u$  are represented by  $REL_u, REL_u = \{i \in TestSet_u | r_{ui} > \theta\}$ , where  $TestSet_u$  is a ground truth for user  $u$ , while  $\theta$  is the

threshold rating, which in our experiments equals to 3.

- Our serendipity metric is based on the traditional one. Although the traditional serendipity metric successfully captures relevance and novelty of recommendations by setting a threshold for ratings and taking into account the number of ratings assigned to an item, the metric disregards unexpectedness. In this paper, we consider an item unexpected to a user if the item has at least one feature novel to the user e.g. a feature, of which the user has not yet rated an item. We therefore calculate the serendipity metric as follows:

$$Ser_u@n = \frac{RS_u(n) \setminus PM \cap REL_u \cap UNEXP_u}{n}, \quad (16)$$

where  $UNEXP_u$  is a set of items that have at least one feature novel to user  $u$ . In our experiments, a movie with at least one genre, which the user has not rated a movie of is considered unexpected.

- To measure diversity, we employed an intra-list dissimilarity metric (Zheng et al., 2015):

$$Div_u@n = \frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1)} \sum_{i \in RS_u(n)} \sum_{j \neq i \in RS_u(n)} 1 - sim_{i,j}, \quad (17)$$

where similarity  $sim_{i,j}$  is based on Jaccard similarity using item sets based on movie genres (eq. 5).

- Novelty is based on the number of ratings assigned to an item (Zhang et al., 2012):

$$nov_i = 1 - \frac{\|U_i\|}{\max_{j \in I} (\|U_j\|)}. \quad (18)$$

## 4 RESULTS

Table 2 demonstrates performance of baselines measured with different evaluation metrics. The following observations can be observed for both datasets:

1. SOG outperforms TD in terms of accuracy and slightly underperforms it in terms of diversity. For example, the improvement of  $NDCG@10$  is 5.3% on the HetRec dataset, while on the 100K ML dataset the improvement is 5.9%. The decrease of  $Div@10$  is less than 2%.
2. SOG outperforms other algorithms in terms of our serendipity metric and the state-of-the-art serendipity-oriented algorithms in terms of diversity, while the highest value of traditional serendipity metric belongs to SPR. TD achieves the highest diversity among the presented algorithms.
3. SOG outperforms SOGBasic in terms of our serendipity metric. For example, the improvement of  $Ser@10$  is 5.9% on the HetRec dataset, while on the 100K ML dataset the improvement is 10.9%.
4. SOG slightly outperforms SOGBasic in terms of  $NDCG@n$  ( $< 1\%$ ) and the traditional serendipity metric  $SerPop@n$  ( $< 1\%$ ) and underperforms in terms of  $Div@n$  ( $< 1\%$  for the HetRec dataset and  $1 - 2\%$  for the 100K ML dataset).
5. Popularity baseline outperforms SOGBasic, SOG and TD in terms of  $NDCG@n$ , but underperforms all the presented algorithms in terms of serendipity.

Observation 1 indicates that our algorithm improves TD in terms of both serendipity and accuracy, having an insignificant decrease in diversity. TD provides slightly more diverse recommendations than SOG, as these algorithms have different objectives. The main objective of TD is to increase diversity (Ziegler et al., 2005), while SOG is designed not only to diversify recommendations, but also expose more recommendations with novel genres to a user. SOG therefore picks movies less expected and slightly less diverse than TD. Surprisingly, suggesting movies with genres novel to a user increases accuracy, which might be caused by diverse user preferences regarding movies. The improvements of accuracy and serendipity seem to overcompensate for the insignificant decrease of diversity.

Observation 2 suggests that our algorithm provides the most serendipitous recommendations among the presented baselines, which is partly due to  $\Theta_F = 0.9$  for our algorithm. This parameter also causes the high diversity of TD. We set  $\Theta_F$  the same as (Ziegler et al., 2005) to emphasize the difference between SOG and TD. SPR achieves the highest traditional serendipity due to its objective function (Lu et al., ). This algorithm is designed to suggest relevant unpopular items to users.

The prediction of genres a user is likely to find relevant improves serendipity, according to observation 3. Meanwhile, accuracy, traditional serendipity and diversity remain almost the same, as observation 4 suggests. SOG appears to increase the number of relevant, novel and unexpected movies and supplant some relevant and expected movies from recommendation lists with respect to SOGBasic, as novel and unexpected movies suggested by SOG are more likely to also be relevant to users than those suggested by SOGBasic.

According to observation 5, our algorithm underperforms the non-personalized baseline in terms of  $NDCG@n$ . Accuracy of POP is generally relatively

Table 2: Performance of algorithms.

HetRec dataset				100K ML dataset			
Algorithm	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	NDCG@15	Algorithm	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	NDCG@15
TD	0,761	0,800	0,840	TD	0,736	0,776	0,823
SOGBasic	0,824	0,841	0,873	SOGBasic	0,800	0,821	0,859
SOG	0,825	0,842	0,873	SOG	0,801	0,822	0,859
POP	0,824	0,848	0,878	POP	0,804	0,833	0,869
SPR	0,854	0,873	0,894	SPR	0,821	0,839	0,868
Zheng's	0,857	0,874	0,898	Zheng's	0,836	0,859	0,887
SVD	0,871	0,894	0,916	SVD	0,844	0,868	0,897
Algorithm	SerPop@5	SerPop@10	SerPop@15	Algorithm	SerPop@5	SerPop@10	SerPop@15
POP	0,224	0,393	0,476	POP	0,039	0,178	0,297
Zheng's	0,323	0,440	0,497	Zheng's	0,215	0,284	0,328
TD	0,457	0,482	0,493	TD	0,318	0,324	0,328
SOGBasic	0,493	0,494	0,501	SOGBasic	0,332	0,331	0,333
SOG	0,493	0,495	0,501	SOG	0,333	0,332	0,333
SVD	0,501	0,544	0,546	SVD	0,338	0,353	0,357
SPR	0,431	0,550	0,563	SPR	0,255	0,373	0,394
Algorithm	Ser@5	Ser@10	Ser@15	Algorithm	Ser@5	Ser@10	Ser@15
POP	0,072	0,112	0,136	POP	0,010	0,055	0,114
Zheng's	0,100	0,122	0,135	Zheng's	0,061	0,094	0,127
SVD	0,159	0,156	0,151	SVD	0,129	0,136	0,144
SPR	0,128	0,162	0,158	SPR	0,086	0,150	0,165
TD	0,192	0,177	0,158	TD	0,166	0,171	0,156
SOGBasic	0,284	0,204	0,168	SOGBasic	0,239	0,193	0,166
SOG	0,305	0,216	0,174	SOG	0,278	0,214	0,174
Algorithm	Div@5	Div@10	Div@15	Algorithm	Div@5	Div@10	Div@15
Zheng's	0,782	0,795	0,798	SPR	0,788	0,792	0,796
SVD	0,787	0,795	0,799	Zheng's	0,783	0,794	0,799
SPR	0,797	0,797	0,796	SVD	0,787	0,795	0,800
POP	0,794	0,803	0,803	POP	0,813	0,810	0,808
SOG	0,944	0,891	0,850	SOG	0,938	0,891	0,853
SOGBasic	0,948	0,893	0,851	SOGBasic	0,959	0,901	0,856
TD	0,952	0,894	0,852	TD	0,964	0,903	0,857

high, as users on average tend to give high ratings to popular movies (Amatriain and Basilico, 2015). However, accuracy in this case is unlikely to reflect user satisfaction, as users are often already familiar with popular movies suggested. Despite being relatively accurate, POP suggests familiar and obvious movies, which is supported by both serendipity metrics. The relatively low accuracy of our algorithm was caused by the high damping factor  $\Theta_F$ .

#### 4.1 Serendipity Weight Analysis

Figure 2 indicates performance of SOG and SOGBasic algorithms with the change of serendipity weight  $\Theta_S$  from 0 to 1 with the step of 0.1 (without cross-validation) on the HetRec dataset (on the 100K ML dataset the observations are the same). The two following trends can be observed: (1) serendipity

declines with the increase of accuracy, as with the growth of  $\Theta_S$  our algorithms tend to suggest more movies that users do not usually rate, and (2) diversity declines with the increase of serendipity, as with the growth of  $\Theta_S$  our algorithms tend to suggest more movies of genres novel to the user limiting the number of genres recommended.

As SOG predicts genres a user likes, its *Ser@10* is slightly higher than that of SOGBasic for the same values of *NDCG@10*. SOG tends to suggest more movies of genres not only novel, but also interesting to a user, which slightly hurts diversity, but improves serendipity.

#### 4.2 Qualitative Analysis

Table 3 demonstrates the recommendations provided for a randomly selected user, who rated 25 movies in




Figure 2: Performance of SOG and SOGBasic algorithms on the Hetrec dataset.

Table 3: Suggestions generated to a random user from the Hetrec dataset (novel genres are in bold).

User profile			
Name	Genres	Rating	<i>nov</i>
Major League	Comedy	3.5	0.882
The Shawshank Redemption	Drama	4.5	0.137
Stargate	Action Adventure Sci-Fi	4.5	0.572
Robin Hood: Men in Tights	Comedy	3.5	0.684
The Three Musketeers	Action Adventure Comedy	3.5	0.789
SPR recommendations			
Name	Genres	Rating	<i>nov</i>
V for Vendetta	<b>Thriller</b>	5	0.438
Enemy of the State	Action <b>Thriller</b>	3.5	0.620
The Count of Monte Cristo	Drama	3.5	0.787
Free Enterprise	Comedy <b>Romance</b> Sci-Fi	4.5	0.989
First Knight	Action Drama <b>Romance</b>	3.5	0.962
SOG recommendations			
Name	Genres	Rating	<i>nov</i>
V for Vendetta	<b>Thriller</b>	5	0.438
The Untouchables	<b>Thriller Crime</b> Drama	4.5	0.604
Monsters. Inc.	<b>Animation Children</b> Comedy <b>Fantasy</b>	4	0.331
Minority Report	Action <b>Crime Mystery</b> Sci-Fi <b>Thriller</b>	3	0.260
Grease	Comedy <b>Musical Romance</b>	3	0.615

the HetRec dataset. The algorithms received 5 ratings as the training set and regarded 20 ratings as the test set for the user. We provided recommendations generated by two algorithms: (1) SOG due to high  $Ser@n$ , and (2) SPR due to high  $SerPop@n$ .

Although SPR suggested less popular movies than SOG, our algorithm outperformed SPR at overcoming the overspecialization problem, as it introduced more novel genres (8 genres) to the user than SPR (2 genres). Our algorithm also provided a more diversified recommendation list than SPR.

The suggestion of the movie “Monsters Inc.” seems to significantly broaden user tastes, as the suggestion is relevant and introduces three new genres to the user. Provided that the movie is serendipitous to the user, it is likely to inspire the user to watch more

cartoons in the future.

Analysis of tables 2 and 3 suggests that the traditional serendipity metric captures only novelty and relevance by penalizing algorithms for suggesting popular and irrelevant items, while  $Ser@n$  takes into account each component of serendipity, which allows assessment of the ability of the algorithm to overcome overspecialization.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

We proposed a serendipity-oriented greedy (SOG) recommendation algorithm. We also provided eval-



uation results of our algorithm and state-of-the-art algorithms using different serendipity metrics.

SOG is based on the topic diversification (TD) algorithm (Ziegler et al., 2005) and improves its accuracy and serendipity for the insignificant price of diversity.

Our serendipity-oriented algorithm outperforms the state-of-the-art serendipity-oriented algorithms in terms of serendipity and diversity, and underperforms them in terms of accuracy.

Unlike the traditional serendipity metric, the serendipity metric we employed in this study captures each component of serendipity. The choice of this metric is supported by qualitative analysis.

In our future research, we intend to further investigate serendipity-oriented algorithms. We will also involve real users to validate our results.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research at the University of Jyväskylä was performed in the MineSocMed project, partially supported by the Academy of Finland, grant #268078.

## REFERENCES

- Adamopoulos, P. and Tuzhilin, A. (2014). On unexpectedness in recommender systems: Or how to better expect the unexpected. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 5(4):1–32.
- Amatriain, X. and Basilico, J. (2015). Recommender systems in industry: A netflix case study. In *Recommender Systems Handbook*, pages 385–419. Springer.
- Castells, P., Hurley, N. J., and Vargas, S. (2015). Novelty and diversity in recommender systems. In *Recommender Systems Handbook*, pages 881–918. Springer.
- Celma Herrada, Ò. (2009). *Music recommendation and discovery in the long tail*. PhD thesis, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Ekstrand, M. D., Ludwig, M., Konstan, J. A., and Riedl, J. T. (2011). Rethinking the recommender research ecosystem: Reproducibility, openness, and lenskit. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 133–140, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Harper, F. M. and Konstan, J. A. (2015). The movielens datasets: History and context. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, 5(4):19:1–19:19.
- Iaquinta, L., Semeraro, G., de Gemmis, M., Lops, P., and Molino, P. (2010). *Can a recommender system induce serendipitous encounters?* InTech.
- Järvelin, K. and Kekäläinen, J. (2000). Ir evaluation methods for retrieving highly relevant documents. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 41–48, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Kaminskas, M. and Bridge, D. (2014). Measuring surprise in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Recommender Systems Evaluation: Dimensions and Design (Workshop Programme of the 8th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems)*.
- Kotkov, D., Veijalainen, J., and Wang, S. (2016a). Challenges of serendipity in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 12th International conference on web information systems and technologies.*, volume 2, pages 251–256. SCITEPRESS.
- Kotkov, D., Wang, S., and Veijalainen, J. (2016b). A survey of serendipity in recommender systems. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 111:180–192.
- Lu, Q., Chen, T., Zhang, W., Yang, D., and Yu, Y. Serendipitous personalized ranking for top-n recommendation. In *Proceedings of the The IEEE/WIC/ACM International Joint Conferences on Web Intelligence and Intelligent Agent Technology*, volume 1.
- Maksai, A., Garcin, F., and Faltings, B. (2015). Predicting online performance of news recommender systems through richer evaluation metrics. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 179–186, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Ricci, F., Rokach, L., and Shapira, B. (2011). *Recommender Systems Handbook*, chapter Introduction to Recommender Systems Handbook, pages 1–35. Springer US.
- Tacchini, E. (2012). *Serendipitous mentorship in music recommender systems*. PhD thesis.
- Zhang, Y. C., Séaghdha, D. O., Quercia, D., and Jambor, T. (2012). Auralist: Introducing serendipity into music recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 13–22, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Zheng, Q., Chan, C.-K., and Ip, H. H. (2015). An unexpectedness-augmented utility model for making serendipitous recommendation. In *Advances in Data Mining: Applications and Theoretical Aspects*, volume 9165, pages 216–230. Springer International Publishing.
- Ziegler, C.-N., McNee, S. M., Konstan, J. A., and Lausen, G. (2005). Improving recommendation lists through topic diversification. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 22–32, New York, NY, USA. ACM.