Themed Presentation from: Slide Chef

# Recommendation Systems Amazon User Recommendation Solution – MIT NCAIML

July 2, 2023 - Edward Lang





# amazon

Recommendations Based on Previous User Ratings:

**Electronic Products** 



#### **Disclaimers & Notices**

The following case study was created for educational purposes only. All data used has been anonymized.

This presentation template is under license by Slide Chef.

Certain trademarks and other protected Intellectual Property belongs to the appropriate owners, including use of the Amazon logo and colors.

#### Sources utilized in preparing this presentation:

https://www.amazon.science/blog/using-graph-neural-networks-to-recommend-related-products https://financesonline.com/amazon-statistics/ https://www.zippia.com/advice/amazon-statistics/ https://www.mageplaza.com/blog/product-recommendation-how-amazon-succeeds-with-it.html https://boostcommerce.net/blogs/all/lesson-learned-from-amazon-product-recommendation https://recostream.com/blog/amazon-recommendation-system









# **Executive Summary**

**Business Problem**: To try and improve Amazon's recommendation systems by building and comparing both an Item-Item and User-User system.

**Data Insights**: We have over 1 million records with ratings between 1-5 on electronic products.

**Methodology**: utilize collaborative filtering techniques and test various models.

**Recommended Solution**: Based on the initial parameters provided, we recommend the User-User system.

**Further Considerations**: With the addition of the user's comments, we could have also looked at a content-based model for comparative purposes.



# **Business Problem: Overview**

There is no denying that Amazon is an eCommerce GIANT. 2<sup>nd</sup> to Alibaba, it is the market leader in the US, including electronics.

Some quick stats:

- Amazon's share of all e-commerce sales in the U.S. hit a whopping 56.7% in 2021. (Zippia, July 2023)
- Amazon has a catalog of 12 million products across all categories and services. (RepricerExpress, 2021)
- The Amazon product category with the most number of global keywords is electronics (70 keywords) followed by home (12), media (7), miscellaneous (6), clothing (4), and food (1). (Visual Capitalist, 2020)
- In the U.S., electronics was the most purchased product category on Amazon Prime Day at 32%, followed by household essentials (22%), health and beauty (21%), and toys and video games (21%). (Numerator, 2020)
- 63.5% of Amazon traffic comes from the U.S. (Amazon, 2021)





ction – MIT NCAIML

# **Business Problem: Details**

#### **History**

Amazon is no stranger to collaborative filtering for a recommendation system. In fact, they pioneered various methods of collaborative filtering, including a published article Recommendations: Item-to-Item Collaborative Filtering in 2003, which later won an award from the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) as the published article that best stood the test of time.

In contrast to content-based filtering, Amazon discovered that other filtering techniques, such as the collaborative filtering done in this study, produces better results, specifically:

- diversity group filtering generates a more diverse list of recommended products, offering customers a wider choice,
- **randomness** recommendations are much more likely to positively surprise customers and show them a product of interest, which they may have never considered, and
- **randomness** these methods can more effectively present to customers offers they would most likely be interested in.

(Source: https://recostream.com/blog/amazon-recommendation-system)

According to a McKinsey study, **up to 35%** of Amazon's sales are generated thanks to the proprietary product **recommendation algorithm.** 



Source: https://www.statista.com/statistics/266282/annual-net-revenue-of-amazoncom/

ction – MIT NCAIML

# **Problem Definition**

As the US eCommerce dominate consumer site, it is critical, with so much choice in the Amazon market, to recommend useful products to consumers.

#### Background

Data Collected - Amazon uses 2 sources

- · general data related to products and users; and
- data about the relationships and dependencies between them.

Amazon's Recommendation algorithm 3 main types of analysis

- User-Product;
- · Product-Product; and
- User-User

Addition data utilized in the current Amazon rrecommendation aalgorithm

- User behavior;
- User demographics; and
- Product attributes.

#### SMS SPAM Prediction - MIT NCAIML

#### Goals

#### **Initial Objectives**

- Gain insights into the relationships between users and product ratings; and
- Build a Recommendation System model using different techniques (I-I & U-U) to try and predict both ratings and recommend electronics to other users
- Compare different models and select the best performing (add'l analysis is in the Appendix).

#### Not considered in this study

 Since none of the additional data utilized by Amazon is provided, these recommendation models are focused only only the product ratings provided by users



# **Solution Design**

The following methodology is being utilized for this study.



# **Solution Design: Methods Applied**

Models Performed Beyond Requested Study (Results in Appendix)

Rank-based Recommendation System: This is the simplest method of creating recommendation systems, where we assume that all customers have similar preferences.

#### Assignment Requirements

User-User Collaborative Filtering: an item is recommended to a user based on user-user similarity, by looking at the items used by similar users.

#### Item-Item Collaborative

**Filtering**: an item is recommended to the user simply based on item-item similarity with items this user has already used. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) Based Collaborative Filtering:, Matrix Factorization is applied to fill user-item interaction matrix in order to make recommendations.

Performance Metrics measures the average difference between a statistical model's predicted values and the actual values. So for our purposes, that would be predicted ratings. We have been asked to consider RMSE first as it is more sensitive to outliers. Hence, the lower the RMSE, the better the model.

**RMSE**: RMSE or Root Mean Squared Error,

MAE: MAE stands for Mean Absolute Error and is a measure of errors between paired observations. For our study, this is the average absolute difference between the predicted rating and the actual rating. We will consider this result second – lower is better. **NMAE**: NMAE or Normalized Mean Absolute Error is used to facilitate the comparison regarding MAE of datasets with different scales. This is a normalized version of MAE. f NMAE, the better the model. We consider 3<sup>rd</sup> – lower is better.

# **Exploratory Data Analysis: Data Definition**

There are three features present in this dataset:

I. User\_Id – this randomized attribute identifies each unique Amazon customer that rated an electronic product
 II. Product\_Id - this randomized attribute identifies each unique Amazon electronic product that was rated
 III. Rating – this attribute is the actual rating, between 1-5, that each user gave to a specific electronic product



# EDA: Data Exploration -Data Overview

- **1,048575 Rows**: Each row in the dataset represents a rating of an electronic product.
- **3 Columns**: The columns/attributes in the dataset contain the necessary details about the User ID, Product ID and Rating

JW No.	user_id	prod_id	rating
1	A2CX7LUOHB2NDG	321732944	5
2	A2NWSAGRHCP8N5	439886341	1
3	A2WNBOD3WNDNKT	439886341	3
4	A1GI0U4ZRJA8WN	439886341	1
5	A1QGNMC6O1VW39	511189877	5
6	A3J3BRHTDRFJ2G	511189877	2
7	A2TY0BTJOTENPG	511189877	5
8	A34ATBPOK6HCHY	511189877	5
9	A89DO69P0XZ27	511189877	5
10	AZYNQZ94U6VDB	511189877	5
11	A1DA3W4GTFXP6O	528881469	5
12	A29LPQQDG7LD5J	528881469	1
13	AO94DHGC771SJ	528881469	5
	514	528881469	1
	01	528881469	4



- There are **no missing** attributes.
- The ratings system is between 1 and 5.
- The **average of all the ratings** given by users is **3.973**. This indicates that the electronics being reviewed on Amazon are generally getting a good ratings from consumers.

#### Data set basic statistics – Rapid Miner

Name	ŀ	Туре	Missing	Statistics			Filter (3 / 3 attributes):
∧ user_id		Nominal	0	400 300 300 300 300 400 400 400	Least AZZZOVIBXHGDR (1)	Most A5JLAU2ARJOBO (412)	Values A5JLAUZARJOBO (412), A231WM2Z2JLOU3 (249), A25HBOSV838E5A (164), A6FIAB28IS79 (146), [786325 more] Details
∧ prod_id		Nominal	0	2,500 2,500 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Least B000IF4G2A (1)	Most B0002L5R78 (9487)	Values B0002L5R78 (9487), B0001FTVEK (5345), B000168BD4 (4903), B000BQ7GW8 (4275), [61888 more] Details
∧ rating		Integer	0	500,000 400,000 300,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Min Max 1 5	Average 3.973	Deviation 1.399

- Plotting the ratings reveals that ~55% of Amazon customers have rated electronics purchased a 5-star rating and nearly 75% give it a 4-star rating or higher. This indicates most customers are very satisfied with their purchases
- ~7% of customers however (a small proportion) have rated the electronics low, i.e., a 1 or 2.

#### EDA: Data Exploration - Ratings Distribution



## EDA: Data Exploration - Ratings Count by Product

- This table shows those electronics with the **highest counts** of ratings in the dataset.
- There are a total of 61,893 unique products of electronics available in the dataset.
- Product "**B0002L5R78**" received the highest number of ratings of any other products (almost 2x1).

Row No.	prod_id	count(prod_id) $\downarrow$
30276	B0002L5R78	9487
24439	B0001FTVEK	5345
61285	B000168BD4	4903
46504	B000BQ7GW8	4275
14183	B00007E7JU	3523
45867	B000BKJZ9Q	3219
45092	B000B9RI14	2996
43023	B000A6PPOK	2828
14780	B00007M1TZ	2608
5130	B00004ZCJE	2547

# **EDA: Data Exploration - Count by Users**

Row No.	user_id	count(user
1	A5JLAU2ARJ0BO	412
2	A231WM2Z2JL0U3	249
3	A25HBO5V8S8SEA	164
4	A6FIAB28IS79	146
5	AT6CZDCP4TRGA	128
6	AKT8TGIT6VVZ5	122
7	A11D1KHM7DVOQK	112
8	A2B7BUH8834Y6M	103
9	A3OXHLG6DIBRW8	95
10	A203OCQQ12MAVT	90

MIT NCAIML

- This table is a quick check to show the User IDs for users who have provided the highest number of reviews for Amazon electronics in the dataset.
- There are a total of **786,329 unique users**, 412 is the highest number of reviews provided by a single user.
- As per the number of unique users and businesses, there is a possibility of 786,329 x 61,893 = 48,668,260,797 ratings. However, we only have 1,045,575 ratings (around 0.0021%), a very small amount of the total possible ratings.





### Item-Item Similarity-Based Model



# Model Comparisons

Model Performance Metrics	RMSE	MAE	NMAE	Runtime
Item-Item Collaborative	1.271	0.981	0.245	5 secs
User-User Collaborative	1.155	0.892	0.223	5 secs

Here are the performance metrics of the 2 different collaborative filtering-based methods asked to be performed using the Amazon dataset:

In our tests – after running the **User-User Similarity Based Recommendation System** and the **Item-Item Similarity-Based Recommendation System** with users who have rated over 100 products, the User-KNN model with k=90, and minimum rating of 1 and range of 4, using cosine similarity as the similarity metric; **the User-to-User Process** produced the best results.





### **Item Recommendation**



<b>Performance Vector</b> (Performance) Result not stored in repository.
PerformanceVector: AUC: 0.395 prec@5: 0.001 prec@10: 0.001 prec@15: 0.001 NDCG: 0.110 MAP: 0.005

# Items Recommended: Optimum Model

- As requested, here is the output for the top 5 recommended electronic products based on our item recommendation model.
- As previously mentioned, with the data set, the user IDs and product IDs have been anonymized.

	user_id	item_id	rank
•	1309	60505	1
•	1309	6691	2
	1309	2548	3
	1309	16436	4
	1309	41718	5
	62644	61838	1
	62644	2692	2
	62644	8047	3
on 5 Pocommo	0953	4	
Fxamples for 2		3119	5

Other Considerations:

- If we were given the actual user reviews, we could have considered a Content-Based Recommendation System
- If we were given other products, we could have seen the relationship between product categories on a userby-user basis.

#### Conclusions

With our initial analysis, we found that most ratings fell between **4 and 5 (75%)** and the overall average rating from the data set was **3.973**.

- Based on our findings, Amazon can continue to aid its customers by continuing to utilize the User-User recommendation model as shown in this study (Rapid Miner files available upon request).
- It has been observed in our initial study that the User-User Collaborative Model produced the best performance based on RMSE, MAE, and NMAE. Even after testing more parameters and additional techniques, including training with more or less records, the User-User model performs the best.
- Amazon should continue using Item-Item Collaborative Filtering models to help make personalized electronic recommendations to enhance discovery, increase loyalty and engagement from customers.











# Model Results: Rank-Based Recommendation

Row No.	prod_id	count(ratin	ıg) ↓	average	e(rating)		
30276	B0002L5R78	9487 4.449					
24439	B0001FTVEK	5345		4.007			
61285	B000168BD4	4903		3.502			
46504	B000BQ7GW8	4275		4 5 5 3			
14183	B00007E7JU	ow No.	prod_i	d	count(rat	ing)	average(rat \downarrow
45867	1 ВОООВКЈZ90		05940	0232X	3		5
45092	3 B000B9RI14		09433	9676X	1		5
43023	5 B000A6PPO		10398	69017	2		5
14780	800007M11		11827	02627	3		5
5130	B000047CIE	L	15758	39415	1		5
5150	33	3	15931	52523	2		5
	34	1	15942	43034	1		5
	37	7	16045	50945	1		5
	38	3	16101	30804	1		5
	49	9	16155	98790	1		5

- This model is the most basic form of a recommendation system by simply recommending the highest-rated product within the category to a new visitor.
- This type of recommendation model is a nonpersonalized technique.
- This Rank-based model was based on users who had at least 100 rated items are taken into consideration.
  - We can see that the product with the most ratings had an average of 4.449.
  - Also, notice the ten items that average a rating of 5, despite having a small number of ratings overall.

### Model: Collaborative Filtering Using the Optimize Parameters Operator for Hyperparameter Tuning



Pearson and Cosine similarity are both measures of similarity between two sets of data but used in different ways. Pearson is a measure of linear correlation between two sets of data. It is commonly used to measure the correlation between two continuous variables, such as the relationship between height and weight. Cosine is a measure of similarity between two non-zero vectors. It is commonly used in NLP such as measuring the similarity between two documents. So, Pearson is best used for continuous data, while Cosine similarity is best used for discrete data.

(Source: https://www.quora.com/In-what-scenario-is-using-Pearson-correlation-better-than-Cosine-similarity)



### Model: Collaborative Filtering User-User Hyperparameter Tuning



### Model: Collaborative Filtering User-User Hyperparameter Tuning RESULTS

~	Label rating	Integer	0	Min 1	Max 5	Average 4.090
~	User identification user_id	Polynominal	0	Least AZZZOVIBXHGDR (0)	Most A5JLAU2ARJOBO (285)	Values A5JLAU2ARJOBO (285), A231WM2Z2JLOU3 (170),[786327 more]
>	Item identification prod_id	Polynominal	0	Least B000IF51UQ (0)	Most B00004S9AK (2)	Values B00004S9AK (2), B00004SCKA (2),[61891 more]
>	count(rating)	Integer	0	Min 103	Max 412	Average 231.565
~	average(rating)	Real	0	Min 3.125	Max 4.963	Average 4.093

#### **Optimized Parameter GRID Stats**

Row No.	rating	user_id	prod_id	count(rating)	average(rat	
1	2	A11D1KHM	B0000010MN	112	3.125	
2	1	A11D1KHM	B00000J1G6	112	3.125	
3	4	A11D1KHM	B00000J9Z7	112	3.125	
4	1	A11D1KHM	B00000JBYW	112	3.125	
5	4	A11D1KHM	B00000JCTD	112	3.125	
6	4	A11D1KHM	B00001P3XM	112	3.125	
7	4	A11D1KHM	B00001W0D4	112	3.125	
8	3	A11D1KHM	B00001ZWRV	112	3.125	
9	1	A11D1KHM	B00004TZK6	112	3.125	
10	3	A11D1KHM	B00004Z0BN	112	3.125	
ExampleSet (1,	005 examples, 3 s	pecial attributes,	2 regular attribute	es)		

#### SMS SPAM Prediction – MIT NCAIML

#### **Fewer Records**



 Observation that the average rating range was reduced to those users with an average rating between 3.1 and 4.9 as the following table shows the distribution.

### Model: Collaborative Filtering User-User Hyperparameter Tuning RESULTS



### Model: Collaborative Filtering User-User Hyperparameter Tuning RESULTS

iteration	User k–NN (2).k	User k–NN (2).reg_u	User k–NN (2).reg_i	User k-NN (2).Correlation mode	RMSE
351	40	1	6	pearson	1.132
1	40	1	1	pearson	1.173
176	40	6	3	pearson	1.133
701	40	1	1	cosine	1.173
526	40	6	8	pearson	1.133

**Optimized Parameter GRID Output** 

### Model: Collaborative Filtering Item-Item Hyperparameter Tuning



## Model: Collaborative Filtering Item-Item Hyperparameter tuning RESULTS

Row No.	RMSE	MAE	NMAE
1	0.988	0.752	0.188
2	1.149	0.915	0.229
3	1.130	0.844	0.211
4	1.285	0.985	0.246
5	1.137	0.862	0.216

#### By Rating

#### **Optimized Parameter GRID Output**

iteration	ltem k-NN (2).k	ltem k-NN (2).reg_u	ltem k-NN (2).reg_i	RMSE ↑
37	50	1	5	1.138
38	60	1	5	1.138
39	70	1	5	1.138
40	80	1	5	1.138
41	90	1	5	1.138

### Model: Collaborative Filtering SVD Similarity-Based



## Model: Collaborative Filtering SVD Similarity-Based RESULTS

Row No.	rating	user_id	prod_id	count(rating)	average(rating)	predicti \downarrow
201	5	A5JLAU2ARJ	B000066E70	412	3.871	5
199	5	A5JLAU2ARJ	B0000658CG	412	3.871	4.814
274	2	A5JLAU2ARJ	B00026IN1U	412	3.871	4.645
347	5	A6FIAB28IS79	B000BKJZ9Q	146	4.137	4.586
189	1	A5JLAU2ARJ	B00004YKDQ	412	3.871	4.494
191	5	A5JLAU2ARJ	B00005LEN4	412	3.871	4.477
98	3	A231WM2Z	B0000APSKB	249	4.309	4.467
106	5	A25HBO5V	B00005ICE1	164	4.963	4.426
275	4	A5JLAU2ARJ	B0002B80EA	412	3.871	4.337
161	3	A2B7BUH88	B0000899ZA	103	4.417	4.326

SVD Model Output

### Model: Collaborative Filtering SVD Similarity-Based RESULTS



### Model: Collaborative Filtering SVD Hyperparameter Tuned



# Model: Collaborative Filtering SVD Hyperparameter Tuned RESULTS

iteration	MF.Learn rate	MF.Iteration number	MF.Regularization	RMSE 🕇
71	0.010	18	0.006	1.257
347	0.070	42	0.026	1.258
84	0.040	26	0.006	1.258
243	0.030	10	0.021	1.258
340	0.100	34	0.026	1.259

**Optimized Parameter GRID Output** 



### Models: I-I, U-U & SVD RESULTS

AMX Item Prediction (4 results. Process results) Completed: jul 1, 2023 11:32:09 AM (execution time: 5 s)								
	Performance Vector (Performance) Result not stored in repository.	ExampleSet (Performance) Result not stored in repository.		ExampleSet (Select Attrib Result not stored in repositor	utes)		IOObject (Item k-NN) Result not stored in repository.	
	PerformanceVector: RMSE: 1.271 MAE: 0.981 NMAE: 0.245	Data Table Number of examples = 1 3 attributes: Role Name Type Rang	ge Missings Comment	Data Table Source: //Local I Number of examples = 16	epository/data/Amazon Ratings 1542	^	com.rapidminer.operator.RatingPrediction.ItemKnnCos	ine@79df28b8
^		<ul> <li>RMSE real = [??]; rr</li> <li>MAE real = [??]; rr</li> <li>NMAE real = [??]; rr</li> </ul>	neam ≠1 no missing values - neam =7 no missing values - no missing values -	Role Name - average (rating) - count (rating)	Type         Range           real         = [??]; mean =?           integer         = [??]; mean =?	Missings Comment no missing - values no missing - values		
				label rating	integer = [??]; mean =?	missing - v		
	ANY line Predictions (2 coults a							
	AMX User Predictions (3 results. Process results) Completed: Jul 1, 2023 11:32:43 AM (execution time: 5 s)							😐 🗙
	Performance Vector (Performance) Result not stored in repository.		ExampleSet (Performance) Result not stored in repository.			ExampleSet (Select Attributes Result not stored in repository.	)	
	PerformanceVector:         Data           Mode:         0.003           Mode:         0.003           Mode:         0.003           Mode:         0.023           Rod         Rod		Data Table Number of examples = 1 3 attributes: Role Name Type Range Missings Comment		Data Table • Source: //Local Report Number of examples = 431 6 attributes:	sitory/data/Amazon Ratings	^	
^	* I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		<ul> <li>RMSE real = {7?}; mean =7 no missing values -</li> <li>MAE real = {7?}; mean =7 no missing values -</li> <li>NMAE real = {7?}; mean =7 no missing values -</li> </ul>		Role Name - count (rating) ir average	Type         Range           tteger         = [7?]; mean =?           tail         = [7?]; mean =?	Missings Comment no missing values no missing	
						(rating) ···	teger = [??]; mean =? 2 (A132P0Y5SISG2, A14KUMEJ094I23, A150Y5KRN7FWJ], A181272F224P001 A19TRA1WAPIS55	values no missing values
	AMX SVD Final (3 results. Process results) Completed: Jul 1, 2023 11:33:03 AM (execution time: 4 s)							🖴 🗙
	Performance Vector (Performance) Result not stored in repository.		ExampleSet (Multiply (4)) Result not stored in repository.			ExampleSet (Performance) Result not stored in repository.		
^	PerformanceVector: MMSE: 1.217 MMAE: 0.243 MMAE: 0.243		Data Table         Source: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings           • Source: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings         Source: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings           • Garmony         • Saurce: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings           • Garmony         • Name         Type           - Grating)         integer         = [77]; mean = ?           - Saverage         real         = [77]; mean = ?           label         rating         integer         = [77]; mean = ?           super         - S(A132POYS)SIGC2, A1         > S(A132POYS)SIGC2, A1	Range 4KUME[094/23, A150Y5KRN: 9TRA1WARK55	Missings Comment no missing - no missing - no missing - values routes rwg, no missing - values rwg, no miccing	Data Table Number of examples = 1 attribute: Rele Name Type Rang - MAE real = [C_7]; m - MAE real = [C_7]; m	ye Missings Comment an #? no missing values - aan #? no missing values = aan #? no missing values =	

ction – MIT NCAIML

### Models: I-I, U-U & SVD Optimization GRID RESULTS

AMX 121 GRID (4 results. Process results) Completed: Jul 1, 2023 11:37:35 AM (execution time: 10 s)					
ExampleSet (Optimize Parameters (Grid)) Result not stored in repository.	Performance Vector (Performance (3)) Result not stored in repository.	ExampleSet (Cross Validation (2)) Result not stored in repository.	IOObject (Item k-NN (2)) Result not stored in repository.		
Data Table <ul> <li>Source: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings</li> <li>Surface Number of examples = 1005</li> <li>Satributes:</li> <li>Role Name Type Range Missings Comment</li> <li>count</li> <li>missing</li> <li>count</li> <li>count</li></ul>	PerformanceVector: RMSE: 1.138 +/- 0.165 (micro average: 1.138) MAE: 0.827 - 0.087 (micro average: 0.672) NMAE: 0.218 +/- 0.082 (micro average: 0.218)	Data Table       Number of oxamples = 5       Sattributes:       Role Name Type     Range       Missings     Comment       -     RMSE real       = [77]; mean = 7     no missing values -       -     NMAE real       = [77]; mean = 7     no missing values -	com.rapidminer.operator.RatingPrediction.ItemKnnCosine@79c2la63		
label rating integer = [??]; mean =? missing -					
AMX U–U GRID (3 results. Process results) Completed: Jul 1, 2023 11:38:04 AM (execution time: 7 s)			<b>×</b>		
Performance Vector (Performance) Result not stored in repository.	ExampleSet (Optimize Parameters (Grid)) Result not stored in repository.	IOObject (User k-NN (2)) Result not stored in repository.			
Performancidvetar: PRSE: 1.32 +/- 0.055 (micro average: 0.470) MAE: 0.270 +/- 0.021 (micro average: 0.218)	Data Table     Source: //Local Repository/data/Amazon Ratings       Number of examples = 1005     Satributes:       Role     Name     Type       -     Count (rating)     integer = [77]; mean = 7       -     average (rating)     real     = [77]; mean = 7       Iabel     rating integer = [77]; mean = 7	Range Missings Comment no missing values - no missing values - no missing values - no missing values - no missing values - no missing values - values -	.RatingPrediction.UserKnnPearson@217ec4fb		
AMX SVD GRID (1 results. Process results) Completed: Jul 1, 2023 11:38:36 AM (execution time: 19 s)			<b>•</b> ×		
Performance Vector (Performance) Result not stored in repository.					
PerformanceVector: RSSE: 1.255 +/- 0.100 (micro average: 1.255) MAE: 1000 // 0.001 (micro average: 1.000) MAE: 0.230 +/- 0.021 (micro average: 0.250)					

ction – MIT NCAIML



# **Model Results: Collaborative Filtering**

Model Name/Performance metrics	RMSE	MAE	NMAE
Item-Item Collaborative	1.271	0.981	0.245
Item-Item Collaborative (Tuned)	1.138	0.872	0.218
User-User Collaborative	1.155	0.892	0.223
User-User Collaborative (Tuned)	1.132	0.870	0.218
SVD	1.208	0.966	0.242
SVD (Tuned)	1.257	0.998	0.250

Here are the performance metrics of different collaborative filtering-based methods applied to the Amazon dataset:

In our tests – after running the **User-User Similarity Based Recommendation System** and the **Item-Item similarity-based recommendation system** with users who have rated over 100 products, the User-KNN model with k=90, and minimum rating of 1 and range of 4, using cosine similarity as the similarity metric; **the User-to-User Optimization Process** produced the best results with the following settings:

- User k-NN (2).k: 40
- User k-NN (2).reg\_u: 1
- User k-NN (2).reg\_i: 6
- User k-NN (2).Correlation mode: pearson