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ABSTRACT
To maintain attractiveness and reduce redundancy of recommendation, the concept of diversity has been brought up in recommender systems (RS). Thus, advanced RS aim at achieving both better accuracy and diversity facing a trade-off issue between the two aspects. Recently, knowledge graphs embedding methods have been widely used in RS for achieving better accuracy provided with auxiliary information along with historical user-item interactions. However, little work has been done to investigate what effects of diversity it brings along with higher accuracy results and how to achieve the best accuracy-diversity trade-off under such circumstances. In this paper, we propose an EM-model capable of incorporating a generalized concept of diversity for a diversity-encoded knowledge graph embedding based recommendation. Our EM-model alternates between a general item diversity learning and knowledge graph embedding learning for user and item representation, which helps to achieve better results in terms of both accuracy and diversity compared to the state-of-art baselines on datasets MovieLens and Anime. Moreover, extensive experiments prove our model outperforms the baseline with existing diversification methods (MMR and DPP) achieving a better accuracy-diversity trade-off.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Recommender systems (RS) have been intensively studied over the last two decades and have reached a remarkable effectiveness. Amazon, Netflix, Facebook. . . : all these applications and e-commerce sites make a very intensive use of recommender systems. Top-N recommender systems exploiting user-item interactions achieve high-level accuracy. Besides, recent works [3, 15] have shown that incorporating multiple relations among items and their semantic information into recommendation task, e.g. via knowledge graphs, can even improve the accuracy in recommendation results. Knowledge graph embeddings have been shown to be highly effective methods to represent user, items and their structural relations [32]. But despite their effectiveness, most recommender systems still suffer from a number of drawbacks and limitations which recently raised the scientific community interest, among which diversity.

A bunch of work have been done recently to address the problem of diversity in recommendation (e.g. [4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 25, 27, 31]). However, achieving a good accuracy-diversity trade-off is still an open challenge. Thus, most of existing works confront with this trade-off assuming submodular feature of optimisation function. A few works [6, 24, 31] try to find solutions both diverse and accurate. Thus, newly proposed diversity-aware recommendation models (e.g. [5, 9, 16, 30, 31]) make use of Determinantal Point Processes (DPPs) [14], an elegant probabilistic model that has been actively conquering the ML and IR communities for the last years. However, there is still lacking of the understanding of a good trade-off between accuracy and diversity and when and how a better trade-off can be achieved. In our opinion, a diversity-aware recommendation algorithm should not only achieve both high accuracy and diversity, but also be robust under different parameter settings.

In this paper, we address the top-N recommendation problem from diversity perspective, while ensuring a trade-off between
accuracy and diversity and making use of rich auxiliary semantic information and relations about items (if available). Another challenge that we respond to lies in the fact that vector representations widely used in modern RS thanks to the popularity of matrix factorisation and various embedding techniques do not account for diversity directly. We argue that it should be encoded in vector representations of items in order to provide a more systematic view on the diversity of user preferences.

To achieve this goal, we propose a general framework called EMDKG that incorporates knowledge graph embedding with Determinantal Point Process (DPP). We make the following contributions. First, we propose an item diversity learning (IDL) framework to learn the vector representations of items based on ground-truth item sets generated given a certain chosen diversity metric. We then propose an EM scheme to co-learn IDL representations with knowledge graph embedding for diversity-aware vector representations of users and items. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to exploit such combination. Based on these representations we can further generate top-N recommendations to leverage better accuracy and diversity. We perform extensive experiments on two datasets (MovieLens-100k and Anime) to evaluate our framework while comparing it against multiple state-of-the-art algorithms.

2 RELATED WORKS

Recent advances in RS focus on key objectives other than accuracy that contribute to the overall satisfaction of the users from the underlying service [12]. Diversity is one of such factors. Thus, more diversified lists of recommendation results bring more satisfaction to users, even at cost of some loss of accuracy [25].

In the context of recommendation, two levels of diversity are usually distinguished: aggregate and individual [8]. Individual diversity reflects item dissimilarity in each list of recommendations for an individual user, thus helping to reduce the ‘filter bubble’ effect. Most of the existing works deal with it [6, 24]. Aggregate diversity (or catalog diversity) [6, 8, 26] reflects the ability of the system to create a more balanced recommendation over all items, thus reducing the long-tail effect and mitigating the popularity bias. It is often measured as a ratio of recommended items to the set of all available items. In this work, we also focus on individual diversity and use the term ‘diversity’ to refer to it, if not specified otherwise.

Diversification techniques can be categorised into two groups: re-ranking and diversity modelling. Most of the existing works (e.g. [4, 22, 25]) approach the diversified recommendation task in two steps, and are based on re-ranking. First, a candidate list is generated typically by choosing the most relevant items (i.e. targeting the accuracy objective). Second, the re-ranking procedure is applied in post-processing to produce the resulting list of recommendations by maximising an objective function. Such function is usually defined as a combination of a candidate’s relevance and its dissimilarity (diversity or distance) with the items already added to the result list (greedy strategy). The methods then differ in the way of selecting the candidate items and computing the dissimilarity measure. A typical example of such a greedy re-ranking technique is Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) [4]. It introduces a relevance-diversity trade-off via the notion of marginal relevance that combines two metrics: relevance and diversity. Probabilistic IR re-ranking models such as IA-Select [1] have also been adapted for diversified recommendation using the latent item feature space (e.g. [27]). In contrast to greedy re-ranking strategy, some of the proposed methods (e.g. [20]) incorporate diversity along with relevance as optimisation objectives and/or constraints to find an optimal item ranking for each user (e.g. [33]). The main advantage of the re-ranking techniques lies in its modular nature allowing to easily incorporate the diversification step into the existing recommendation process and explicitly control the accuracy-diversity trade-off. At the same time, the latter represents a limitation of this group of techniques, as an extensive hyperparameter tuning may be required for a better performance. Moreover, such post-processing strategies may result in a significant loss in terms of accuracy. Another important limitation is the adoption of pairwise measures of diversity to characterise the list that do not account for some complex relationships between items [5].

New recommendation algorithms tend to consider diversity directly when generating recommendations, thus developing diversity models and finding a more sophisticated accuracy-diversity trade-off (e.g. [6, 9, 16, 23, 31]). Some works approach accuracy-diversity trade-off as exploration-exploitation trade-off and propose bandit-based models (e.g. [18]). Recently, Determinantal Point Processes (DPPs) [13, 14] have been used to improve recommendation diversity (e.g. [5, 9, 16, 30, 31]). This probabilistic model allows to select relevant yet diverse items without loosing importantly the item relevance to a user. A key component of a DPP is its kernel matrix that models item feature space and is indexed with candidate set of items. Its diagonal elements reflect items’ quality (in RS context, relevance), while off-diagonal elements measure their similarity. The methods then differ in the way they determine this kernel matrix and the sampling techniques applied to generate the result list of items. The kernel matrix can be learnt from data (e.g. [17, 30, 31]) or constructed heuristically (e.g. [5, 9]). Chen et al. [5] proposed a fast greedy Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) inference for effective sampling of the result list from candidate items. This method was further adopted by other algorithms, including DivKG [9] that uses it for the prediction part. DivKG constructs the DPP kernel matrix empirically based on the relevance and similarity measures issued from knowledge graph embedding model. Recent advances in generative adversarial networks (GAN) frameworks have been employed for diversified recommendations (e.g. [31]). For instance, PD-GAN (Personalized Diversity-promoting GAN) [31] combines DPP model [5] used as the generator with the discriminator aiming to distinguish between generated lists and the ground truth. PD-GAN allows to capture individual preferences towards diversity, and generated diversified yet relevant items accordingly.

The work closest to ours is DivKG [9]. Similar to DivKG [9], we exploit the knowledge graph embedding (KGE) techniques for representing users and items and capturing auxiliary information and relations that can improve the recommendation. However, DivKG assumes the learned item vectors represent the similarity/dissimilarity of item lists with semantic information, which is not always the case. In contrast to that, our proposal EMDKG explicitly propose an Item Diversity Learning module to distill the semantic diversity into item vector representations. Also EMDKG bridges this Item Diversity Learning with KGE for learning both
an accurate and diversity-encoded representations for users, items
and their affinity relation, prompting to enable a better-off between
accuracy and diversity when applied with diversification methods.

3 BACKGROUND
The goal of our recommendation task is two-fold: given a set of users
\( U \), a set of items \( I \), user-item interactions, provide each user \( u \in U \) with relevant yet diverse recommendations based on historical
user-item interactions and auxiliary information for items. Our
solutions lies on two ideas: Determinantal Point Processes and
Translation-Based Knowledge Graph Embedding, which we present
brievly in this Section to provide the background for our solution.

3.1 Determinantal Point Processes
A determinantal point process (DPP) is a probabilistic model over
selection of points. Originating from quantum physics, this model
is characterized by its repulsiveness, which means a higher prob-
ability of a subset selection associates with more repelling points
to each other in the subset [14]. DPP \( \varphi \) over a discrete point set
\( \Omega = \{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_M\} \) is determined by a \( M \times M \) positive semi-definite
matrix \( L \) indexed by the elements from \( \Omega \) and defining the proba-
ability of point selection. In our case, \( \Omega \) is the set of items.

Given a discrete point set \( \Omega \), a determinantal point process \( \varphi \) is a
probability measure defined on \( 2^{\Omega} \), the set of all subsets of \( \Omega \), such that if \( \varphi \sim \varphi \) is a random subset, then we get:

\[
\varphi(A = A) = \det(L_A)
\] (1)

where \( L_A = [L_{ij}]_{\Omega \times A} \). The diagonal elements of \( L \) provide
the probabilities of selecting individual items from \( \Omega \) (\( \varphi(o_i) \in \varphi \), \( i = 1, \ldots, M \)), while the off-diagonal elements of \( L \) reflect the negative
correlations between item pairs. The larger the values of \( L_{ij} \), the
smaller the tendency of \( o_i \) and \( o_j \) to co-occur. The determinants
of entries \( L_{ij} \) can be viewed as measurements of the similarity
between \( o_i \) and \( o_j \). Therefore, more similar items are less likely
to get selected together. In the RS context, the diagonal elements \( L_{ii} \)
can be seen as user’s affinities towards an item \( o_i \).

As we mentioned in Section 2, various sampling procedures can be
applied to DPP for generating diversified item lists. For instance,
MAP inference [5] suggests to iteratively add items \( j \) to the list \( A \)
by maximising the following objective function:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{MAP} = \log \det \left( L_{A \cup \{j\}} \right) - \log \det \left( L_A \right)
\] (2)

Here, we also consider a pairwise loss function between selected
and all remaining items, and uniform sampling under the frame-
work of Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [19]. For instance,
given a user \( u \in U \), the set of items \( I \), the BPR loss function for the
parameter vector of an arbitrary model class \( \Theta \) is defined as:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{BPR} = \sum_{(u, i \in I) \in D_T} \ln \sigma(\hat{x}_{uij}(\Theta)) - \lambda_0 ||\Theta||^2
\] (3)

where \( \sigma(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-x}} \) is the logistic sigmoid function, \( \hat{x}_{uij}(\Theta) \) is a
model specific function estimating a real value of preferences of user
\( u \) and items \( i \) and \( j \), \( \lambda_0 \) are model specific regulation parameters,
\( D_T : U \times I \times I \) s.t. \( D_S = \{(u, i, j) \mid i \in I^u \land j \in I \setminus I^u \} \) and \( (u, i, j) \in D_S \) denotes that the user \( u \) prefers the item \( i \) over \( j \), \( T \subseteq U \times I \) being
the available user-item interactions and \( I^u = \{i \mid (u, i) \in T\} \).
The estimator \( \hat{x}_{uij} \) is decomposed as \( \hat{x}_{uij} = \hat{x}_{ui} - \hat{x}_{uj} \). We will
specify the function used for optimisation in the next Section.

3.2 Translation-Based Knowledge Graph
Embedding for Recommendation

A knowledge graph (KG) is a multi-relational graph (\( V, Edges, R \))
consisting of nodes \( v \in V \), i.e. entities such as users, items, genres,
actors, etc., and edges \( e \in E \) defining a relation between them \( r \in R \)
e.g. user-item interaction, belonging to a category, being directed
by a certain person, etc.). Thus, an edge \( e \in Edges \) is a triplet of the
head (or left) entity \( h \in V \), the relation \( r \in R \), and the tail (or right)
entity \( t \in V \), i.e. \( e = (h, r, t) \). We denote by \( r_i \) the affinity relation
between a user and an item (user-item interaction), and by \( r_j \) any
other relation between entities.

The main idea of translation-based embedding is to project the
entities and the relations of the knowledge graph into the
embedding space, i.e. a d-dimensional vector space \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Thus, to each
entity \( h \in V \) (resp. \( t \in V \)) corresponds a vector \( h \in \mathbb{R}^d \) (resp.
\( t \in \mathbb{R}^d \)). A score function \( f_r(h, t) \) is defined to measure the plau-
sibility that the triplet is incorrect. In other words, the relation
should correspond to a translation of the embeddings. Various
score functions have been proposed for achieving better accuracy
for tasks as link prediction, node classification and recommendation
[10]. Here we use two forms of score functions from TransE and
TransH as examples of KGE for recommendation. More advanced
and complex forms of score functions are believed to provide a
better performance. The score function of TransE [2] is given by:

\[
f_r^E(h, t) = ||h + r - t||_p \quad (r \in \mathbb{R}^d).\text{ TransH} [29] \text{ projects the embed-
}
\] (4)

dings \( h \) and \( t \) to a relation-specific hyperplane \( w_r \), and considers
the relation-specific translation vector \( d_r \) in \( w_r \). Its score function is
defined as:

\[
f_r^H(h, t) = ||(h - w_r^T h_r^t) + d_r - (t - w_r^T w_r^t)||_2^2
\]

projection of \( h \) to \( w_r \), projection of \( t \) to \( w_r \).

For training, the following margin-based ranking loss function
\( \mathcal{L}_{KGE} \) can be used:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{KGE} = \sum_{(h, r, t) \in \Delta} \sum_{(h', r', t') \in \Delta'} \left[ f_r(h, t) + \gamma - f_r'(h', t') \right]_+
\] (4)

where \( [x]_+ = \max(0, x) \), \( \gamma \) is the margin between positive and
negative triplets, \( \Delta \) and \( \Delta' \) denote the sets of positive and negative
triplets, respectively. The negative triplets \((h', r', t')\) are the results of
the corruption of \((h, r, t)\).

4 EMDKG MODEL
In this Section, we describe our solution EMDKG which targets
at optimizing both item diversity representations and knowledge
graph embedding for top-N recommendations. In the following of
this paper, EMDKG \( _E \) (resp. EMDKG \( _H \)) denotes our solution EMDKG
incorporating TransE (resp. TransH) knowledge-graph embedding.

4.1 General Overview
We propose an EM-schemed representation learning for recom-
dination. Corresponding to the two objectives for diversity-aware
translation-based recommendation, the E-step aims at optimising
translation-based knowledge graph representations for users, items
and entities with a modified margin-based ranking loss for taking into account the diversity of item vectors. And the M-step aims at learning a diversity-encoded item representations with a pairwise BPR-based loss. The general model alternates the learning processes of these two parts until it converges.

### 4.2 Item Diversity Learning.

Diversity can be considered in terms of categories. In this case, one-hot encoding [34] can be used to represent item features. However, such an approach becomes infeasible when the definition of diversity goes wider or the category number increases significantly. To overcome these limitations, vector representations can be used. Indeed, with the growing popularity of matrix factorisation and embedding techniques, modern RS largely rely on user and item representations in continuous vector space. We argue that diversity should be encoded in vector representations of items. To do so, we propose an item diversity learning framework with negative sampling.

We first need to demarcate the concepts of (a) semantic diversity based on the available information about the items (take categories/movie genres as example), and (b) vectorial diversity based on item vector representations and calculated using item vectors. In the Item Diversity Learning (IDL) module, we make use of both concepts. Our motivation behind that is as follows. In traditional RS, item vectors are often learnt by optimising item relevance to a given user profile (user vector). At the same time, a general principle is that similar users tend to like similar items. Thus, there exists a correlation between the similarity of items and their vector representations. However, it is not always the case.

A diversity measure $div(\cdot)$, whether on discrete or continuous space, should be defined to characterise the diversity for a given list. For instance, one can use pairwise vector dissimilarity metrics like intra-list average distance (ILAD) [33], intra-list minimal distance (ILMD), or set-level metrics like category coverage (CC), $\alpha$-NDCG and log-determinant of item-indexed kernel matrix employed in DPP [5] defining diversity in the vector space of the entire list of items. As semantic information is handled in one-hot encoding on discrete space, only ILAD, ILMD, CC and $\alpha$-NDCG can be used to calculate this information. In contrast, learned vector representations are in continuous vector space, and metrics as determinant, ILAD and ILMD are the possible diversity measures here.

For a given user $u \in U$, the IDL-module aims at learning the representations of items which can reflect the semantic diversity based on the available information (features, relations). As input, it takes the set of ground-truth item sets, denoted $(T_u)$, each of the element $T_u$ (one individual item set) having the same size (length) consisting of the items the user had interactions with\(^1\). We consider the item sets in this set to be the most diverse for a given user.

Based on each element from the ground-truth set $T_u$ and the remaining items $I \setminus T_u$, the negative sampling is performed by randomly replacing all the items from $T_u$ except for one with the items from $I \setminus T_u$. Note that the size of the item sets is the same, i.e. $|T_u| = |T_u|$. The items for substitution are selected so that the overall semantic diversity of these negative item sets is inferior to the one of the ground-truth. In other words, if $div(\cdot)$ is a list diversity measure, then $div(T_u) > div(T_u')$. At this step, we consider semantic diversity and suggest to apply dissimilarity measure on discrete space to calculate it. Thus, negative item sets $T_u'$ are generated.

Once the negative items sets are constructed, the IDL-module learns item vector representations by optimising the following loss function:

$$L_{IDL} = \log 1 - e^{-d(i, j)}$$

Here, we make use of vectorial diversity and apply log-determinant measure to calculate it. Thus, the loss function gets the following form:

$$L_{IDL} = - \sum A_u \sum A_u - \log (\sigma |\log \det(L_{A_u}) - \log \det(L_{A_u})|)$$

where $A_u$ is the ground truth diverse item set, and $A_u'$ is one item set from all negative item sets. $L_{A_u}$ and $L_{A_u}'$ are the kernel matrix of DPP indexed with the elements from $A_u$ and $A_u'$, respectively.

This kernel matrix is built as follows. Given an item list set $A \subset I$, we denote with $v_A$ a vector representation of the item list $A$. Then $L_A = v_Av_A^\top$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. The larger the value $\det(L_A)$ is, the more diverse the item set $A$ is [14].

As the result of the IDL-module, we obtain vector representations of items that reckon with semantic similarity and vector similarity.

### 4.3 Modified Translation-Based Knowledge Graph Embedding for Recommendation.

Auxiliary semantic information related to items such as categories, film directors, actors, etc. can provide valuable assets for enhancing recommendation accuracy [3, 15]. Such auxiliary information can contain categorical information and relational knowledge with other entities which do not engage in the recommendation directly. It has been shown [10] that a translation-based knowledge graph embedding for recommendation can efficiently take into account (1) various entities that may affect user’s preferences/choices for items and (2) different types of relations between them.

In this work, when constructing a knowledge graph, in terms of modelled relations, we distinguish between user-item interactions and any other relation between entities. We refer to the latter as auxiliary relations. Let $r_0$ be the relation between users and items reflecting a user-item interaction. As described in Section 3.2, for the triplet $(u, r_0, i)$ we can define a translation-based score function $f_{r_0}(u, i)$ to measure the affinity value between the user $u$ and the item $i$. The smaller the value of $f_{r_0}(u, i)$ is, the larger the affinity between the user $u$ and item $i$ is. We can define the score function $f_{r_1}(i, e)$ for any auxiliary relation $r_1, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots \}$ between the item $i$ and the auxiliary entity $e \in E \setminus \{U \cup I\}$. To learn the embedding accounting for both types of relations (user-item interactions $r_0$ and auxiliary relations $r_1, j \neq 0$), we can rewrite the margin-based ranking loss function from eq. 4 as:

$$L_{KGE} = \sum_{(u, r_0, i)} \sum_{(u, r_0, i')} [-f_{r_0}(u, i) + f_{r_0}(u, i'), 0] + \sum_{(i, r_1, e)} \sum_{(i, r_1, e')} [-f_{r_1}(i, e) + f_{r_1}(i, e'), 0]$$

As stated above, such loss function aims at separating the golden triplets (both, historical user-item interactions and existent item-entity relations) from the negative triplets.
However, conventional KGE only considers the existing relations of entities in the graph and does not explicitly optimize the diversity representations of item vectors as we do in Section 4.2. Thus, we propose a modified knowledge graph embedding loss function to bridge KGE and Item Diversity Learning:

$$L_{x_{KGE}} = L_{KGE} + KL\text{Divergence} (V_{L_{KGE}}^i, V_{L_{IDL}}^i)$$ (7)

where $V_{L_{KGE}}^i$ and $V_{L_{IDL}}^i$ represent the item vectors in KGE and Item Diversity Learning. We minimize KL-divergence of the vector representations of items in two modules in order to resemble the two item representations. Finally, we alternate the learning of knowledge graph embedding and item diversity learning by alternating optimisation of functions (eq. 5) and (eq. 7) until the learning converges. Thus, we can formalize our proposal EMDKG as a dual-goal optimization problem of the Diversity-Aware Translation-Based Recommendation as follows.

(Diversity-Aware Translation-Based Recommendation.) Given a set of users $U$, items $I$, other entities $E$, historical user-item interactions $H_{u,r,i}$ and item-side relation information triplets $H_{i,r,e}$, the diversity-aware translation-based recommendation aims at minimizing two loss functions 5 and 7 simultaneously.

The process of co-learning is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Co-learning of KGE and IDL

Require: $T = \{ T_c \}$, $P = \{(u,i)\}$, $Q = \{(i,r,e)\}$, $k$

Ensure: $V_{L_{IDL}}^i, V_{L_{KGE}}^i, V_U, V_R$

1: Initialize $V_{L_{IDL}}^i, V_{L_{KGE}}^i, V_U, V_R$
2: while not converge do
3: for $k$ times do
4: Get batch $p \subseteq P$ and $q \subseteq Q$
5: Optimize Eq.(5) with $p$ and $q$
6: Get batch $t \subseteq T$
7: Using negative sampling to obtain $t_-$ from $t$
8: Optimize Eq.(5) with $t$ and $t_-$

5 EVALUATION

5.1 Experiment Settings

5.1.1 Datasets & ground truth. We consider two publicly available datasets for recommendation: Movielens-100k\(^2\), also used in [28, 31, 32] and Anime\(^3\), also used in [31]. In both cases, we keep only users with at least 20 ratings. Thus, the Movielens-100k dataset, denoted as ML-100K, contains 100K of 5-ratings from 943 users on 1,682 movies (with at least 20 ratings per user). Following common practice in the field, we consider ratings of four and higher as positive implicit feedback, leading to 82K positive interactions. Movies are categorized into 18 non-exclusive genres (e.g., action, adventure, comedy, fantasy, etc.), so any movie belongs to at least one category. Similar to [9], we combined ML-100K and the IMDb dataset\(^4\) to construct the related knowledge graph. We extract the ratings and 12 categories of information, including movie genre, director, actor, actress, composer, writer, production designer, archive footage, archive sound, cinematographer, producer and editor, that are used to define the entities and relations within our knowledge graph. The Anime dataset contains 1 million 10-ratings from 73,516 users on 12,294 animes (with at least 20 ratings per user). Ratings of 6/10 and higher are treated as positive feedback, leading to more than 1.8 million of positive interactions. Each anime may belong to one or more of the 44 non-exclusive genres available in the dataset, e.g., drama, romance, slice of life, action, etc. We used these categories to construct the knowledge graph. We use leave-one-out strategy to divide datasets into training/validation/test datasets. For generating ground-truth item sets for a given user, we use items from historical user-item interactions as candidates and randomly generate item sets of length 10 and keep the top-100 item sets with the highest semantic diversity scores.

5.1.2 Baselines. We consider both diversified and not diversified baselines to evaluate EMDKG in terms of diversity, accuracy and diversity-accuracy trade-off:

BPRMF [19] is a MF approach that uses a pairwise ranking loss to provide recommendations. Similar to EMDKG, it considers implicit feedback. However, it does not focus on diversity, nor it uses relational information from knowledge graph.

FISM [11] is an item-based CF method that exploits user-item relations through low-dimensional latent factor matrices. It is a strong baseline for highly sparse datasets.

TransKG\(^{[1]}\) [9] models users, items and all the associated entities in a knowledge graph, then uses the embedded vectors obtained with translation-based KG embedding, TransE [2] (TransKG\(_E\)) or TransH [29] (TransKG\(_H\)), to give the result.

\(^2\)https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/100k/
\(^3\)https://www.kaggle.com/CooperUnion/anime-recommendations-database
\(^4\)https://datasets.imdbws.com/
We thus combine each algorithm with two baselines diversification when evaluating diversity ability, we adopt a similar approach as [9].

<p>| Table 1: Accuracy and diversity results before diversification method for ml100k extended datasets. Bold results are significantly higher than other results in the same column with $p = 0.01$. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Hit (%) @5</th>
<th>Hit (%) @10</th>
<th>Hit (%) @20</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @5</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @10</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @20</th>
<th>CC (%) @5</th>
<th>CC (%) @10</th>
<th>CC (%) @20</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @5</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @10</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPRMF</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>49.51</td>
<td>65.32</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>62.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISM</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>31.44</td>
<td>42.82</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>36.57</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td>63.47</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>51.73</td>
<td>62.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRGAN</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>53.26</td>
<td>69.18</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>64.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>29.59</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>53.40</td>
<td>69.88</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>52.71</td>
<td>65.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransKG</td>
<td>22.07</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>65.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransKG</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>34.36</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>50.93</td>
<td>65.65</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>53.77</td>
<td>64.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMDKG-E</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>33.65</td>
<td>46.03</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>54.23</td>
<td>65.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMDKG-H</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>46.34</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Table 2: Accuracy and diversity results before diversification method for anime datasets. Bold results are significantly higher than other results in the same column with $p = 0.01$. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Hit (%) @5</th>
<th>Hit (%) @10</th>
<th>Hit (%) @20</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @5</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @10</th>
<th>NDCG (%) @20</th>
<th>CC (%) @5</th>
<th>CC (%) @10</th>
<th>CC (%) @20</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @5</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @10</th>
<th>$\alpha$-NDCG (%) @20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPRMF</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>40.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISM</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>42.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRGAN</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>35.63</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>44.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>38.99</td>
<td>51.97</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>34.94</td>
<td>45.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransKG</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>47.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransKG</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>47.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMDKG-E</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>46.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMDKG-H</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>40.66</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IRGAN [28] is a framework that makes compete a discriminative and a generative model in an adversarial way to solve several IR problems, including top-N recommendation.

RCF [32] is a CF approach that exploits user-item relations and other item relations through knowledge graph embedding.

These baselines have not been designed to promote diversity. We use them to evaluate the accuracy of our approach before applying diversification to the recommended list. To ensure a fair comparison when evaluating diversity ability, we adopt a similar approach as [9].

We thus combine each algorithm with two baselines diversification techniques, namely MMR [4] and the method from [5] that we denote FastDPP. MMR is a well-known re-ranking approach to promote diversity in recommendation, that iteratively re-rank items to adjust the trade-off between accuracy and diversity. FastDPP promotes diversity by re-ranking the results using DPP and MAP inference. In total, we obtain 12 diversified baselines.

Finally, we also compare EMDKG with two recent baselines that consider DPP to provide diversity-promoting recommendations:

DivKG [9] is a re-ranking approach exploiting multiple relations of items using KGE to provide recommendations. It combines TransKG with FastDPP to enhance the diversity of the result list, but it does not explicitly encode diversity into the representations.

PD-GAN [31] combines DPP with GAN to generate personalized and diverse recommendations without using the relations between items and other entities or knowledge graphs.

For reproducibility sake, we provide our source code.

5.1.3 Performance Metrics. To assess the accuracy of the proposed method and the baselines, we consider standard metrics widely used in the field (e.g. [11, 28]), namely Hit Rate (Hit@n) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG@n). We take $n = \{5, 10, 20\}$.

Similar to [6, 21, 31], we evaluate the diversity through: (1) Category Coverage: $CC@n = \sum_{u \in U} \frac{|U(L_u)|}{|U|}$, and (2) $\alpha$-NDCG@$n = \sum_{u \in U} \frac{\alpha(DCG_u@n)}{DCG_u@n}$, in which $\alpha(DCG_u@n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\min(n, |D_u|)} (1-\alpha) \frac{q_k^{D_u} \cdot (1+q_{k-1}^{D_u})}{log_2(k+1)}$, with $q_k^{D_u}$ equals to the rating of the $k$th item in the list for user $u$ if $k$th item belongs to the genre $l$ otherwise 0. $q_k^{D_u}$ counts the number of items belonging to genre $l$ up to the $k - 1$ position in the list, which accompanying the constant $\alpha$ to modify the redundancy in the recommendation list. $a(DCG_u@n)$ denotes the largest value of $a(DCG_u@n)$ which achieves the ideal diversification of recommendation lists. We take $n = \{5, 10, 20\}$.

5.1.4 Hyperparameter Settings. For hyperparameters in KGE we use the same variations of values as in TransKG. In IDL we generate 99 negative item sets for each ground-truth diverse item set.

5.2 Results

5.2.1 General results. First, we evaluate EMDKG before diversification. Table 1 shows the results of accuracy and diversity for each

https://github.com/LGanShare/EMDKG_WI.git
Figure 1: Comparison of EMDKG against state-of-the-art approaches in terms on Hit Ratio (left), Coverage (center), \( \alpha \)-NDCG (right) when varying: (a) the trade-off parameter, (b) the candidate item list length (trade-off parameter: 0.5).

method on MovieLens. We can see that EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H perform much better for all accuracy and diversity metrics compared to BPRMF. Compared to FISM, although its performance in term of accuracy shows a slight advantage (not statistically significant), EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H bring a significant improvement in diversity. Although IRGAN and RCF show higher values in terms of \( CC@10 \) and \( CC@20 \), EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H still defeats these two methods in other diversity metrics and largely in accuracy. Compared to TransKGs, it is observed that \( TransKG_H \) outperforms EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H in terms of accuracy but EMDKG-H compensates it by an obvious gain in diversity w.r.t. all diversity metrics. Besides, EMDKG-E shows both improvements in accuracy and diversity comparing to \( TransKG_E \).

Table 2 shows the results of accuracy and diversity on dataset Anime. Our proposals EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H outperform BPRMF and FISM in all metrics of accuracy and diversity. Compared to IRGAN, although IRGAN show comparable results or slightly better results in terms of accuracy, EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H win with a margin for most diversity metrics except for \( CC@20 \). Compared to \( TransKG_E \) and \( TransKG_H \), it is observed that EMDKG-E and EMDKG-H repsectively have outperform on accuracy and diversity. We have conducted pairwise t-test to confirm the result difference with confidence 99%.

5.2.2 Impact of trade-off parameter \( \alpha \). We show the impact of parameter \( \alpha \) in Fig. 1 (a). We choose \( Hit@10 \) as accuracy metric and \( CC@10 \) and \( \alpha \)-NDCG@10 as diversity metrics for each method combined with one of diversification methods \( MMR \) or \( FastDPP \). In each chart, we present the results of the corresponding metric for every method by varying the trade-off parameter \( \alpha \). We can see that by increasing the value \( \alpha \), accuracy metrics tend to increase for most methods combined with any of the diversification method while diversity metrics have tendency of increasing in most diversification combinations. In terms of accuracy, EMDKG demonstrates a huge advantage under various \( \alpha \) compared to other baseline methods, except for DivKG and FISM. Besides, we can tell that the combinations of EMDKG and FastDPP maintain better their accuracy while decreasing the \( \alpha \) compared to those with MMR. While EMDKG and DivKG have comparable results in accuracy, EMDKG improves diversity in terms of both \( CC \) and \( \alpha \)-NDCG for both diversification methods. Compared to FISM, EMDKG wins with a large margin in terms of both \( CC@10 \) and \( \alpha \)-NDCG.

In terms of diversity, EMDKG-H shows competitive results in both diversity and accuracy results compared to all other methods. While the combinations of IRGAN+MMR gains advantage of \( \alpha \)-NDCG, it also presents much lower accuracy for \( Hit@10 \) and lower diversity for \( CC@10 \). And compared to DivKG (noted as \( TransH+DPP \) and \( TransH+MMR \), although our proposal does not gain a huge margin in terms of accuracy (still in general no worse than both of them), EMDKG-H +DPP and EMDKG-H +MMR bring obvious improvements for both diversity metrics when varying trade-off parameter \( \alpha \) correspondingly.

5.2.3 Impact of candidate item set length \( M \). We show the impact of candidate item set length \( M \) for applying diversification methods in Fig. 1 (b). To speed up the re-ranking and keep the accuracy performance, we select the top-\( M \) (\( M \)-\( N \)) items from the prediction of each recommendation before diversification as candidate items for re-ranking. We can tell from Fig. 1 (b) that EMDKG combined with FastDPP achieves stable results for both diversity and accuracy, while the combination with MMR suffers from a loss of accuracy.
when increasing the size $M$ of candidate item sets. Besides, EMDKG shows better stability compared to DivKG and TransKG+MMR.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we aim at learning representations for top-N recommendation to achieve better accuracy-diversity trade-off. In our perspective, the latter is not limited to only achieve both high accuracy and diversity, but should also be robust under different parameter settings. Thus, we propose a novel EM-schemed diversity-encoded knowledge graph embedding model EMDKG which incorporates item diversity Learning and Knowledge Graph Embedding for this purpose. We compare EMDKG with multiple state-of-art baseline methods before and after applying two diversification methods MMR and DPP. The results show that before diversification EMDKG can adjust accuracy and diversity to a better trade-off and after diversification EMDKG can outperform the baselines when varying the trade-off parameters and the candidate item set length. In all, EMDKG demonstrates better performance in terms of accuracy-diversity trade-off compared to competitive state-of-art works.
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