

Information Filtering for arXiv.org: Bandits, Exploration vs. Exploitation, and the Cold Start Problem

Masterclass, Day 2, Lancaster University, January 2014

Peter Frazier

School of Operations Research & Information Engineering
Cornell University


Lancaster University, January 14, 2014



We are interested in

information filtering


- ❖ We face a sequence of time-sensitive items (emails, blog posts, news articles).
- ❖ A human is interested in some of these items.
- ❖ But, the stream is too voluminous for her to look at all of them.
- ❖ **Our goal:** design an algorithm that can learn which items are relevant, and forward only these items to the user.



We are interested in

information filtering

- ❖ If we had lots of historical data, we could train a machine learning classifier to predict which items would be relevant to this user.
- ❖ But what if we are doing information filtering for a new user?
- ❖ **Research Question:** How can we quickly learn user preferences, without forwarding too many irrelevant items?




We are interested in


exploration vs. exploitation

in information filtering

- ❖ More generally, suppose there is an item type with little historical data from this user.
- ❖ This can arise because:
 - ❖ this is a new user;
 - ❖ the item mix is changing;
 - ❖ the information filtering alg. has not forwarded items of this type.
- ❖ We may **EXPLORE**, i.e., forward a few items of this type, to better learn this type's relevance.
- ❖ But, we may want to **EXPLOIT** what little training data we have, which may suggest this item type is irrelevant.
- ❖ What should we do?




We develop an information filtering algorithm that trades exploration vs. exploitation



- We use an **optimal learning** approach, which relies on **Bayesian statistics** and **dynamic programming**.

We develop an information filtering algorithm that trades exploration vs. exploitation



- ❖ We focus on the **value of the information** in the user's relevance feedback.

Information filtering & recommender systems are useful



- ❖ Recommender systems are closely related to information filtering systems.
- ❖ A recommender system is a computer system that makes personalized recommendations to users based on their browsing history.
- ❖ Many businesses have, or should have, a recommender system, or an information filtering system.

We are motivated by an information filtering system we are building for arxiv.org



Cornell University
Library

arXiv.org

Open access to 826,463 e-prints in Physics, Mathematics, Computer Science
Subject search and browse:

29 Aug 2012: [Simons Foundation funds new arXiv sustainability model](#)
See cumulative "What's New" pages. Read [robots beware](#) before attempting

Physics

- [Astrophysics \(astro-ph new, recent, find\)](#)
includes: [Cosmology and Extragalactic Astrophysics](#); [Earth and Planetary Astrophysics](#); [Solar and Stellar Astrophysics](#)
- [Condensed Matter \(cond-mat new, recent, find\)](#)
includes: [Disordered Systems and Neural Networks](#); [Materials Science](#); [Strongly Correlated Electrons](#); [Superconductivity](#)
- [General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology \(gr-qc new, recent, find\)](#)
- [High Energy Physics - Experiment \(hep-ex new, recent, find\)](#)
- [High Energy Physics - Lattice \(hep-lat new, recent, find\)](#)
- [High Energy Physics - Phenomenology \(hep-ph new, recent, find\)](#)
- [High Energy Physics - Theory \(hep-th new, recent, find\)](#)
- [Mathematical Physics \(math-ph new, recent, find\)](#)
- [Nonlinear Sciences \(nlin new, recent, find\)](#)
includes: [Adaptation and Self-Organizing Systems](#); [Cellular Automata and Computational Intelligence](#)
- [Nuclear Experiment \(nucl-ex new, recent, find\)](#)
- [Nuclear Theory \(nucl-th new, recent, find\)](#)

- ❖ arXiv.org is an electronic repository of scientific papers hosted by Cornell.
- ❖ Papers are in physics, math, CS, statistics, finance, and biology.
- ❖ arXiv currently has $\approx 800,000$ articles, and 16 million unique users accessing the site each month.



The arXiv is an important repository of scientific articles

Google Scholar

physics



< Top 20 publications matching *physics*

Publication	h5-index	h5-median
1. arXiv High Energy Physics - Theory (hep-th)	137	180
2. arXiv High Energy Physics - Phenomenology (hep-ph)	135	182
3. arXiv Mesoscale and Nanoscale Physics (cond-mat.mes-hall)	132	193
4. arXiv Quantum Physics (quant-ph)	126	181
5. Journal of High Energy Physics	124	167
6. Applied Physics Letters	121	147
7. Nature Physics	117	160
8. Reviews of Modern Physics	94	210
9. Physics Letters B	89	130
10. The Journal of Chemical Physics	80	112
11. arXiv High Energy Physics - Experiment (hep-ex)	78	113

❖ In several research areas in physics, the arXiv's impact factor is higher than that of any journal.



Our goal is to improve daily & weekly new-article feeds



Cornell University
Library

arXiv.org > astro-ph

Astrophysics

New submissions

Submissions received from Mon 4 Mar 13 to Tue 5 Mar 13, announced

- [New submissions](#)
- [Cross-lists](#)
- [Replacements](#)

[total of 79 entries: 1-79]

[showing up to 2000 entries per page: [fewer](#) | [more](#)]

New submissions for Wed, 6 Mar 13

[1] [arXiv:1303.0833](#) [[pdf](#), [ps](#), [other](#)]

Transverse oscillations in solar spicules induce

H. Ebadi, M. Hosseinpour, Z. Fazel

Comments: Accepted for publication in Astrophysics and Space Science


Subjects: Solar and Stellar Astrophysics (astro-ph.SR)

The excitation of Alfvénic waves in the solar spicules due to the sheared magnetic fields is solved. Stratification due to gravity and transition region can penetrate from transition region into the corona.

- ❖ Many physicists visit the arXiv every day to browse the list of new papers, to stay aware of the latest research.
- ❖ There are lots of new papers (roughly 80 new papers / day in astrophysics.)
- ❖ Problem 1: Browsing this many papers is a lot of work for researchers.
- ❖ Problem 2: Researchers still miss important developments.



Our goal is to improve daily & weekly new-article feeds



Our goal is to improve daily & weekly new-article feeds

You are logged in as *pfrazier_Dec30* [[My account](#)] [[Log out?](#)]

my:arXiv [Search help](#)

Personalization tools

- ◆ Recommended for you
- ◆ Your personal folder (95)
- ◆ Past activity
- ◆ Your account settings
- ◆ Research tools (staff only)

Articles by category

- ◆ Physics
- ◆ Mathematics
- ◆ Non-linear Sciences
- ◆ Computer Science
- ◆ Quantitative Biology
- ◆ Quantitative Finance
- ◆ Statistics

My.ArXiv Version 0.2.038 (2013-11-16)

This project is supported by the National Science Foundation: (#NSF IIS-1142251) (BIGDATA: Mid-Scale: ESCE:

Recent articles recommended for you

Suggestion list [no. 15044 \(ee4sug/20131216.05063.000002.txt\)](#) was generated for user *pfrazier_Dec30* at: Mon Dec 16 01:23:23 EST 2013 (11 hours ago). It contains some articles of possible interest to you selected from those released since Mon Sep 23 02:17:15 EDT 2013.

[Merge=true](#)

The entire list contains 191 articles. Articles ranked from 1 through 10 are shown below.

- [1.\[score=0.6940000057220459\]](#) arXiv:1312.3352; 2013-12-10 [[Details](#)] [[PDF/PS/etc](#)]
Asymptotic theory of sequential detection and identification in the hidden Markov models
Savas Dayanik, Kazutoshi Yamazaki
Subjects:math.OG math.ST stat.TH
[Expand](#)
[Interesting: move to my folder, remove from list](#) [Interesting: remove from list](#) [Not interesting: remove from list](#)
- [2.\[score=3.999349355697632\]](#) arXiv:1312.3516; 2013-12-11 [[Details](#)] [[PDF/PS/etc](#)]
Density Estimation in Infinite Dimensional Exponential Families
Bharath Sriperumbudur, Kenji Fukumizu, Arthur Gretton, Aapo Hyvärinen
Subjects:math.ST stat.ME stat.ML stat.TH
[Expand](#)
[Interesting: move to my folder, remove from list](#) [Interesting: remove from list](#) [Not interesting: remove from list](#)
- [3.\[score=0.6940000057220459\]](#) arXiv:1312.3921; 2013-12-12 [[Details](#)] [[PDF/PS/etc](#)]
A Relaxed-Projection Splitting Algorithm for Variational Inequalities in Hilbert Spaces
J. Y. Bello Cruz, R. Diaz Millan
Subjects:math.OG

We also want to **understand** exploration vs. exploitation in information retrieval

- ❖ In this talk, we focus on the simplest of several models we have developed.
- ❖ The simplicity of the model makes clear the essential insights of our analysis into the exploration vs. exploitation tradeoff.
- ❖ However, building a system that provides value to users requires a number of tweaks to this simple model.
- ❖ We will discuss these tweaks briefly at the end of the talk.

Literature Review

- ❖ Exploration vs. exploitation has been studied extensively in the context of the multi-armed bandit problem:
 - ❖ Bayesian treatments: [Gittins & Jones, 1974; Whittle 1980] ...
 - ❖ non-Bayesian treatments: [Auer, Cesa-Bianchi, Freund, Schapire, 1995; Auer, Cesa-Bianchi & Fischer, 2002] ...
- ❖ Exploration vs. exploitation has also been studied in reinforcement learning [Kaelbling et al., 1998, Sutton and Barto, 1998].
- ❖ Exploration vs. exploitation has also been studied in information retrieval: [Zhang, Xu & Callan 2003; Agarwal, Chen & Elango 2009; Yue, Broder, Kleinberg & Joachims 2009; Hofmann, Whitestone & Rijke 2012]


Outline

- ❖ Categorizing items
- ❖ Mathematical Model
- ❖ Extension #1: Periodic Review
- ❖ Extension #2: Unknown Costs

Outline

- ❖ Categorizing items
- ❖ Mathematical Model
- ❖ Extension #1: Periodic Review
- ❖ Extension #2: Unknown Costs

We use a pre-processing step that divides items into categories




We use a pre-processing step that divides items into categories

- ❖ The next few slides will describe in detail the method that we are using.
- ❖ Other categorization methods are also possible:
 - ❖ Arxiv papers are also pre-labeled with categories: e.g., Artificial Intelligence; Computation and Language; Computational Complexity; Computational Engineering, Finance, and Science; Computational Geometry; Computer Science and Game Theory; Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition; ...
 - ❖ We are also experimenting with a Bayesian methods for categorizing documents into groups, designed to optimally support filtering.

Step 1 in creating our categorizer is to create a ratings matrix

- * **Step 1:** We use historical data to create a “ratings” matrix.
 - * Each row i is a user. Only established users, with lots of history, are used in the ratings matrix.
 - * Each column j is a paper. Only older papers, with lots of history, are used in the ratings matrix.
 - * Cell (i,j) is 1 if user i downloaded paper j , and 0 if not.
 - * This is a big matrix: 800,000 columns, and a similar number of rows



more columns...
(about 800,000)




Step 2 in creating our categorizer is to do low-rank matrix factorization

- ❖ **Step 2:** We use a standard technique, called “low-rank matrix factorization”, which will be described shortly.
- ❖ This technique will output a vector for each paper.
- ❖ Each component in the vector corresponds to some latent feature, e.g., “parallel computing” or “Bayesian statistics”, and tells us how much of this feature this paper has.


Step 2 in creating our categorizer is to do low-rank matrix factorization

- * We suppose each (older) paper j is described by a vector v_j of length K .
 - * Entry v_{jk} is the “amount of feature k ” in paper j . (where $k=1,\dots,K$)
- * We describe each (older) user i is described by a vector u_i of length K .
 - * Entry u_{ik} is user i 's “interest in feature k ”. (again, $k=1,\dots,K$)
- * We suppose that user i 's interest in paper j is approximated by $u_i(v_j)^T$



Step 2 in creating our categorizer is to do low-rank matrix factorization

- ❖ User i 's interest in paper j is approximated by $u_i(v_j)^T$
- ❖ Put all the row vectors u_i into a “tall & skinny” matrix U , and all of the column vectors v_j into a “long & skinny” matrix V .
- ❖ Then, our approximation of the ratings matrix is UV .



Step 2 in creating our categorizer is to do low-rank matrix factorization


- ❖ We don't know the U and V matrices, so we choose their values to make the approximation as good as possible.
- ❖ This is really an optimization problem:

$$\min_{U,V} ||\text{RatingsMatrix} - UV||$$

- ❖ where the matrices are constrained to have skinny dimension K , and where we usually use the sum of squared entries as our matrix norm.
- ❖ This optimization problem can be solved efficiently:
 - ❖ 1. Perform a singular value decomposition (SVD) of RatingsMatrix
 - ❖ 2. Take the largest K singular values, and the corresponding singular vectors, to create U and V .




Step 2 in creating our categorizer is to do low-rank matrix factorization

- ❖ This process gives us the matrix \mathbf{V} : 
- ❖ Each column of this matrix is a paper, and describes what the paper is about.
- ❖ We will feed these columns into the next step of our categorizer
- ❖ The matrices U and V can also be used to recommend old papers to old users:
 - ❖ Predict the rating for an unknown user / paper pair (i,j) from the estimated values for U and V . Then recommend papers for which this prediction is large.
- ❖ However, we want to filter **new papers**, and we want to do this well for **all users**, old & new.

We use a pre-processing step that divides items into categories

- ❖ **Step 3:** We think each paper j as the point v_j in R^K . We then use a clustering algorithm (kmeans) to cluster nearby papers together.



- ❖ All of the papers in a single cluster are about similar things.
- ❖ Our categorizer will try to reproduce these clusters in the categories it creates. It must do so based on things that can be directly observed from the paper, rather than how it was viewed by users.

We use a pre-processing step that divides items into categories

- * **Step 4:** We train a multi-class support vector machine to predict the cluster from observable paper features: the words in a paper.


Paper	Cluster	Word 2: a	Word 2: aa	Word 2: aardvark	Word 2: aardwolf	Word3: aargh	Word4: Aarhus	...
1	16	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	...
2	11	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	...
3	1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	...
4	2	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	...
5	11	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	...
...

- * Once we have trained it, the SVM **can predict the category for new papers, based only on the words in them.** No ratings data is needed for new papers.

Here's a summary of our categorization method

- ❖ **Step 1:** We use historical data to create a ratings matrix for older items and users with lots of history.
- ❖ **Step 2:** We use a singular value decomposition to represent older items as points in a low-dimensional space. Dimensions correspond roughly to “topics”.
- ❖ **Step 3:** We use kmeans clustering on the low-dimensional space to cluster older items.
- ❖ **Step 4:** We train a multi-class SVM to predict the cluster from item features, e.g., the words in a paper, or the authors.

We now take the categorizer as given, and move on to the information filtering algorithm



Outline

- ❖ Categorizing items
- ❖ **Mathematical Model**
- ❖ Extension #1: Periodic Review
- ❖ Extension #2: Unknown Costs
- ❖ Lessons

Mathematical Model

- ❖ An item from category x is relevant to the user with probability θ_x .
- ❖ We begin with a Bayesian prior distribution on θ_x , which is independent across x .

$$\theta_x \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{0x}, \beta_{0x})$$

- ❖ Items arrive according to a Poisson process with rate λ .
- ❖ An item falls into category x with probability p_x . An item's category is observable. Thus, items from category x arrive according to a Poisson process with rate $\lambda_x = \lambda p_x$.
- ❖ When each paper arrives, we decide whether to forward or discard. For the n^{th} item from category x , let $U_{nx} = 1$ if we forward it, and 0 if not.

Mathematical Model


- ❖ When each item arrives, we decide whether to forward or discard. For the n^{th} item from category x , let $U_{nx}=1$ if we forward it, and 0 if not.
- ❖ If $U_{nx}=1$, we then observe Y_{nx} , which is 1 if the item was relevant to the user, and 0 if not.

$$Y_{nx} | \theta_{nx} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_x)$$


- ❖ We can then update our posterior distribution on θ_x , which will still be Beta-distributed (details later),

$$\theta_x | (Y_{mx} : m \leq n, U_{mx} = 1) \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$$

Mathematical Model



Mathematical Model



Mathematical Model

- ❖ To model the cost of the user's time, we penalize ourselves with a cost c for forwarding an item. [more on the choice of c later]
- ❖ We give ourselves a reward of 1 for showing a relevant item.
- ❖ Our net reward is $U_{nx} (Y_{nx} - c)$.
- ❖ Our goal is to design an algorithm π that maximizes

$$E^\pi \left[\sum_{x=1}^k \sum_{n=1}^{N_x} U_{nx} (Y_{nx} - c) \right]$$

- ❖ Here, N_x is the # of items available for forwarding from category x , before some random time horizon T .

Mathematical Model

- ❖ Recall: N_x is the # of items available for forwarding from category x , before some random time horizon T .
- ❖ More formally, $N_x = \sup\{n : t_{nx} \leq T\}$, where t_{nx} is the arrival time of the n^{th} item in category x .
- ❖ For mathematical convenience, we assume $T \sim \text{Exponential}(r)$. We set r so that $E[T]$ is the lifetime in system of a typical user.
- ❖ Then, $N_x \sim \text{Geometric}(\lambda_x / (\lambda_x + r))$. This will make it easier to solve an upcoming dynamic program.


Mathematical Model

- ❖ Putting all of this together, our goal is to solve:

$$\sup_{\pi} E^{\pi} \left[\sum_{x=1}^k \sum_{n=1}^{N_x} U_{nx} (Y_{nx} - c) \right]$$

- ❖ Here, an algorithm π is a rule for choosing each U_{nx} based only on previously observed feedback ($Y_{mz} : U_{mz}=1, t_{mz} < t_{nx}$),

Let's first solve the problem for a single category



Let's first solve the problem for a single category


- ❖ For a given cluster x , let's figure out how to maximize the reward from just that cluster,

$$\sup_{\pi} E^{\pi} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{N_x} U_{nx} (Y_{nx} - c) \right]$$

- ❖ When choosing U_{nx} , it is sufficient to consider feedback only from previous items in our category x , ($Y_{mx} : U_{mx}=1, m < n$)


We use a standard Bayesian statistical model

- ❖ Recall that we model $\theta_x \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{0x}, \beta_{0x})$.
- ❖ Here's how we choose α_{0x} and β_{0x} .
 - ❖ We first find a few users with lots of historical data in this cluster.
 - ❖ We estimate θ_x for each of these users, using their average relevance feedback.
 - ❖ We then make a histogram.




We use a standard Bayesian statistical model

- ❖ Recall that we model $\theta_x \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{0x}, \beta_{0x})$.
- ❖ Here's how we choose α_{0x} and β_{0x} .
 - ❖ We then fit a beta density to this empirical distribution, using maximum likelihood estimation.
 - ❖ We set α_{0x} and β_{0x} to their values from the fitted distribution.
 - ❖ A beta distribution is analytically convenient, and fits the data well.



We use a standard Bayesian statistical model

- ❖ Recall that we model $\theta_x \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{0x}, \beta_{0x})$.
- ❖ Here's how we choose α_{0x} and β_{0x} .
 - ❖ We then fit a beta density to this empirical distribution, using maximum likelihood estimation.
 - ❖ We set α_{0x} and β_{0x} to their values from the fitted distribution.
 - ❖ A beta distribution is analytically convenient, and fits the data well.



We use a standard Bayesian statistical model


- ❖ After observing our data, we update our prior to obtain a posterior distribution using Bayes rule.

$$\theta_x | (Y_{mx} : m \leq n, U_{mx} = 1) \\ \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$$

- ❖ Here, α_{nx} and β_{nx} count the effective numbers of relevant and irrelevant items shown:

$$\alpha_{nx} = \alpha_{0x} + \sum_{m=1}^n U_{mx} Y_{mx}$$

$$\beta_{nx} = \beta_{0x} + \sum_{m=1}^n U_{mx} (1 - Y_{mx})$$



We use a standard Bayesian statistical model


- ❖ After observing our data, we update our prior to obtain a posterior distribution using Bayes rule.

$$\theta_x | (Y_{mx} : m \leq n, U_{mx} = 1) \\ \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$$

- ❖ Here, α_{nx} and β_{nx} count the effective numbers of relevant and irrelevant items shown:

$$\alpha_{nx} = \alpha_{0x} + \sum_{m=1}^n U_{mx} Y_{mx}$$

$$\beta_{nx} = \beta_{0x} + \sum_{m=1}^n U_{mx} (1 - Y_{mx})$$




We use a standard Bayesian statistical model

- Our posterior is

$$\theta_x | (Y_{mx} : m \leq n, U_{mx} = 1) \\ \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$$


- We can parameterize this posterior with $(\mu_{nx}, \alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx})$ where

$$\mu_{nx} = E_n[\theta_x] = \frac{\alpha_{nx}}{\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}}$$




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is one possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is another possible algorithm:




An algorithm partitions the space of posteriors into “Forward” and “Discard”

- ❖ Here is yet another possible algorithm:



The myopic algorithm can be expressed in this way.

- ❖ The expected *immediate* payoff of forwarding is $E_n[\theta_x - c] = \mu_{nx} - c$
- ❖ The expected immediate payoff of discarding is 0.
- ❖ The rule that maximizes expected immediate reward is:
 - ❖ Forward if $\mu_{nx} > c$
 - ❖ Discard if not.




The myopic algorithm ignores the value of **exploring**

❖ If our current posterior has:

❖ small $\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}$

❖ μ_{nx} close to c



μ_{nx}

c

❖ then it might be worth forwarding, just to learn more about θ_x .

❖ If it turns out $\theta_x > c$, we can take advantage of this in future forwarding decisions.

Forward

Discard


$\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}$

We can compute the optimal algorithm through stochastic dynamic programming

- ❖ Let $V(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$ be the expected future reward under the optimal policy, given n documents of history, and given $N_x \geq n$.

- ❖ V satisfies the dynamic programming recursion:

$$V(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx}) = P(N_x \geq n+1 \mid N_x \geq n) \max(0, \mu_{nx} - c + E_n[V(\alpha_{n+1,x}, \beta_{n+1,x})])$$




We can compute the optimal algorithm
through stochastic dynamic programming

❖ **Let's go to the whiteboard.**


The optimal algorithm trades **exploration vs. exploitation**

- ❖ **Theorem 1:** There exists a function $\mu^*(\cdot)$ such that it is optimal to forward when $\mu_{nx} \geq \mu^*(\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx})$ and to discard otherwise.
- ❖ **Theorem 2:** $\mu^*(\alpha + \beta)$ has the following properties:
 - ❖ it is bounded above by c ;
 - ❖ it is increasing in $\alpha + \beta$;
 - ❖ it and goes to c as $\alpha + \beta \rightarrow \infty$.




The optimal algorithm trades **exploration vs. exploitation**

- ❖ When $\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}$ is small, $\mu^*(\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx})$ is much less than c , and we favor **exploration**.
- ❖ When $\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}$ is big, $\mu^*(\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx})$ is close to c , and we favor **exploitation**.




Here's a sample path where optimal is **better** than myopic

$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (1, 19)$, $\theta = 0.070522$, $\gamma = 0.999$, $c = 0.05$



Here's a sample path where optimal is **worse** than myopic



$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (1, 19)$, $\theta = 0.054712$, $\gamma = 0.999$, $c = 0.05$



This is actually a bandit problem


- * Deciding whether to forward or discard is really a 2-armed bandit problem.
 - * Arm 0 corresponds to discarding, and always gives reward 0.
 - * Arm 1 corresponds to forwarding, and gives reward $Y_{nx}-c$
- * Each arm has associated with it a Gittins index, and the optimal policy is to pull the arm with the highest Gittins index.
 - * The Gittins index of arm 0 is 0.
 - * The Gittins index of arm 1 is $v(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$.
- * $v(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx}) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu^*(\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx}) > c$.

Optimal outperforms myopic (with simulated users)




In these graphs,
“with exploration”=optimal
“no exploration”=myopic

Optimal outperforms myopic (in backtesting with historical data)



Combining single-category solutions solves the multi-category problem



Combining single-category solutions solves the multi-category problem

- ❖ We know the optimal forwarding / discarding strategy for a single category.
- ❖ To deal with multiple categories, simply apply this strategy independently to each individual category.
- ❖ The value of this optimal multi-category strategy is the sum of the values of the optimal single-category strategies:

$$\sup_{\pi} E^{\pi} \left[\sum_{x=1}^k \sum_{n=1}^{N_x} U_{nx}(Y_{nx} - c) \right] = \sum_{x=1}^k \sup_{\pi} E^{\pi} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{N_x} U_{nx}(Y_{nx} - c) \right]$$


Outline

- ❖ Categorizing items
- ❖ Mathematical Model
- ❖ **Extension #1: Periodic Review**
- ❖ Extension #2: Unknown Costs

We need a new mathematical model to handle periodic review

- ❖ In the arxiv, users do not respond instantaneously. Instead they visit arxiv periodically (once per day) to read papers.
- ❖ We allow papers to accumulate in a queue until the user arrives.
- ❖ When the user arrives, we decide which papers to forward / discard.
- ❖ Building on the previous analysis, we present a revised analysis.


We need a new mathematical model to handle periodic review



We need a new mathematical model to handle periodic review

- ❖ On the n^{th} user arrival:
 - ❖ As before, things will work out so $\theta_x \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$.
 - ❖ We choose U_{nx} , the max # of papers we will show.
 - ❖ Let L_{nx} be the # of papers available for forwarding from category x . If the user goes exactly Δ time units between arrivals, then $L_{nx} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_x \Delta)$. We can also make other assumptions about L_{nx} .
 - ❖ We show $\min(L_{nx}, U_{nx})$ papers.
 - ❖ We observe relevance feedback for each of these:
 - ❖ $Y_{nx} \mid \theta_x, L_{nx}, U_{nx} \sim \text{Binomial}(\theta_x, \min(L_{nx}, U_{nx}))$

Before we divided into “Forward” ($U=1$) and “Discard” ($U=0$). Now we divide into more levels.




Again, we can compute the optimal algorithm through stochastic dynamic programming

- Let $V(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx})$ be the expected future reward under the optimal policy, given n documents of history.

- V satisfies the dynamic programming recursion:

$$V(\alpha_{nx}, \beta_{nx}) = P(N_x \geq n + 1 | N_x \geq n) \max_{u=0,1,2,\dots} (\mu_{nx} - c) E[\min(u, L_{N+1,x})] + E_n [V(\alpha_{n+1,x}, \beta_{n+1,x}) | U_{n+1,x} = u].$$



Outline

- ❖ Categorizing items
- ❖ Mathematical Model
- ❖ Extension #1: Periodic Review
- ❖ Extension #2: Unknown Costs

We need a new mathematical model to handle unknown costs

- ❖ In reality, we do not know the cost c for each forwarded document.
- ❖ To address this, we:
 - ❖ Compute c^* for each paper, which is the largest cost c such that we would be willing to forward this paper.
 - ❖ We present papers in a ranked list in decreasing order of c^* .
- ❖ Optimality analysis:
 - ❖ If we model the user as knowing his own c , and looking at all papers with $c^* > c$, then this algorithm **is optimal**.
 - ❖ If we model the user as looking at the top n papers in the list each time, this algorithm **is not optimal** in general, but we can obtain tractable upper and lower bounds.
 - ❖ If $n=1$, this algorithm **is optimal**, and is equivalent to the Gittins index policy for multi-armed bandits.

Extensions we did not discuss: Time-varying user preferences

- ❖ User preferences change over time.
- ❖ Our Bayesian statistical model may be extended to allow θ_x to change over time.
- ❖ The analysis is still tractable.

Extensions we did not discuss: Correlated prior distributions

- ❖ Our model assumed an independent prior on θ_x .
- ❖ In the data, a user's strong interest in one category (e.g., theoretical high-energy physics) may make a strong interest in another category more likely (e.g., experimental high-energy physics).
- ❖ We can model this with a correlated prior on θ_x .
- ❖ The dynamic program is no longer tractable, but we can compute $\mu^*(\alpha_{nx} + \beta_{nx})$ using independence, but update our posterior using a correlated prior.

Thanks to my collaborators!

- ❖ Paul Ginsparg, Thorsten Joachims, Xiaoting Zhao, Darlin Alberto, Karthik Raman, Ziyu Fan, Akilesh Potti (**Cornell**)



- ❖ Paul Kantor & Vladimir Menkov (**Rutgers**)



- ❖ Dave Blei & Laurent Charlin (**Princeton**)

Thank you for your attention!
