# GB-CENT Gradient Boosted Categorical Embedding and Numerical Trees

March 28, 2017

Liangjie Hong Head of Data Science, Etsy Inc.

# Liangjie Hong

- Head of Data Science at Etsy Inc. since Aug. 2016.
- Senior Manager of Research at Yahoo Research in Sunnyvale, CA Leading science efforts for personalization and search sciences
- WWW 2011 Best Poster Paper Award WSDM 2013 Best Paper Nominated **RecSys 2014 Best Paper Award**
- **IJCAI** and various journal reviewers
- PhD in Machine Learning from Lehigh University

Published papers in SIGIR, WWW, KDD, CIKM, AAAI, WSDM, RecSys and ICML (1800+ citations)

• Program committee members in KDD, WWW, SIGIR, WSDM, AAAI, EMNLP, ICWSM, ACL, CIKM,

• Authors

**Qian Zhao**, PhD Student from **University of Minnesota** Yue Shi, Research Scientist at Facebook, formerly at Yahoo Research Liangjie Hong, Head of Data Science at Etsy Inc., formerly at Yahoo Research

Paper Venue

Full Research Paper in The 26th International World Wide Web Conference, 2017 (WWW 2017)

# **About This Paper**

# Why we need GB-CENT

## Why we need GB-CENT

## Two Families of Powerful Practical Data Mining and Machine Learning Tools

- Tree-based Models Decision Trees, Random Forest, Gradient Boosted Decision Trees...
- Matrix-based Embedding Models Matrix Factorization, Factorization Machines...

## Why we need GB-CENT: Tree-based Models

## • Pros:

Interpretability Effectiveness in certain tasks: IR ranking models Simple and easy to train Handle numerical features well

• • •

## • Cons:

Cannot easily handle categorical features with large cardinality Hard to interpret complex trees

• • •



## Why we need GB-CENT: Embedding-based Models

## • Pros:

Predictive power Effectiveness in certain tasks: recommender systems Handle categorical features well

• Cons:

. . .

Cannot easily handle numerical features Hard to interpret in general

. . .



## Why we need GB-CENT

In practice,

- We have both numerical features and categorical features.
- We need to utilize both models.

## In a nutshell, GB-CENT is to combine

## • Tree-based Models Handle numerical features...

# Matrix-based Embedding Models Handle large-cardinality categorical features...

. . .



**Two Ingredients:** 

- Factorization Machines without Numerical Features
- GBDT without Categorical Features



A prediction is based on:

- Bias terms from each categorical feature
- Dot-product of embedding features of two categorical features e.g., user-side v.s. item-side
- Per-categorical decision trees based on numerical features ensemble of numerical decision trees where each tree is based on one categorical feature



### **Different from GBDT:**

- GBDT has a pre-specified number of trees *M*.
- numerical features.
- CENT only involves its supporting instances.



• The number of trees in GB-CENT depends on the cardinality of categorical features in the data set, while

• Each tree in GB-CENT only takes numerical features as input while GBDT takes in both categorical and

• Learning a tree for GBDT uses all N instances in the data set while the tree for a categorical feature in GB-



## **Training GB-CENT:**

- Train embedding part firstly
- Train GBDT part secondly Sort categorical features by their support and fit trees by that order Use a validation set to see whether to stop

Datasets  $\bullet$ 

> MovieLens: 240K users, 33K movies, 22M instances, 5 ratings **RedHat**: 151K customers, 7 categories, 2M instances, binary response

**Baselines**  $\bullet$ 

> GB-CENT variants: CAT-E, CAT-NT, GB-CENT GBDT variants: GBDT-OH, GBDT-CE FM variants: FM-S, FM-D SVDFeature variants: SVDFeature-S, SVDFeature-D

**Metrics**  $\bullet$ 

AUC, Accuracy, Time (Empirically)

Data Set	Metric	GBDT-OH	GBDT-CE	SVDFeature-S	SVDFeature-D	FM-S	FM-D	CAT-E	CAT-NT	GB-CENT
MovieLens	RMSE	$0.883 \\ (0.007) \\ -\%1.8$	$0.863 \\ (0.006) \\ +\%0.4$	0.877 (0.009) - $\%1.1$	$0.867 \\ (0.006) \\ +\%0.0$	0.913 (0.024) - $\%5.3$	0.888 (0.005) - $\%2.4$	$0.886 \\ (0.011) \\ -\%2.1$	$0.900 \\ (0.006) \\ -\%3.8$	$0.867 \\ (0.006)$
	Time (s)	$\begin{array}{c} 282 \\ +1.08 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r}1034\\+6.65\end{array}$	$68 \\ -\%49.6$	$\frac{66}{-\%51.1}$	$73 \\ -\%45.9$	60 -\$55.5	$77 \\ -\%42.9$	$54 \\ -\%60.0$	135
$\operatorname{RedHat}$	AUC	$0.955 \\ (0.0005) \\ -\%3.6$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.981 \\ (0.0003) \\ -\%1.0 \end{array}$	$0.975 \\ (0.0002) \\ -\%1.6$	0.976 (0.0003) - $\%1.5$	$0.986 \\ (0.0009) \\ -\%0.5$	0.987 (0.0003) - $\%0.4$	0.967 (0.0002) - $\%2.4$	0.942 (0.0006) -%4.9	$0.991 \\ (0.00006)$
	Time (s)	$857 \\ +\%35.8$	$3140 \\ +3.97$	$130 \\ -\%79.3$	$241 \\ -\%61.8$	$204 \\ -\%67.6$	$181 \\ -\%71.3$	$561 \\ -\%11.0$	$98 \\ -\%84.4$	631



Table 3: The effect of minTreeSupport and max-TreeDepth on MovieLens data set. minTreeSupport is held to be 50 when varying maxTreeDepth; max-TreeDepth is held to be 3 when varying minTreeSupport.

minTree-	RMSE	maxTree-	RMSE
Support		Depth	
10	0.902	2	0.901
50	0.906	3	0.906
100	0.917	5	0.918
200	0.925	8	0.924
300	0.936	10	0.929
400	0.943	15	0.950

### Main takeaway: Learn many shallow small trees

Table 4: The effect of tree regularization on MovieLens data set. minTreeSupport=50, max-TreeDepth=3.

Regulariza-	minTree-	Number of	RMSE
tion	Gain	Accepted	
		Trees	
AAT	N.A.	7926	0.905
	0	7606	0.906
	1	7559	0.913
VSLR	3	7441	0.921
	5	6737	0.928
	8	6375	0.945



## **GB-CENT**

- Combine Factorization Machines and GBDT together
- Combine interpretable results and high predictive power
- Achieve high performance in real-world datasets

## Summary



Questions