NSWI166 Introduction to recommender systems and user preferences

1/3 Peter Vojtáš, KSI MFF UK
2/3 Láďa Peška, KSI MFF UK
5/12 Linear Monotone Preference Model

Originally Information models with ordering NDBI037

Outline of this lecture

Information models and ordering

Various representation and presentations of ordering in data, information, knowledge +Linear Monotone Preference Model

- User requirements conflicting, multicriterial
- Ordering human, intuitive, (self) explainable
- Decathlon
- Customer model ideal values, choice
- Linear Monotone Preference Model
- Data cube, Preference cube, contour lines, top-k, ...
- Examples, Conclusions

Motto: "The purpose of abstraction is not to be vague, but to create a new semantic level in which one can be absolutely precise."

— Edsger W. Dijkstra, "The Humble Programmer" 1972 ACM Turing Lecture, see <u>Human-Centered Approach to Static-Analysis-Driven Developer Tools</u>

Conflicting requirements –

Price			0	•						
	Professional Lapto	ps 🖪 💟 🖾			NIO		h n	roo	1	\ +
30 000, 30 000,-	Display size from 14 " to 17.3 " >	<			INO	Suc	Λ II	100	านเ	ノレ
In Stock	Size of operational RAM from 8 G	B to 32 GB X		-			I	_		_
Order status ♥ ○ All	Storage capacity from 1,500 GB t	to 2,000,000 GB X	$D \cap 2 n \vee d$	∽f +!	haca	$c \cap$	mo		CO	2
Brand New Unwrapped, Nearly	Clear selected Parameters		DU any u		1626	UU	コニ	CIU	50	•
New and Used	Professional Lantons we will dispat		in the second							2000 00
Brands		Modify Results	Your Search Sa	ve search						Clear All
Apple (0)	Specify	1997-199	Certified	SUV / C	rossover ×	Min Year:	2000 🗙	Max Year: 1	2016	×
Dell (0)	category	Radius			()	1				
HP (0)		100 Miles	 Min Price: \$10 	,000 ×	Max Price: \$14,0	× 000	Mileage: Un	der 30,000	×	
MSI (0)	0 Results		Automatic	*						
Next 2		Minimum Year	Automatic	~						
Display size	O No matching products.	2000	Edit this search	Start a new se	earch					
14 " - 17.3 "		Maximum Year								
Colour		2016	- Sort by Price	- Lowest	 Per page 	25 -				Page 1 of 1
Processor type	Professional Lapto	Minimum Datas	Sorry, we con	uldn't find y	our dream car					
Intel Core i7 (0)		Minimum Price	We can alert you	as soon as or	te is available. Just	save this se	earch and set u	ip alerts		
Intel Core i3 (0)	RUG STRIX G Find Laws, Youring Laws	\$10,000	• With My Autoual	Jei.						
AMD Ryzen 5 (0) AMD Ryzen 3 (0)	Značk	Maximum Daina	Save Search			-	-			
Next 8	Ruge String String String	Maximum Price		·		Close	e! Hov	v to r	nea	sure it?
Size of operational RAM	A505,	\$14,000	Do any of the	ese come c	lose?					
8 G8 - 32 G8		Mileage	CALL NOW: (888	306-0836			1		U	unsigningentig
Storage Type	🔄 Office 🔸 💒	Under 30,000	-		Sneak Peek					
HDD + SSD (0) HDD + Opta (0)	💿 RTX Studio 🔹 📍	Style				1				9
HDD (0)	Extended ,	AWD / 4WD	HANLEES () = MILITO	NISSAN			016 June 19 1		9 10	Channen (Strend
Storage capacity	How to choose a	Commercial	\$13,000	le i	13 493	s 2	13 994	ot	\$13,990	p Patriot
	laptop	Convertible	010,000			•			1.0,000	

Ordering – human, intuitive, ...scaled

- ... Self explainable Information technology more and more about the people and for the people
- Ordering in the language, Likert's scale <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Likert_scale</u>, ...





*****	***	** 7.	9/10
4884 IMDb usors ba	ve diven a we	ighted average	vote of 7 2 / 1
4004 11000 03613 118	ve given a we	agined average	VOLE OF 1.27 1
Demographic break	downs are she	own below.	
Viotos	Dereentere		Doting
1402	Fercentage	28 7%	10
652	13.3%	20.770	9
928	19 (0%	8
566	11.6%	0,0	7
229 4 7%			6
178 3.6%			5
148 3.0%			4
139 2.8%			3
148 3.0%			2
494 1	0.1%		1
Arithmetic mean = 7	2 Median =	= 8	
, atamoto modil – i		-	
This page is updated	d daily.		
See user ratings rep	ort for:		
	Votes	Average	
Male	2186	j =	7.1
Female	s 1543		7.2
Aged under 1	8 231		8.0
Males under 1	8 118		8.3
Females under 1	8 110		7.6
Aged 18-2	9 2022		7.4
Males Aged 18-2	9 1136		7.5
Females Aged 18-2	9 866		7.2
Aged 30-44	4 920		6.6
Males Aged 30-44	4 568		- 6.4
Females Aged 30-4	4 33/		6.9
Aged 45-	+ 355		6.2
Males Aged 45-	+ 213		5.0
remaies Aged 45-	F 131		1.0
Top 1000 votor	12		6.8
Top Tool Voters	9 4 <u>2</u>		0.0

Own the

More at I

Discu

Add to V

Quicklinks

Top Links

trailers an full cast an trivia

memorah

main deta

combined full cast at company episode li episodes

episode ratin

by votes

Awards &

Overview

Boa

"Scream Queens" (2015) More at IMDbProx

User preference – scaled + ideal values

- In competitions it is clear who is better = winner
- On e-shop it is not clear users differ
- Producers know this Marketing Segmentation
- "Faceted browsing" specifying "ideal values"
- Too many items, conflicting requirements



tegory lectronics	Price Any Price	Display Size Any Display Size
Camera & Photo	\$0-\$24 (32)	1.9 in. & Under (20)
< Digital Cameras	\$25-\$49 (12)	2 to 2.9 in. (111)
Point-and-Shoot Digital	\$50-\$99 (48)	3 to 4.9 in. (11)
Cameras	\$100-\$199(126)	
	\$200-\$499 (83)	Image Stabilization
and	\$500-\$999(1)	Any Image Stabilization
ny Brand	\$5000-\$9999(1)	None (74)
Canon (29)		Optical (37)
Sony (14)	Megapixels	Electronic (5)
Panasonic (26)	Any Number of Megapixels	
Kodak (26)	1.9 MP & Under (12)	Viewfinder Type
Nikon (8)	2 to 2.9 MP (2)	Any Viewfinder Type
General Imaging (11)	3 to 3.9 MP (4)	None (92)
Pentax (8)	5 to 5.9 MP (10)	Optical (41)
Olympus (36)	6 MP & Up (106)	LCD (13)
Samsung (25)		
Fuji (15)	Optical Zoom	
Casio (4)	Any Optical Zoom	
Bushnell (11)	1.9x & Under (22)	
> See more	2.0x to 3.9x (124)	
	4.0x to 5.9x (36)	
ller	6x to 9.9x (12)	
ny Seller	10x to 19x (15)	
Amazon.com		

Preferential sets

- Preferential sets are variants of fuzzy sets
 - Fuzzy sets intended to model linguistic vagueness
 - Preferential sets model human some linear preferences
- Price fully cheap, reasonable, expensive
- Linearly ordered domain low, medium, high
- Linguistic input is very rare we usually have



- $\star \star$ • $\star \star \star$
- $\star \star \star \star$
- $\cdot \quad \star \star \star \star \star \star$
- Preference scale, e.g. [0, 1]



Decathlon data – scale-points, multicriterial

																				Javeli		
Р	Athlete	Points	Р	100m	Р	Long	Р	Shot	Р	High	Р	400m	Р	110mh	Ρ	Discus	Р	Pole	Р	n	Р	1500m
1	Šebrle CZE	9026	1	10,64	1	8.11	4	15.93	1	2.12	2	46,89	1	13,92	4	48.53	2	5.3	1	70.16	5	4.21,85
2	Nool EST	8604	4	10,66	2	7.8	3	15.83	5	2.12	8	47,70	3	13,99	1	47.92	4	5.2	6	68.15	1	4.21,98
1	BDvorak CZE	8527	2	10,73	3	7.69	9	15.67	7	2.06	1	47,79	4	14,22	3	46.74	11	5.1	2	66.94	12	4.26,13
4	Lobodin RUS	8465	17	10,76	8	7.49	1	15.33	12	2.03	9	48,01	7	14,30	5	46.73	10	5	3	66.66	10	4.27,65
Ę	Zsivoczky HUN	8173	3	10,84	6	7.39	8	15.16	4	2	14	48,67	10	14,30	7	46.61	12	5	14	63.93	11	4.31,69
6	Ambrosch AUT	8122	10	10,87	11	7.35	16	15.1	13	2	3	48,76	9	14,36	9	46.41	9	4.9	15	61.65	3	4.33,58
1	Kürtösi HUN	8099	14	10,89	4	7.32	10	14.85	2	1.97	17	48,76	2	14,46	11	44.07	1	4.8	5	60.57	4	4.35,97
8	Warners NED	8085	8	10,90	5	7.19	7	14.77	3	1.97	10	48,77	8	14,48	2	43.32	6	4.8	16	59.97	6	4.36,36
ę	Hämäläinen FIN	8028	6	10,93	12	7.17	6	14.71	14	1.97	5	48,81	6	14,56	8	41.64	8	4.8	7	59.83	2	4.39,11
10	Jensen NOR	8004	9	10,99	7	7.16	17	14.67	15	1.97	4	48,91	12	14,61	12	41.56	3	4.7	10	58.51	16	4.40,22
11	Schönbeck GER	7891	13	10,99	9	7.11	5	14.6	6	1.94	7	49,07	14	14,70	15	41.3	7	4.7	17	58.23	8	4.42,47
12	Niklaus GER	7891	5	11,01	13	7.11	2	14.37	8	1.94	13	49,26	15	14,83	14	41.14	15	4.6	11	58.11	9	4.42,66
13	Tebbich AUT	7632	16	11,03	10	6.94	11	14.17	16	1.94	6	49,33	17	14,97	10	40.38	5	4.5	8	55.62	13	4.46,57
14	Llanos PUR	7613	7	11,08	15	6.93	13	13.78	9	1.91	16	49,90	11	15,06	13	40.18	13	4.5	4	54.56	15	4.47,22
1{	SchnallingerA UT	7576	12	11,09	14	6.89	14	13.67	11	1.88	12	50, <mark>1</mark> 4	13	15,07	6	39.52	17	4.4	13	54.32	17	4.48,52
16	Walser AUT	7546	11	11,31	17	6.83	12	12.99	10	1.85	15	50,25	16	15,27	16	39.45	16	4.2	12	51.95	7	4.49,58
17	Walser AUT	7506	15	11,35	16	6.81	15	12.98	17	1.82	11	50,51	5	15,43	17	37.2	14	4.1	9	50.33	14	4.59,38

Decathlon points-commeasurable

																Disc						
P	Athlete	Points	P	100m	Ρ	Long	P	Shot	Ρ	High	P	400m	Р	110mh	P	us	P	Pole	P	Javelin	P	1500m
1	Šebrle CZE	9026	1	942	1	1089	4	847	1	915	2	964	1	985	4	840	2	1004	1	892	5	799
2	Nool EST	8604	4	938	2	1010	3	841	5	915	8	924	3	976	1	827	4	972	6	861	1	798
3	Dvorak CZE	8527	2	922	3	982	9	831	7	859	1	919	4	946	3	803	11	941	2	843	12	770
4	Lobodin RUS	8465	17	915	8	932	1	810	12	831	9	909	7	936	5	803	10	910	3	839	10	760
5	Zsivoczky HUN	8173	3	897	6	908	8	800	4	803	14	877	10	936	7	800	12	910	14	797	11	734
6	Ambrosch AUT	8122	10	890	11	898	16	796	13	803	3	873	9	929	9	796	9	880	15	763	3	721
7	Kürtösi HUN	8099	14	885	4	891	10	780	2	776	17	873	2	916	11	748	1	849	5	746	4	706
8	Warners NED	8085	8	883	5	859	7	776	3	776	10	872	8	913	2	732	6	849	16	737	6	703
9	Hämäläine n FIN	8028	6	876	12	854	6	772	14	776	5	870	6	903	8	698	8	849	7	735	2	686
10	Jensen NOR	8004	9	863	7	853	17	769	15	776	4	866	12	897	12	696	3	819	10	715	16	679
11	Schönbeck GER	7891	13	863	9	840	5	765	6	749	7	858	14	886	15	691	7	819	17	711	8	665
12	Niklaus GER	7891	5	858	13	840	2	751	8	749	13	849	15	870	14	688	15	790	11	709	9	664
13	Tebbich AUT	7632	16	854	10	799	11	739	16	749	6	846	17	853	10	672	5	760	8	672	13	640
14	Llanos PUR	7613	7	843	15	797	13	715	9	723	16	819	11	842	13	668	13	760	4	656	15	636
15	Schnallinge rAUT	7576	12	841	14	788	14	708	11	696	12	808	13	841	6	655	17	731	13	653	17	628
16	Walser AUT	7546	11	793	17	774	12	667	10	670	15	803	16	817	16	653	16	673	12	617	7	621
17	Walser AUT	7506	15	784	16	769	15	666	17	644	11	791	5	798	17	608	14	645	9	593	14	563

Better is rephrased by dominance

- Intuitively better (dominating) means better in all disciplines = Pareto ordering – it is a partial ordering! We need the winner!
- Lobodin dominates both Nool and Dvorak •. and are incomparable (restricted to 100m x shot data and points)



LMPM

Better is rephrased by dominance

- Intuitively better (dominating) means better in all disciplines = Pareto ordering – it is a partial ordering! We need the winner!
- Lobodin dominates both Nool and Dvorak •. and are incomparable (restricted to 100m x shot data and points)



Sum of points makes Decathlon linear

 Data cube (upper right) – point function transforms achievements to preference cube (lower left)

LMPM

- dominates
 long
- • and are incomparable
- Sum (aggregation) of points in these two events
- = 1703 points
- = 1696 points
- PC contour line connects points with same result in Pareto cube
- Contour line can be propagated to data cube



Athlete

2NooLES

11

Points

902

8604

Sum of points makes Decathlon linear

- Data cube (upper right) point function transforms achievements to preference cube (lower left)
- dominates
 lo
- • and are incomparable
- Sum (aggregation) of points in these two events
- = 1703 points
- = 1696 points
- PC contour line connects points with same result in Pareto cube
- Contour line can be propagated to data cube



Athlete

Points

Decathlon like preference model for information ordering in web e-shops DC-Athletes \rightarrow items, Ordering made linear by sum \rightarrow aggregation Preference scale linear point system \rightarrow [0,1] preference degree Single authority decides winner \rightarrow each user separately has/can have own preferences PC-Multicriterial Pareto partial ordering of preference degree vectors Decathlon like preference model – all parts linear – **linear monotone preference model - LMPM**



Vojtáš 5/12 NSWI166 RS&UP

LMPM

Linear Monotone Preference Model-LMPM

- Decathlon "single user" IAAF rules order athletes
 - Disciplines $\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_{10}$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, ..., \mathcal{D}_{10}$; ideal (field / track)
 - \mathcal{A}_i point function $\mathbf{f}_i : \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ makes results commeasurable
 - Winner overall IAAF achievement is obtained via sum $\Sigma{f_i(athletelD.\mathcal{A}_i): i = 1, ..., 10}$
- Retail, e-shop set of users U, LMPM^u orders items
 - Attributes $A_1, ..., A_m$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, ..., \mathcal{D}_m$; ideal points can be for each user different
 - Degree of preference for \mathcal{A}_i and user $\mathbf{u} \in U$ $\mathbf{f}_i^{\mathbf{u}}: \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow [0, 1] hardly made commeasurable in response time$
 - Winner, top-k, overall degree of preference aggregation
 r^{f,t}(objectID) = t^u{f_i^u(objectID._H): i = 1, ..., m}

Here t^{u} : $[0, 1]^{m} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $t^{u}(0,...,0) = 0$, $t^{u}(1,...,1) = 1$, t^{u} monotone(linear) - preserves Pareto ordering, Let us build LMPM step by step

Data model: attributes $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$; only 2-dimensional makes paper drawing easier

triangular degree of preference of \mathcal{A}_i , a value from \mathcal{D}_i (local preference) is given by an ideal point i_i and function f_i $f_i(x_i) = 0$, $x_i = \min \mathcal{D}_i$ $f_{i}(x) = (x - x_{i})/(i_{i} - x_{i})$ if $x_{i} \le 1$ $X \leq i_i$ $f_{i}(i_{i}) = 1$ $f_{i}(x) = (y_{i} - x)/(y_{i} - i_{i})$ if $i_{i} \le x$ $\leq y_i$ $f_i(y_i) = 0$, $y_i = \max \mathcal{D}_i$,



Similarly

trapezoidal degree of preference of \mathcal{A}_j , a value from \mathcal{D}_j (local preference) is given by an ideal interval $[i_j^1, i_j^r]$ and analogically defined functions f_j



degree of preference of \mathcal{A}_j , a value from \mathcal{D}_j (local preference) can have different shapes depending on position of ideal points / intervals



degree of preference of \mathcal{A}_j , a value from \mathcal{D}_j (local preference) can have different shapes depending on position of ideal points / intervals (and all possible combinations)



Let us describe steps leading to calculation of preference degree of item B (for user u), we first describe mapping DC-data cube to PCpreference cube

Assume degree of preference $f_i^u: \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (for an user $u \in U$),

Object with objectID = B has attribute values B. $A_1 = b_1$ and B. $A_2 = b_2$, sometimes we write B=(b_1 , b_2).

Attribute preference degrees $f_j^u(B, \mathcal{A}_j) = b_j^u$ and corresponding point in preference cube is $B^u =$ (b_1^u, b_2^u) other points analogically



Note, that point B^u has 4 coimages B, B', B'', B''' Degree of preference for user $u \in U$ are given by f_1^u and f_2^u .

Object with objectID = B has attribute values B. $\mathcal{A}_1 = b_1$ and B. $\mathcal{A}_2 = b_2$, sometimes we write B=(b_1 , b_2).

For B, D, E attribute preference degrees the corresponding points in preference cube are B^u, D^u, E^u,

Note that B^u and D^u are incomparable in Pareto order and E^u is dominated by both B^u and D^u,



Pareto ordering of pref. cube (\underline{x}) <_{Pareto} (\underline{y}) iff (for each i) $x_i \le y_i \& (\exists i) x_i < y_i$

Assume A, B, C, D, E, F, G are images of respective items under some attribute preference

We say that item **B** dominates item **G** in <_{Pareto} (**G** is dominated by **B**), in fact **B** dominates whole red area

F is dominated by whole green area

Pareto is not linear, e.g. B
and C are not comparable



Pareto ordering of pref. cube $(\underline{x}) <_{Pareto} (\underline{y})$ iff (for each i) $x_i \le y_i \& (\exists i) x_i < y_i$

Assume A, B, C, D, E, F, G are images of respective items under some attribute preference

Repeat, that item **B** dominates whole red area and is dominated by whole green area

<_{Pareto} is not linear, e.g. **B** and **C** are not comparable

All item images in white areas are incomparable with **B**



To get global preference degree of items we need aggregation functions. It is a function $[0,1]^2 \rightarrow [0,1]$ $t(x_1, x_2) = w_1^* x_1 + w_2^* x_2,$ where $w_1, w_2 \ge 0$ are attribute weights with $w_1 + w_2 = 1$

Graph of t is a 3D object. Intuition behind display of aggregation function are contour lines (e.g. $cl_{1/3}$, $cl_{2/3}$) for users u, resp. u

Note, that on the preference cube diagonal corresponding contour line of preference degree $y \in [0,1]$ intersect the diagonal at point (y, y), because

 $w_1^*x + w_2^*x = y$ gives $x^{*}(w_{1} + w_{2}) = y$, i.e. x = y



```
Assume, we have users u,
and u. Red are item
image using u's
preference, green that of
u.
```

Notice e.g. $t^{u}(A) = 0.54$

B and **C** are not <_{Pareto} comparable, aggregation makes **C** more preferable for user **u** than **B** (w_1 is sufficiently bigger than W_2)

E is best for **u**

Can **C** be better than **E**? Can **B** be better than **C**?

If two PC cube points are Pareto incomparable, then any ordering of these is possible – prove or disprove!



Vector of attribute preferences $\mathbf{f}=[f_1, ..., f_m]$ and aggregation \mathbf{t} define a user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t} = \mathbf{u}$ Overall preference of user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t}$ is given by $r^{f,t}: \mathbf{O} \rightarrow [0,1]$, for object oid given by $r^{f,t}(oid) =$ $\mathbf{t} ([f_i(oid.A_i) : i = 1, ..., m])$

Depict contour line (i.e. items of same preference degree) in DC-data cube is a little bit trickier (depending on position of ideal points and/or intervals)



Dynamical model – three sessions – moving ideal points (aggregations remain same) Simulation of development in time Starting vector of attribute preferences f^0 and aggregation t^0 define an user $u^0_{f,t} = u^0$ in time 0. Depict contour line in DC-data cube.

Assume user clicks on third item. In time 1, t⁰ = t¹, ideal is clicked item (triangular max-min shape remains).

In time 1 user clicks on second item – this becomes ideal in time 2. Describe order in time

2. Use copy of DC, PC in pptx.



Dynamical model – three sessions – moving ideal points (aggregations remain same) Simulation of development in time Starting vector of attribute preferences f^0 and aggregation t^0 define an user $u^0_{f,t} = u^0$ in time 0. Depict contour line in DC-data cube.

Assume user clicks on third item. In time 1, t⁰ = t¹, ideal is clicked item (triangular max-min shape remains).

In time 1 user clicks on second item – this becomes ideal in time 2. Describe order in time 2. Use copy of DC, PC in

pptx.



Dynamical model – three sessions – moving ideal points (aggregations remain same) Simulation of development in time Starting vector of attribute preferences f^0 and aggregation t^0 define an user $u^0_{f,t} = u^0$ in time 0. Depict contour line in DC-data cube.

Assume user clicks on third item. In time 1, t⁰ = t¹, ideal is clicked item (triangular max-min shape remains).

In time 1 user clicks on second item – this becomes ideal in time 2. Describe order in time 2. Use copy of DC, PC in

pptx.



Dynamical model – three sessions – moving ideal points and **moving** aggregation

Simulation of development in time Starting vector of attribute preferences f^0 and aggregation t^0 define an user $u^0_{f,t} = u^0$ in time 0. Depict contour line in DC-data cube.

Assume user clicks on third item. In time 1, t⁰ = t¹, ideal is clicked item (triangular max-min shape remains).

In time 1 user clicks on second item – this becomes ideal in time 2. Describe order in time

2. Use copy of DC, PC in pptx.





For better understanding are different contour lines (of same t) in colors

User $u_{f,t}$, preference of user $u_{f,t}$, $R^{f,t}$: $\Pi D_i \rightarrow [0,1]$ $R^{f,t}(a_1, ..., a_m) = t ([f_i(a_i) : i = 1, ..., m])$ (a) ≥^{f,t} (b) iff $R^{f,t}(a) \ge R^{f,t}(b)$



Let us insert into previous slide the preference cube diagonal and depict it in DC. Does it preserve preference degree?

We have now mappings from $DC \rightarrow PC$ and from $PC \rightarrow DC - what$ are properties?

DC→PC is injective, PC→DC need not Both mappings preserve line segments (maybe in quadrants , see quadrant in yellow)

Mapping of areas, e.g. quadrilaterals can be more complicated





Data model: attributes $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$; Ideal points can be for each user different, we consider users **u** and **u**.

Degree of preference $f_i^u: \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (for an user $u \in U$), so we have f_i^u and f_i^u .

Object with objectID = B has attribute values B. $\mathcal{A}_1 = b_1$ and B. $\mathcal{A}_2 = b_2$, sometimes we write B=(b_1 , b_2).

Attribute preference degrees $f_i^u(B,\mathcal{A}_i) = b_i^u$ and corresponsing point in preference cube is $B^u =$ (b_1^u, b_2^u) Find both images of C,

...



Data model: attributes $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$; Ideal points can be for each user different, we consider users **u** and **u**. Both have same aggregation average AVG As before we have

 $f_i^u: \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (for an user $u \in U$), so we have f_i^u and f_i^u .

Object with objectID = B has attribute values B. $\mathcal{A}_1 = b_1$ and B. $\mathcal{A}_2 = b_2$, sometimes we write B=(b₁, b₂) has two images in preference cube B^u and B^u.

Let us depict ½ contour line in DC, interpret result, discuss intuitiveness



Data model: attributes $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$; domains $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$; Ideal points can be for each user different, we consider users **u** and **u**. Both have same aggregation average AVG As before we have $f_i^u: \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (for an user $u \in U$), so we have f_i^u and f_i^u .

Object with objectID = B has attribute values B. $A_1 = b_1$ and B. $A_2 = b_2$, sometimes we write B=(b_1 , b_2) has two images in preference cube B^u and B^u.

Let us depict ³⁄₄ contour line in DC, interpret result, discuss intuitiveness



Previous two slides in one.

Observe ½ and ¾ contour lines in DC.

It seems that there is some parallelism.

Formulate statement, prove or disprove.

Interpret result, discuss intuitiveness



Discuss all possible combinations for two users:

Different attribute preferences same aggregation

Same attribute preferences and different aggregations

All is different, both attribute preferences and aggregations

?All possible shapes of f_i^u

Interpret result, discuss intuitiveness

Some comments on market segmentation



Similarly

trapezoidal degree of preference of \mathcal{A}_j , a value from \mathcal{D}_j (local preference) is given by an ideal interval $[i_j^1, i_j^r]$ and analogically defined functions f_j

Instead of minimum/max of domains \mathcal{D}_j we can/have to consider the possibility that trapezoid is based on some interval $[a_j, d_j]$

Depicting contour lines continues on blackboard





Four corners versus one corner - Makes your solutions faster

Illustration for "one quarter" construction

Saves time

Only illustration, must be constructed





Consider different combination of "hill" "valley" shaped attribute preferences

Illustration for "one quarter" construction ...



Possible task: assume we know the convex hull of data (as depicted in DC), find the best object, calculate it's preference degree x, find objects with preference degree 0.9*x

Discuss all possible solution strategies, which is/can be most intuitive for an untrained user?

Consider variants of this task, e.g. with trapezoidal attribute preferences; with ideal point in max/min of domains,

Consider $\mathbf{f_i}^u$ and t variable, formulate tasks

...



Possible task: assume we know the convex hull of data (as depicted in DC), find the best object, calculate it's preference degree x, find objects with preference degree 0.9*x

Discuss all possible solution strategies, which is/can be most intuitive for an untrained user?

Consider variants of this task, e.g. with trapezoidal attribute preferences; with ideal point in max/min of domains,

Consider \mathbf{f}_{i}^{u} and t variable, formulate tasks

...



Possible task: assume we know the convex hull of data each product group separately (as depicted in DC), find the best object, calculate it's preference degree x, find objects with preference degree 0.9*x

Discuss all possible solution strategies, which is/can be most intuitive for an untrained user?

Consider variants of this task, e.g. with trapezoidal attribute preferences; with ideal point in max/min of domains,

Consider **f**_i^u and t variable, formulate tasks

...



Vector of attribute preferences $\mathbf{f}=[f_1, ..., f_m]$ and aggregation \mathbf{t} define an user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t} = \mathbf{u}$ Overall preference of user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t}$ is given by $r^{f,t}: O \rightarrow [0,1]$, for object oid given by $r^{f,t}(oid) =$ $t ([f_i (oid.A_i) : i = 1, ..., m])$

Depict contour line (i.e. items of same preference degree) in DC-data cube is a little bit trickier (depending on position of ideal points and/or intervals)



Vector of attribute preferences $\mathbf{f}=[f_1, ..., f_m]$ and aggregation \mathbf{t} define an user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t} = \mathbf{u}$ Overall preference of user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t}$ is given by $r^{f,t}: O \rightarrow [0,1]$, for object oid given by $r^{f,t}(oid) =$ $t ([f_i (oid.A_i) : i = 1, ..., m])$

Depict contour line (i.e. items of same preference degree) in DC-data cube is a little bit trickier (depending on position of ideal points and/or intervals)



Vector of attribute preferences $\mathbf{f}=[f_1, ..., f_m]$ and aggregation \mathbf{t} define an user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t} = \mathbf{u}$ Overall preference of user $\mathbf{u}_{f,t}$ is given by $r^{f,t}: O \rightarrow [0,1]$, for object oid given by $r^{f,t}(oid) =$ $t ([f_i (oid.A_i) : i = 1, ..., m])$

Depict contour line (i.e. items of same preference degree) in DC-data cube is a little bit trickier (depending on position of ideal points and/or intervals)





Possible task:

assume a cluster of item segments

Assume a cluster of possible ideal points of users

Assume a cluster of their aggregations

Discuss the situation



Questions?

Comments?