

# You Get What You Chat: Using Conversations to Personalize Search-based Recommendations

Ghazaleh H. Torbati<sup>(✉)</sup>, Andrew Yates, Gerhard Weikum

Max-Planck Institute for Informatics  
Saarland Informatics Campus, Saarbrücken, Germany  
{ghazaleh, ayates, weikum}@mpi-inf.mpg.de

**Abstract.** Prior work on personalized recommendations has focused on exploiting explicit signals from user-specific queries, clicks, likes, and ratings. This paper investigates tapping into a different source of implicit signals of interests and tastes: online chats between users. The paper develops an expressive model and effective methods for personalizing search-based entity recommendations. User models derived from chats augment different methods for re-ranking entity answers for medium-grained queries. The paper presents specific techniques to enhance the user models by capturing domain-specific vocabularies and by entity-based expansion. Experiments are based on a collection of online chats from a controlled user study covering three domains: books, travel, food. We evaluate different configurations and compare chat-based user models against concise user profiles from questionnaires. Overall, these two variants perform on par in terms of NCDG@20, but each has advantages in certain domains.

**Keywords:** Search-based recommendation · User modeling · Personalization

## 1 Introduction

**Motivation:** Recommender systems are at the heart of *personalized* shopping and online services for music and video streaming, hotels and restaurants, or food recipes [32,6,18]. *Search-based recommendation* is a setting where the user starts with a query and the recommendation model determines the result ranking based on the user's interests and preferences. This paper considers medium-grained queries about product entities (books, food recipes, and travel destinations) such as *paranormal romance* or *wine lover destinations* – in contrast to coarse-grained queries such as *love novels* or *Europe* and fine-grained queries such as *similar to Stephenie Meyer's Twilight* or *vineyards of the Bourgogne*. Results are assumed to come from a search engine (restricted to suitable domains for the respective vertical). Therefore, the personalization amounts to *re-ranking* the top results with regard to a model of the user's individual tastes.

For this setting, the *user model* or *profile* can be represented explicitly in a personal knowledge base [5] or implicitly in a latent model [22,51]. These models can be constructed from various kinds of observations on user behavior:

- A: Explicit signals like clicks, likes, ratings and purchases.
- B: User profiles such as `adssettings.google.com` where users can see and check or un-check topics (even if the profile itself is learned from other signals).

C: Implicit signals from other online behavior, like social media posts or conversations with other users.

Option A is most widely used in practice (e.g., [52,25,19]) and includes standard recommenders based on collaborative filtering [35]. However, this rich kind of data is available only to major service providers, such as music streaming where playlists and other I-like-the-song signals are abundant. Option B operates on concise digests of user interests and item properties, for example, a list of topics and tags (e.g., [45]). This is less informative than A, but has the advantage that the user can easily interpret her profile and adjust it at her discretion (e.g., dropping a topic that is unwanted). Option C has been studied for recommending news and discussions, but the best signals are still the user histories of clicks, dwell times and likes (e.g., [28,44]). For search-based recommendation of product entities, C has not been explored at all, except for the specific case of leveraging product reviews (e.g., [14,7,34]).

This paper focuses on option C. It investigates how online chats between users can be leveraged for personalization in the outlined setting. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first work that studies chats as a source for search-based recommendation.

**Research Questions:** We investigate the following research questions:

- RQ0: How can we leverage signals from *user-user chats* to personalize search-based recommendations across a *variety of domains*: books, food recipes, and travel destinations?
- RQ1: How do methods that tap into individual *conversations* compare to methods that merely access *concise user profiles*?
- RQ2: How important is it to *customize* the per-user models to the *specific domain* at hand, for example, books vs. travel?
- RQ3: How much added value can we get from *entity awareness*: detecting named entities in user chats, mapping them to a background knowledge base, and using that information for expansion of user models and re-ranking techniques?

**Contributions:** We devise techniques for constructing language models and using them for re-ranking, with various components derived from chats: i) computing domain-specific vocabularies and ii) entity detection and entity-based expansions. The chats are recorded real-time conversations, gathered in a substantial user study with 14 students and 83 pair-wise chats (with 9,797 utterances and 59k tokens in total and a total duration of 93 hours). We contrast chat-based personalization against techniques that merely build on concise user profiles derived from short questionnaires [43]. The paper makes the following contributions:

- It is the first approach to consider user chats as a source for search-based recommendation across a variety of vertical domains. Chats are a rich source of information about individual interests and tastes. In contrast to latent models learned from clicks, likes, ratings, etc., a user can more easily interpret and edit/censor this information to selectively restrict its usage for privacy reasons.
- We systematically compare chat-based personalization against a more restrictive approach that merely uses concise user profiles based on short questionnaires. In our experiments, both show advantages in certain domains, and perform on par overall.

- We devise techniques for per-domain customization by controlling the vocabulary and appropriate weighting of terms, and report on their experimental effectiveness.
- We devise techniques to harness entities and background knowledge in the construction of user models, and report on their experimental effectiveness.
- We release a dataset consisting of filled questionnaires, pair-wise user chats, document URLs, and search result assessments by users for three domains (books, travel, food). The data is available at <http://personalization.mpi-inf.mpg.de/>

## 2 Computational Model and Re-ranking

We approach the personalization of entity-search answers by re-ranking a pool of initial non-personalized results using three different methods for scoring and ranking: the BM25 family, statistical language models, and neural ranking. Beginning with these ranking methods, we incorporate a user model to personalize results and domain-specific term weights to identify terms that are informative with a domain. We additionally apply expansion techniques to expand entities found in the user model. Rerankers thus consider a user model in addition to queries and documents. In our setting,

- **Queries** are short, medium-grained bags of words (or phrases), such as “scandinavian suspense” (for the books domain) or “wine lover destinations” (travel).
- **Documents** are entity-level answers obtained from specific websites that provide comprehensive contents about three domains: `goodreads.com` for books, `wikivoyage.org` for travel, and `allrecipes.com` for food. Each answer has a key entity that can be easily identified (e.g., from the URL string or page title) and comprises an informative description of the entity. Two of the sites include also extensive reviews and discussion by their communities.
- **User models** represent a user’s interests and tastes as a bag of words (or n-grams) taken from either a short *questionnaire/profile* filled in by the user or a *collection of online chats* with other users. Both of these options are further refined by instructing users to focus on specific scopes: general, books, travel, and food. This yields 8 basic options for the user model, which we further augment with techniques for domain-specific vocabularies and entities.

For illustration, Figure 1 shows excerpts from the questionnaire and the chat collection for an example user. For the query “temples and culture”, this user-specific information led to high ranks of travel destinations like Borobudur, Delphi and Ellora – all confirmed as very good recommendations by that user.

### 2.1 Re-Ranking Methods

Given a query  $q$ , a user model  $u$ , and a document  $d$  from a pool of non-personalized results, we personalize the results by re-ranking them according to the user model. We explore three re-ranking methods for doing this.

**Language Models:** The first variant for re-ranking is based on language models (LMs) [50], which provide a natural way to incorporate the user model. We compute the Kullback-Leibler divergence between a query model and a document model with Dirichlet smoothing over unigrams or n-grams. In pilot experiments, unigrams outperformed

<p>- How often and how long do you travel for leisure? Occasionally for short trips (3-5 days)</p> <hr/> <p>- Which countries (or regions) have you ever traveled to? Through the north of <b>Colombia</b> and the south of <b>Germany</b></p> <hr/> <p>- Which locations (countries, regions, cities, landmarks) and activities did you enjoy the most ? It doesn't matter the country, region or city, I love to go to <b>museums</b> (every museum) <b>historic buildings</b> and <b>monuments</b>. I really love <b>art museums</b> in <b>Bogota, Paris, Rome</b> and <b>Munich</b></p> <hr/> <p>- Name 3 places that you would like to visit? <b>Tokyo, Disneyland US, Machu Picchu</b></p> <hr/> <p>- Describe your dream vacation in a sentence or two! Traveling through the most important cities for the <b>art history</b> in the world</p>	<p>Even the <b>Rome colosseum</b> ... Actually I was a bit disappointed about it when I went inside</p> <hr/> <p>Ohh, but why? it looks nice in the photos which i have seen</p> <hr/> <p><b>Rome ruins</b> are something that everyone abandoned for a long time and then tried to take care of... My mother is an architect and I'm an <b>art student</b> so of course <b>Rome monuments</b> have a strong influence in my life</p>
--	---

**Fig. 1.** Excerpts from user questionnaire and chat on travel domain (with recognized named entities and concepts in boldface)

bigrams and trigrams; hence we focus on the unigram case. To personalize for a specific user, we compute the Kullback-Leibler divergence i) between the query  $q$  and the document  $d$  and ii) between the user model  $u$  and the document  $d$ . These two components are combined into a linear mixture with hyper-parameter  $\lambda$ . Additionally, we incorporate a background model  $C$  for smoothing, based on ClueWeb'09. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
 score(q, d, u) &\propto -(\lambda div(\theta_q || \theta_d) + (1 - \lambda) div(\theta_u || \theta_d)) \propto \\
 &-\lambda \sum_{w \in V_q} spy(w) \cdot p(w | \theta_q) \log \frac{p(w | \theta_q)}{(p(w | \theta_d) + \mu p(w | \theta_C)) / (|d| + \mu)} \quad (1) \\
 &-(1 - \lambda) \sum_{w \in V_u} spy(w) \cdot p(w | \theta_u) \log \frac{p(w | \theta_u)}{(p(w | \theta_d) + \mu p(w | \theta_C)) / (|d| + \mu)}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $V_u$  and  $V_q$  are the vocabularies of the user and query models, and  $\theta_q, \theta_u, \theta_d$  and  $\theta_C$  denote the multinomial parameters of query, user, document and background models, with Dirichlet smoothing parameter  $\mu$  set to the average document length. We introduce additional weights  $spy(t)$  which reflect the specificity of a term  $t$  for a given domain (books, food or travel), as described in Section 3. This can be viewed as conditioning the query and user models with a domain model.

Optionally, we integrate word embeddings by using the cosine distance between precomputed word2vec embeddings [31] as a term-term similarity score  $sim(w, t)$ . This is plugged into the document model by means of a translation model largely following [24], with per-term contributions  $p(w | \theta_d)$  replaced by summing over all similar terms (above a threshold):  $\sum_{t:w \sim t} sim(w, t) \cdot p(t | \theta_d)$ .

**BM25:** The second variant for re-ranking is the Okapi BM25 model [33]. We incorporate the user model by query expansion. In principle, all terms from the entire chat

collection of a user are added to the query. We will discuss ways of reducing noise and focusing the query in Sections 3 and 4. That is,

$$score(q \cup u, d) \propto \sum_{w \in V_{q \cup u}} spy(w) \cdot idf(w) \cdot \frac{tf(w, d) \cdot (k_1 + 1)}{tf(w, d) + k_1 \cdot \left(1 - b + b \cdot \frac{|d|}{avgdl}\right)} \quad (2)$$

with domain-specificity weight  $spy(w)$ , document length  $|d|$ , average document length  $avgdl$ , and BM25 parameters  $b$  and  $k_1$ .

**Neural Ranking with KNRM:** The third variant for re-ranking is the KNRM neural method [46] which takes a bag-of-words query as input. KNRM produces a query-document relevance score by comparing embedding similarities between query and document terms. During training, KNRM learns how to weigh different embedding similarity levels. As with BM25, we incorporate the user model by query expansion.

### 3 Domain-specific Vocabulary Weighting

As described in the previous section, the ranking models are further augmented by awareness of domain-specific vocabularies, customizing the user models and document models to books, travel or food, respectively. The intuition is that terms in a user chat are informative if they refer to a certain meaning within a particular domain. For example, terms like “history” or “museum” are good cues about a user’s travel interests, whereas terms like “price” or “bargain” are uninformative – although all these terms have comparable idf values in large corpora.

We incorporate this idea of domain specificity by computing per-domain weights for terms, and weighing term contributions by the various ranking models accordingly (or even eliminating low-weight terms). To this end, we estimate the conditional probability of a term occurring in a domain-specific context (document or chat) given that it occurs in a general corpus:

$$spy(w) = P(w \in Dom | w \in All) \propto \frac{tf(w \in Dom) / |Dom|}{tf(w \in All) / |All|} \quad (3)$$

As underlying text collections for this estimator, we use the pool of all retrieved documents per domain (e.g., all answers for book search, including book descriptions and user reviews) against the pool of documents for all three domains together. We also experimented with term weighting for user-specific vocabularies, contrasting all chats by the same user against a universal corpus. This did not lead to significant changes in the empirical results, though, and is disregarded in the following.

### 4 Entity Expansion

**Named Entity Recognition and Disambiguation (NER/NED):** Among all terms and phrases in the user’s chats and questionnaires, entities and concepts deserve specific

treatment. We ran standard NER ([stanfordnlp.github.io](https://stanfordnlp.github.io)) and NED ([github.com/ambiverse-nlu](https://github.com/ambiverse-nlu)) tools to link text spans to uniquely identified entities in the YAGO knowledge base, which in turns links most of these to Wikipedia. However, the NER stage produced both many false positives and false negatives. This is largely caused by the very colloquial nature of user chats, with short-hands, misspellings, ungrammatical utterances and ad-hoc choice between upper-case and lower-case. To mitigate this effect, we hired crowdsourcing workers to mark up text spans for entities and also general concepts that exist in YAGO and Wikipedia (e.g., “history“ or “Buddhist art”). This way we eliminated nearly all NER errors. As a result, the NED stage performed well, with precision reaching approximately 0.83 (estimated by sampling). We obtained this perfect mark-up only for NER as this is much easier for crowd workers than NED.

**User Model Expansion:** Rather than adding the names of these detected and linked entities to the user model directly, which is likely to overfit given that we deal with many long-tail entities (e.g., lesser-known books or special travel destinations), we experimented with expanding entities using embeddings and Wikipedia descriptions. We first conducted pilot experiments with entity embeddings using Wikipedia2vec [48,47] to achieve proper generalization, but this did not perform well: many terms that are highly related by Wikipedia2vec are quite uninformative if not misleading (e.g., history being most related to literature; modern, natural, and wine being most related to coffee, beer, food). Ultimately, to avoid this noise and topical drift, we expanded the entities using their descriptions from (the first paragraph of) their Wikipedia articles. This captures, for example, content sketches of books, highlights of travel destinations, etc. The resulting terms were added to general as well as domain-specific user models. For the latter, we computed the domain specificity of an entity and its descriptive terms, using the weighting model of Section 3.

**Selective Expansion by Domain-Specificity:** Some of the extracted entities may be poor cues for a certain target domain (e.g. a user chatting about “Italian cuisine” is not helpful for books and could even be misleading for travel). To counter this potential dilution, we use the domain-specificity of entities to filter the candidate entities before expanding the user model.

To this end, we construct a domain model for each of the three domains using Wikipedia2vec embeddings which capture both entity-level linkage and textual descriptions [48,47]. Candidate entities are mapped into the same latent space, and the cosine similarity between entity and domain is used to select entities above a threshold. Specifically, the domain vectors are computed by a weighted average of the  $m = 50$  words and entities that are most related to the Wikipedia articles on “book”, “travel” and “food”, respectively, with weights proportional to cosine between vectors. For selective entity expansion of per-domain user models, we pick entities whose similarity to the respective domain model is above a specified threshold.

This approach introduces several thresholds and hyper-parameters: per-domain numbers of related terms for the domain model and similarity thresholds for pruning entities. We tuned these via grid search with the objective of maximizing the area under the precision-recall curves for entity detection and disambiguation. We used the manu-

ally annotated entities in the domain-specific questionnaires as ground-truth for domain relatedness.

## 5 Data Collection

We gathered personal data in a 4-week user study with 14 students who were paid ca. 10 Euros per hour. We randomly paired two users for 3 chats per week. For the first week, users were instructed to chat generally, like mutual introductions. During the remaining weeks users were asked to chat about specific topical domains: users’ interests and tastes in books and their experience and interests in traveling and food. On average, each user had 2.8 sessions for each domain, totaling to ca. 11 sessions overall, with an average of 653 utterances and 3934 tokens per user. In addition, each user filled in several questionnaires upfront: a general one with 18 questions about demographics, general interests and personality, and one for each of the themes books, travel and food with 2, 5 and 10 questions, respectively (see left side of Figure 1 for an example excerpt). The general questionnaire included personality-oriented questions such as “What are your hobbies?”, “What makes you happy?”, and “Your golden rule?”.

## 6 Experimental Studies

### 6.1 Setup

The 14 users from whom we collected questionnaire and chat data also participated in an assessment study of personalized search results. To this end, we compiled 75 medium-grained keyword queries (25 per domain). Example queries are shown in Table 1.

All queries were issued to a commercial search engine with site restrictions as described in document models (section 2). The top-100 answers were retrieved, keeping only those that were about specific entities and discarding general list pages – this left us with 90 or more answers for each query.

The users were asked to identify around 5 queries for each domain on topics that looked potentially appealing to them. This way we avoided personalized judgements on topics that the user does not care about. For each query, a user assessed 20 results that were sampled uniformly at random (to avoid ranking bias) and, additionally, the top-10 results from the original ranking (with the risk of bias). We asked for subjective, graded assessments with labels: 2 = strongly interested, 1 = mildly interested, 0 = uninterested, and discarded all “I don’t know” assessments. We required the users to enter justification sentences along with their judgements. In total, we obtained 2673 individual assessments for 113 user-query pairs with 73 distinct queries.

**Evaluation Metrics:** The primary metric is **NDCG@20**, which we use to refer to methods’ effectiveness when re-ranking the 20 randomly sampled query results. In addition,

**Table 1.** Example queries by domain

Books	Scandinavian suspense	Novels made into movies	Personal development
Travel	Weekend trip for festival	Best wine lover destination	Epic road trip
Food	Perfect breakfast	Iron rich vegetarian recipes	15-minute meal recipes

we report on **precision@1** where we compare the highest-ranked results from the 20 random samples against a user judgement of 1 or 2 (= strongly or mildly interested). For completeness, we also consider **NDCG@top10** for the top-10 results of the original, potentially biased, rankings from a commercial search engine.

**Methods under Comparison:** We cover the following methods and configurations.

- **LM** denotes the language model approach. To isolate the effect of the user model in the re-ranking, and as our initial pool of entities are to some extent relevant to the query, we either set the  $\lambda$  to 0 or 1. When  $\lambda = 1$  the input to the re-ranker is the query model and when  $\lambda = 0$  only the user model is given as input.
- **LM-embed** is the language-model method with word embeddings using word2vec. The term-term similarity threshold is set to 0.5.
- **BM25** is the BM25 method with parameters set to the following values widely used in the literature:  $b = 0.75, k_1 = 1.5$ .
- **KNRM** is the neural ranker, with the maximum query and document lengths set to 50 and 5000, respectively. The terms for the query/user model are obtained by tf order, selecting the top 50 distinct terms. Document terms are the top-5000 terms. Models are trained on data per domain with 504, 772 and 806 assessments for book, food and travel, respectively.  
As this training is fairly low-end, we also study a variant **KNRM-all** where we combine all domains into a single training set with 2082 labeled samples. We report on ten-fold cross-validation with 8, 1 and 1 folds for training, validation and test, respectively.
- **SE** is the initial ranking from a commercial search engine.

## 6.2 User Models: None vs. Chats vs. Questionnaires (RQ0 and RQ1)

Table 2 shows the NDCG@20 results for the influence of different user models. The top part of Table 2 gives the overall results across all domains (averaged over the 113 user-query pairs). The other parts show per-domain results. The user models under comparison here are query-only vs. questionnaires-based vs. chats-based. For the latter two, we varied the specific setting by deriving models from all available inputs regardless of the domains (*All*), using only general questionnaires or chats (*Gen*, see Section 5), using only domain-specific inputs (*Dom*), or using both general and per-domain inputs (*Dom + Gen*). In this comparison, all methods were configured without entity expansion and without domain-specific vocabularies (which will be discussed in the next subsections).

**Overall results (top part of Table 2):** The overriding observation is that almost all rankers with different degrees of personalization improve over the SE baseline and that both questionnaire-based and chat-based user models achieve notable gains over the query-only rankers: in the order of 2 to 4 percentage points in NDCG@20. While the effect size of personalization is only moderate, the relative gains are statistically significant and come at little cost for the ranker efficiency. For significance, two-tailed paired t-tests in comparison to the Query-Only baselines mostly had p-values  $< 0.05$ . These results are marked with an asterisk in Table 2.



Interestingly, LM-embed did not improve over LM. The term-term relatedness by word2vec seems to be too crude for our task and dilutes the query focus. KNRM and KNRM-all were inferior to the Query-Only case. The combination of small training data and limited input size is the likely cause for this disappointing result.

When comparing questionnaire-based vs. chat-based personalization, the former performs slightly better than the latter, but the differences are minor. For both, the best variants were the ones with user models *Dom* or *Dom + Gen*, indicating awareness of the domain is beneficial. *Dom* is almost always preferable to *Dom + Gen* in the case of chats, but there is no clear trend when using questionnaires. This is likely due to the fact that the general questionnaires were designed to reveal user personalities, whereas the general chats were mostly introductory and less informative. These gains are not

**Table 2.** NDCG@20 for different rankers and user models. Best results per row are in boldface. Statistically significant improvements over the Query-Only baselines are marked with an asterisk.

Ranker	User Model								
	Query Only	Questionnaires				Chats			
		All	Gen	Dom	Dom+Gen	All	Gen	Dom	Dom+Gen
LM	0.796	0.816	0.804	0.823*	<b>0.824*</b>	0.811	0.806	0.822*	0.817*
LM-embed	0.794	0.791	0.787	<b>0.811</b>	0.798	0.782	0.777	0.795	0.784
BM25	0.785	0.823*	0.815*	0.827*	<b>0.833*</b>	0.819*	0.816*	0.827*	0.821*
KNRM	<b>0.807</b>	0.791	0.805	0.798	0.794	0.780	0.786	0.784	0.785
KNRM-all	<b>0.810</b>	0.807	0.796	-	-	0.788	0.791	-	-
SE	0.786	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Books</b>									
LM	0.825	0.829	0.823	0.822	0.834	0.846	<b>0.854</b>	0.844	0.847
LM-embed	<b>0.818</b>	0.795	0.803	0.801	0.799	0.811	0.799	0.813	0.806
BM25	0.814	0.843	0.846	0.834	0.847	0.846	0.849	<b>0.851</b>	0.850
KNRM	0.826	0.827	<b>0.832</b>	0.817	0.816	0.790	0.810	0.790	0.809
SE	0.777	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Travel</b>									
LM	0.818	0.821	0.815	<b>0.854*</b>	0.838	0.826	0.813	0.841	0.835
LM-embed	0.813	0.799	0.787	<b>0.849*</b>	0.814	0.785	0.782*	0.803	0.796
BM25	0.794	0.837*	0.833*	<b>0.857*</b>	0.849*	0.836*	0.837*	0.844*	0.838*
KNRM	<b>0.838</b>	0.806	0.833	0.827	0.801	0.800	0.800	0.805	0.800
SE	0.794	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Food</b>									
LM	0.753	0.802*	0.779	0.790	<b>0.803*</b>	0.772	0.766	0.785	0.777
LM-embed	0.757	0.778	0.775	0.777	<b>0.780</b>	0.758	0.755	0.773	0.757
BM25	0.756	0.793	0.775	0.791	<b>0.806*</b>	0.783	0.770	0.793*	0.782
KNRM	0.761	0.751	0.756	0.755	<b>0.771</b>	0.752	0.753	0.757	0.753
SE	0.785	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

always statistically significant, but the best cases are: for example, the improvement for LM from 0.811 with chats-*All* to 0.822 with chats-*Dom* had a p-value of 0.0018.

**Per-domain results:** The results vary among the different domains in an interesting way. We base the discussion on LM and BM25 as they achieved the best results. For books and travel, the gains from user models are most pronounced. For books, the chat-based models achieved a small but notable and significant improvement over the questionnaire-based ones. We observe that for questionnaire-based models *Dom+Gen* outperforms *Dom*. This is due to the low coverage of the book domain with only two questions on the user’s favorite books and genres, whereas the general questionnaire includes demographics and personal traits. On the other hand, for the travel domain with 5 specific questions, *Dom* performs better than *Dom+Gen* in both questionnaire-based and chat-based models, with the former giving the best results.

For food, personalization led to gains, but the absolute NDCG scores were substantially lower than for the other two domains. Here, the SE performed better than the re-rankers with the query-only model. However, using *Dom+Gen* questionnaire-based profiles, we achieved up to 2% improvement over the SE results. It seems that the food domain is inherently difficult to understand, as its vocabulary mixes specific and very common words with a strong influence of the latter on tastes and sentiments (e.g., “hot”, “terrific” etc.).

As for precision@1, the overall gains by personalization were nearly 10 percent: considering the best-performing rankers on overall results, the LM improved from 70% with query-only models to 81% with questionnaire-based models, and BM25 went up from 66% to 83%. Again, the gains were most substantial for books and travel, but here food as well showed notably improved precision@1. We further evaluated NDCG@top10: not surprisingly, the SE baseline was stronger for this metric, but was still outperformed by re-ranking with personalization. The best values for our method were comparable to those for NDCG@20, around 83% across all domains and up to 87% for travel.

### 6.3 Domain Vocabularies (RQ2)

Recall from Section 3 that we optionally incorporate domain-specific term weighting to reduce the influence of irrelevant wording from the user chats. Table 3 shows NDCG@20 results with this awareness of domain vocabularies, for the four chat-based configurations *All*, *Gen*, *Dom* and *Dom + Gen*. We show only overall results across all domains, but for each domain, all user-model terms were weighted by the respective  $spy(w)$  domain model. For brevity, we restrict ourselves to the LM-based ranker; the findings were similar for the other two rankers.

Table 3 indicates that there are small gains from this domain-specific weighting, but the effect size is marginal and not statistically significant (p-value > 0.1). It seems that chats are not sufficiently focused on domain-specific topics. Humans do jump between topics, so chats naturally have a high level of thematic diversity.

## 6.4 Entity Expansion (RQ3)

To study the influence of entity expansion for the user models, we compared different settings against the previously reported configurations without entity awareness: *all* expands all entities including concepts (in Wikipedia, such as “history” or “Buddhist art”); *domain* restricts the entities to those that are related to the respective domain (see Section 4); *NE-all* uses only named entities (i.e., discarding general concepts); *NE-dom* uses only named entities with domain relatedness above a threshold.

Table 4 shows the overall NDCG@20 for these settings with the different configurations for the user-model construction. We observe that almost none of the expansion methods significantly improve the models derived from questionnaires. The reason is that these models are already very concise given their high-quality inputs. For chat-based user models, on the other hand, entity expansion led to small, but notable and statistically significant (p-values  $< 0.05$ ), improvements of ca. 1%.

## 7 Related Work

**Recommender systems** are ubiquitous in search, e-commerce and social content sharing. Most state-of-the-art systems learn from massive amounts of user-behavior signals: queries, clicks, likes, ratings, etc. (e.g., [52,25,19]). To a lesser extent, product reviews are considered as well (see, e.g., [14,7]), but recent studies [40,34] indicate that there is considerable noise in user reviews and limited benefit from such additional input. In the opposite direction, [6] made the point that user models for personalized recommendations should be scrutable and, therefore, use as little information as possible and make the derived models transparent and user-interpretable. The work [43] pursued this rationale by building on explicit user profiles from short questionnaires. The current paper’s experiments include comparisons to that approach. None of the prior works has considered user-user chats as a source for capturing user interests and tastes. Note that interactive and conversational recommenders [36,26] are a very different approach, as they build on dialogs between user and system, not among users.

**Specialized recommenders** that tap textual contents have been investigated for domains like e-learning, literature exploration or tourism (e.g., [20,3,27,30]). These are based on rich context models of user history and interests. However, they are not query-based, disregarding the additional component of search results on behalf of the user.

**Personalized ranking of search results** has been addressed from two angles (see [17] for a survey): i) building user models from user queries and browsing histories (e.g., [41,37,1,15,23]), and ii) exploiting such models for ranking, query expansion or auto-completion (e.g., [29,38,12]). For the first task, the seminal work of [41] analyzed

**Table 3.** NDCG@20 for LM-based ranker with domain-specific vocabularies

Domain Specificity	Chats			
	All	Gen	Dom	Dom+Gen
Disabled	0.811	0.806	0.822	0.817
Enabled	0.821	0.813	0.83	0.826

**Table 4.** NDCG@20 for LM-based ranker with entity expansion. Best results per column are in boldface. Statistically significant improvements over None baselines are marked with an asterisk.

Entity Expansion	User Models							
	Questionnaires				Chats			
	All	Gen	Dom	Dom+Gen	All	Gen	Dom	Dom+Gen
None	0.816	0.804	0.823	0.824	0.811	0.806	0.822	0.817
All	0.817	<b>0.816</b>	0.826	0.822	<b>0.821</b>	0.814	0.828	0.824
Domain	0.823	0.812	<b>0.827</b>	0.824	<b>0.821*</b>	0.814*	0.829	0.824
NE-all	0.823	0.81	0.826	0.829	0.818*	0.813	0.829	<b>0.825*</b>
NE-dom	<b>0.829*</b>	0.809	0.825	<b>0.833</b>	0.819*	<b>0.815*</b>	<b>0.83</b>	0.824*

user activities reflected in queries, clicks and emails, all the way to news and other contents read by a user. For personalized ranking, language models were enhanced with user-specific priors [39]. The interplay of long-term behavior and short-term sessions of a user was studied by [8,10]. Other work [42,9] investigated the issue of when to personalize and when to disregard user profiles. None of these prior works is specifically geared for entity search, and none considers user models derived from chats.

**Entity search** (e.g., [4,16]) has been studied for personalization only in limited settings. The CLEF competition on book recommendations [21] relied on extensive data (posts, tags, reviews, ratings) by large user communities at LibraryThing and Amazon. Most related to our work is [2] on personalized product search, based on embeddings for users and products in a joint latent space. That method exploited user reviews on product pages. In contrast, our approach is based on user-user chats, an unintrusively observable asset disregarded in prior works.

**Query expansion** is a well established methodology in IR (see, e.g., [13] for a survey). Personalization has been studied in this context along various routes. Notable examples are [11,53] based on user-provided tags, and [23] based on email histories and utilizing word embeddings learned from email contents. Recently, [49] has pursued the theme of personalized word embeddings further, based on query histories.

## 8 Conclusion

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that explores leveraging *user-to-user* conversations as a source for personalization of search-based recommendations. We compared chat-based user models against models derived from concise questionnaires. Both achieved substantial improvements over both the original search-engine ranking and non-personalized query-only re-rankings.

Between chat-based and questionnaire-based re-rankings, there is no clear winner. The two paradigms of user models each have specific benefits:

- Questionnaires are transparent and scrutable for users. However, they require an explicit effort. Most users seem fine with a one-time questionnaire, but few seem ready for periodic updating as their interests and tastes evolve.

- Chats, on the other hand, require no effort at all from the user side, and could be easily updated without user intervention. However, the derived models are less transparent to humans and not easily adjustable by users themselves. Also, chat data comes with higher privacy risks.

The additional enhancements devised in this paper – domain awareness and entity expansion – further improved the NDCG scores, but only to a small extent. On the other hand, focusing on entities in conversations and casting them into an explicit user model is a step towards making chat-based profiles more transparent and scrutable for users.

**Acknowledgements.** This research was supported by the ERC Synergy Grant 610150 (imPACT).

## References

1. Agichtein, E., Brill, E., Dumais, S., Ragno, R.: Learning user interaction models for predicting web search result preferences. In: Proceedings of the 29th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval. ACM (2006)
2. Ai, Q., Zhang, Y., Bi, K., Chen, X., Croft, W.B.: Learning a hierarchical embedding model for personalized product search. In: Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. SIGIR '17, ACM (2017)
3. Bai, X., Wang, M., Lee, I., Yang, Z., Kong, X., Xia, F.: Scientific paper recommendation: A survey. IEEE Access (2019)
4. Balog, K.: Entity-Oriented Search. The Information Retrieval Series, Springer (2018)
5. Balog, K., Kenter, T.: Personal knowledge graphs: A research agenda. In: Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval, ICTIR (2019)
6. Balog, K., Radlinski, F., Arakelyan, S.: Transparent, scrutable and explainable user models for personalized recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR (2019)
7. Bauman, K., Liu, B., Tuzhilin, A.: Aspect based recommendations: Recommending items with the most valuable aspects based on user reviews. In: Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. ACM (2017)
8. Bennett, P.N., Radlinski, F., White, R.W., Yilmaz, E.: Inferring and using location metadata to personalize web search. In: Proceeding of the 34th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (2011)
9. Bennett, P.N., Shokouhi, M., Caruana, R.: Implicit preference labels for learning highly selective personalized rankers. In: Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on The Theory of Information Retrieval, ICTIR (2015)
10. Bennett, P.N., White, R.W., Chu, W., Dumais, S.T., Bailey, P., Borisyuk, F., Cui, X.: Modeling the impact of short- and long-term behavior on search personalization. In: The 35th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (2012)
11. Biancalana, C., Gasparetti, F., Micarelli, A., Sansonetti, G.: Social semantic query expansion. ACM TIST (2013)
12. Cai, F., de Rijke, M.: Selectively personalizing query auto-completion. In: Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (2016)

13. Carpineto, C., Romano, G.: A survey of automatic query expansion in information retrieval. *ACM Comput. Surv.* (2012)
14. Chen, L., Chen, G., Wang, F.: Recommender systems based on user reviews: the state of the art. *User Model. User Adapt. Interact.* (2015)
15. Chirita, P., Firan, C.S., Nejdl, W.: Personalized query expansion for the web. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2007)
16. Dietz, L.: ENT rank: Retrieving entities for topical information needs through entity-neighbor-text relations. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2019)
17. Ghorab, M.R., Zhou, D., O'Connor, A., Wade, V.: Personalised information retrieval: survey and classification. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* (2013)
18. Guo, Q., Zhuang, F., Qin, C., Zhu, H., Xie, X., Xiong, H., He, Q.: A survey on knowledge graph-based recommender systems. *CoRR* (2020)
19. Jiang, J., Wu, T., Roumpos, G., Cheng, H., Yi, X., Chi, E., Ganapathy, H., Jindal, N., Cao, P., Wang, W.: End-to-end deep attentive personalized item retrieval for online content-sharing platforms. In: *WWW '20: The Web Conference 2020. ACM / IW3C2* (2020)
20. Klasnja-Milicevic, A., Vesin, B., Ivanovic, M., Budimac, Z., Jain, L.C.: *E-Learning Systems - Intelligent Techniques for Personalization*. Intelligent Systems Reference Library, Springer (2017)
21. Koolen, M., Bogers, T., Gäde, M., Hall, M.M., Hendrickx, I., Huurdeman, H.C., Kamps, J., Skov, M., Verberne, S., Walsh, D.: Overview of the CLEF 2016 social book search lab. In: *Experimental IR Meets Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Interaction CLEF. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer (2016)
22. Koren, Y., Bell, R., Volinsky, C.: Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer* (2009)
23. Kuzi, S., Carmel, D., Libov, A., Raviv, A.: Query expansion for email search. In: *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. ACM* (2017)
24. Kuzi, S., Shtok, A., Kurland, O.: Query expansion using word embeddings. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM* (2016)
25. Lalmas, M.: Personalizing the listening experience (invited talk), slides at <https://prs2019.splashthat.com/>
26. Lei, W., He, X., de Rijke, M., Chua, T.: Conversational recommendation: Formulation, methods, and evaluation. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval. ACM* (2020)
27. Li, X., Chen, Y., Pettit, B., de Rijke, M.: Personalised reranking of paper recommendations using paper content and user behavior. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* (2019)
28. Liu, J., Dolan, P., Pedersen, E.R.: Personalized news recommendation based on click behavior. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces, IUI. ACM* (2010)
29. Matthijs, N., Radlinski, F.: Personalizing web search using long term browsing history. In: *Proceedings of the Forth International Conference on Web Search and Web Data Mining, WSDM* (2011)
30. Menk, A., Sebastia, L., Ferreira, R.: Recommendation systems for tourism based on social networks: A survey. *CoRR* (2019)
31. Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G.S., Dean, J.: Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26: 27th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems NIPS* (2013)

32. Ricci, F., Rokach, L., Shapira, B. (eds.): *Recommender Systems Handbook*. Springer (2015)
33. Robertson, S.E., Zaragoza, H.: The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* (2009)
34. Sachdeva, N., McAuley, J.: How useful are reviews for recommendation? a critical review and potential improvements. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. SIGIR '20*, Association for Computing Machinery (2020)
35. Sarwar, B., Karypis, G., Konstan, J., Riedl, J.: Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In: *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web* (2001)
36. Schnabel, T., Amershi, S., Bennett, P.N., Bailey, P., Joachims, T.: The impact of more transparent interfaces on behavior in personalized recommendation. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval. ACM* (2020)
37. Shen, X., Tan, B., Zhai, C.: Implicit user modeling for personalized search. In: *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM CIKM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (2005)
38. Shokouhi, M.: Learning to personalize query auto-completion. In: *The 36th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval* (2013)
39. Sontag, D., Collins-Thompson, K., Bennett, P.N., White, R.W., Dumais, S.T., Billerbeck, B.: Probabilistic models for personalizing web search. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Web Search and Web Data Mining, WSDM* (2012)
40. Stratigi, M., Li, X., Stefanidis, K., Zhang, Z.: Ratings vs. reviews in recommender systems: A case study on the amazon movies dataset. In: *New Trends in Databases and Information Systems, ADBIS 2019. Communications in Computer and Information Science, Springer* (2019)
41. Teevan, J., Dumais, S.T., Horvitz, E.: Personalizing search via automated analysis of interests and activities (sigir test-of-time award 2017). In: *Proceedings of the 28th Annual International ACM SIGIR* (2005)
42. Teevan, J., Dumais, S.T., Liebling, D.J.: To personalize or not to personalize: modeling queries with variation in user intent. In: *Proceedings of the 31st Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2008)
43. Torbati, G.H., Yates, A., Weikum, G.: Personalized entity search by sparse and scrutable user profiles. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval. CHIIR '20*, Association for Computing Machinery (2020)
44. Wu, F., Qiao, Y., Chen, J., Wu, C., Qi, T., Lian, J., Liu, D., Xie, X., Gao, J., Wu, W., Zhou, M.: MIND: A large-scale dataset for news recommendation. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL. Association for Computational Linguistics* (2020)
45. Wu, L., Grbovic, M.: How airbnb tells you will enjoy sunset sailing in barcelona? recommendation in a two-sided travel marketplace. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval. ACM* (2020)
46. Xiong, C., Dai, Z., Callan, J., Liu, Z., Power, R.: End-to-end neural ad-hoc ranking with kernel pooling. In: *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. ACM* (2017)
47. Yamada, I., Asai, A., Shindo, H., Takeda, H., Takefuji, Y.: Wikipedia2vec: An optimized tool for learning embeddings of words and entities from wikipedia. *CoRR* (2018)
48. Yamada, I., Shindo, H., Takeda, H., Takefuji, Y.: Joint learning of the embedding of words and entities for named entity disambiguation. In: *Proceedings of the 20th SIGNLL Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL. ACL* (2016)

49. Yao, J., Dou, Z., Wen, J.: Employing personal word embeddings for personalized search. In: Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval. ACM (2020)
50. Zhai, C.: Statistical language models for information retrieval: A critical review. Found. Trends Inf. Retr. (2008)
51. Zhang, S., Yao, L., Sun, A., Tay, Y.: Deep learning based recommender system: A survey and new perspectives. ACM Comput. Surv. (2019)
52. Zhao, Z., Hong, L., Wei, L., Chen, J., Nath, A., Andrews, S., Kumthekar, A., Sathiamoorthy, M., Yi, X., Chi, E.H.: Recommending what video to watch next: a multitask ranking system. In: Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys. ACM (2019)
53. Zhou, D., Wu, X., Zhao, W., Lawless, S., Liu, J.: Query expansion with enriched user profiles for personalized search utilizing folksonomy data. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2017)