

Multi-output Headed Ensembles for Product Item Classification

Hotaka Shiokawa*
hotaka.shiokawa@fmr.com
Fidelity Investments, Workplace
Investing Business Unit
Boston, MA, USA

Pradipto Das†
pradipto.das@rakuten.com
Rakuten Institute of Technology
Boston, MA, USA

Arthur R. Toth
Justin Chiu
arthur.toth@rakuten.com
justin.chiu@rakuten.com
Rakuten Institute of Technology
Boston, MA, USA

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we revisit the problem of product item classification for large-scale e-commerce catalogs. The taxonomy of e-commerce catalogs consists of thousands of genres to which are assigned items that are uploaded by merchants on a continuous basis. The genre assignments by merchants are often wrong but treated as ground truth labels in automatically generated training sets, thus creating a feedback loop that leads to poorer model quality over time. This problem of taxonomy classification becomes highly pronounced due to the unavailability of sizable curated training sets.

Under such a scenario it is common to combine multiple classifiers to combat poor generalization performance from a single classifier. We propose an extensible deep learning based classification model framework that benefits from the simplicity and robustness of averaging ensembles and fusion based classifiers. We are also able to use metadata features and low-level feature engineering to boost classification performance. We show these improvements against robust industry standard baseline models that employ hyperparameter optimization.

Additionally, due to continuous insertion, deletion and updates to real-world high-volume e-commerce catalogs, assessing model performance for deployment using A/B testing and/or manual annotation becomes a bottleneck. To this end, we also propose a novel way to evaluate model performance using user sessions that provides better insights in addition to traditional measures of precision and recall.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning; Learning paradigms; Supervised learning;**

KEYWORDS

neural network ensembles, product classification

1 INTRODUCTION

Product taxonomy classification is a tricky problem to solve for large-scale e-commerce catalogs that are continuously evolving. The difficulties stem from the following factors:

- (1) Continuous large-scale manual annotation is infeasible. Data augmentation, semi-supervised and few-shot learning [4, 28, 31, 32] may help but with no guarantees.
- (2) The efficacy of data augmentation and semi-supervised learning methods gets severely limited in the presence of

label noise, which in industrial settings can easily range around 15% [34]. Identifying the nature of corruption in labels is non-trivial [9]. Internal assessments reveal that the genre assignment error rate by merchants is around 20% for the large scale catalog with more than 13K leaf nodes in the product taxonomy, which has been made available to us.

- (3) There is often an unknown covariate shift [10, 18] in the final evaluation dataset that consists of the Quality Assurance (QA) team’s preferred ways of sampling items including those strategies that provide incentives to merchants.

While these problems have no robust solutions, practitioners of taxonomy classification for products in e-commerce catalogs have always relied on improving a “science” Key Performance Indicator (science KPI) that is usually based on F1 and AUC scores. Recently hosted data challenges for this problem [2, 17] and papers in the extreme classification domain [25–27, 29, 30] highlight the advances in neural network based classification models for product catalogs.

In general, a fusion of classifiers works better than single classifiers. However, the *final selection of classifiers for deployment* in production depends on several business Service Level Agreements (SLAs). Key among them are model performance metrics on rigorous validation datasets that are not affected by covariate shifts, some acceptance criteria by the QA team on the final evaluation dataset and *compute cost* in terms of training and serving time. The economic cost is usually justified if *significant improvements* in KPIs are obtained. In §5, we highlight a different way of evaluating models that tries to replace the need for expensive manual curation of evaluation sets on a continuous basis and instead rely on privacy preserving user interactions during product search sessions.

Effective catalog classifiers have been fastText [12, 17] and more recently fastText with automatic tuning of hyperparameters¹ and Neural Network based ones [5, 23, 39]. The fastText classifier is chosen for its speed and robustness due to a single linear hidden layer logistic regression model trained with Asynchronous Stochastic Gradient Descent algorithm and feature bucketing. However, the representational capacity of fastText is limited due to the use of a fixed inventory of possible features and the lack of non-linearities. On the other extreme, some large cloud based services provide neural network models that find the best architecture of the network automatically from the data for a particular task. Popular among these is Google Cloud Platform’s AutoML² [19, 41]. However, it is difficult to train and deploy such models repeatedly due to the conflicting goals of dollar cost and solution time. The hypothesis

*Corresponding author.

†Corresponding author.

¹<https://fasttext.cc/docs/en/autotune.html>

²<https://cloud.google.com/automl>

space of estimators beginning with fastText at one end and AutoML at the other consists of hundreds of innovations in designing neural network architectures, self-attention based pre-training and fusion of neural networks [17].

In §2, we propose a minimalistic Neural Network (NN) architecture *framework* that takes advantage of reduction of estimator variance for ensembles and the advantages of fusing several classifiers. Ensembles of *independent* estimators generalize better than an individual estimator in that the variance of the ensemble estimator is better than the worst individual estimator. Let us denote the T independent estimators that estimate the posterior class probabilities by $g_t^{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{x})$, where \mathcal{D} is the training dataset and \mathbf{x} is any sample. Let us also denote the estimator with the *worst variance* to be $g_i(\mathbf{x})$, for some $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, dropping the superscript \mathcal{D} where dependence on \mathcal{D} is assumed and let this variance be σ^2 . Then we have,

$$\text{Var} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T g_t(\mathbf{x}) \right) = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Var}(g_t(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^2 \leq \frac{1}{T} \sigma^2 \quad (1)$$

While designing our proposed model framework named MoHE, our first inspiration has been the mixture of experts (MoE) [8, 11, 21, 24, 33] model – see Fig. 2b. The MoE model in the context of a neural network is a system of “expert” and gating networks with a selector unit that acts as a multiplexer for stochastically selecting the prediction from the best expert for a given task and input. However, from a generalization point of view, the MoE classifier has a much looser bound than an ensemble of i.i.d estimators. If $E_{in}(g)$ denotes the in-sample (training) error and $E_{out}(g)$ denotes the out-of-sample (test) error, then using the union bound of probability, we have the following for MoE:

$$|E_{in}(g) - E_{out}(g)| > \epsilon \implies |E_{in}(g_1) - E_{out}(g_1)| > \epsilon \dots \text{or} \\ \dots \text{or } |E_{in}(g_T) - E_{out}(g_T)| > \epsilon \quad (2)$$

Applying the Hoeffding Inequality [1], we have

$$P(|E_{in}(g) - E_{out}(g)| > \epsilon) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T P(|E_{in}(g_t) - E_{out}(g_t)| > \epsilon) \\ \leq 2Te^{-2\epsilon^2 N} \quad (3)$$

where N is the number of in-sample data points. Equ. 3 shows that generalization error bound for MoE can be loose by a factor of T .

2 MULTI-OUTPUT HEADED ENSEMBLE (MOHE) FRAMEWORK

The central idea of MoHE architecture is a loosely coupled ensemble *framework* where each individual classifier’s output is considered as a **head**. This is similar in spirit to the BERT model [7], however, in this framework, heads are defined only at the output layer. Furthermore, in this architecture, shown in Fig. 2c, any number of independent input-encoder-output units, dubbed **estimator threads** or just **threads** are loosely coupled through an additional classification module dubbed **aggregator**. The aggregator typically performs the function of a fusion module as shown in Fig. 1.

Each thread is allowed to have its own unique (and possibly transformed) input, parameters, encoder and output layer for single task problems. By design, this framework can easily be extended to handle multi-task problems, but we do not explore that direction.

The number of heads, therefore, is $T + 1$ where T is the number of threads (estimators) *chosen by design* and the additional one is for the aggregator that loosely couples the estimator threads. Posterior class probability estimates can then be obtained by either taking the output from the aggregator alone (see Fig. 1) or summing all (or part) of the output probabilities from the output heads of the estimator threads including the aggregator. The latter usually outperforms the former except at early stages of training or for small training datasets.

The analysis of variance for the MoHE framework becomes complicated without any distributional support. Let us assume that for each category k ,

the output vector from the heads and the aggregator, $\mathbf{g}_k \equiv \mathbf{g}$, follows multivariate normal distribution. For a particular head t , we can write the covariance and mean for \mathbf{g} as,

$$\mathbf{g} = \begin{bmatrix} g_t \\ \mathbf{g}_{-t} \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_{g_t} \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{g_t, g_t} & \Sigma_{g_t, \mathbf{g}_{-t}} \\ \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, g_t} & \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{g}_{-t} is a T -dimensional vector and g_t is a scalar for each class k . Under this assumption, if we hold all of \mathbf{g}_{-t} fixed, we can show that:

$$\mu_{g_t | \mathbf{g}_{-t}} = \mu_{g_t} = \Sigma_{g_t, \mathbf{g}_{-t}} \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}^{-1} (\mathbf{g}_{-t} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}})$$

$$\Sigma_{g_t | \mathbf{g}_{-t}} = \Sigma_{g_t, g_t} - \Sigma_{g_t, \mathbf{g}_{-t}} \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}^{-1} \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, g_t} = \Sigma_{g_t, g_t} - \hat{\Sigma}_{g_{T+1}} \quad (5)$$

We note that $\Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}^{-1}$ is positive definite (PD) since $\Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}$ is. This is easily shown for an arbitrary PD matrix \mathbf{A} and its eigenvalues Λ and eigenvectors \mathbf{V} : $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} = \lambda_{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{v} \implies \frac{1}{\lambda_{\mathbf{v}}}\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ for $\lambda_{\mathbf{v}} \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{V}$. Since $\Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}^{-1}$ is positive definite and $\Sigma_{g_t, \mathbf{g}_{-t}}^{\top} = \Sigma_{\mathbf{g}_{-t}, g_t}$, hence by definition of positive definiteness that $\mathbf{v}^{\top} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v} > 0$, there is a **reduction of variance for each g_t** , $t \in \{1, \dots, T + 1\}$ and then Equ. 1 applies. Note that in Equ. 5, $\Sigma_{g_t, g_t} \equiv \sigma_{g_t}^2$ for fixed \mathbf{g}_{-t} .


The caveat for equations 1 and 4 is that they often are oversimplifications in absence of well calibrated class probabilities. In this paper, we do not tackle calibration, however, it is an important research topic in and of itself – see [15] and the references therein.

2.1 Neural Network Architecture for MoHE

Our basic MoHE architecture consists of encoder threads with arbitrary parameters and input tokenization. The outputs from all encoders (CNNs used here) are globally max-pooled, concatenated, and given to the aggregator module – see Fig. 2c for our *baseline* MoHE architecture. We define T to be the number of estimator threads, which are, for instance, independent classifiers in our *baseline* ensemble framework (see Fig. 2a). Tokenized input text sequences, \mathbf{x}_t , which can be pre-processed differently for each thread so that $\mathbf{x}_{t_i} \neq \mathbf{x}_{t_j}$, are first converted to word embedding vector representations, $\mathbf{v}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{L_t \times D_t}$, where L_t and D_t are the input text sequence length and embedding dimension, respectively. Denote

$$\mathbf{V}_t = f_{t,1}(\mathbf{x}_t) = \text{Dropout}(\text{Embedding}(\mathbf{x}_t)) \quad (6)$$

Figure 1: The Aggregator framework with AGG as a “fusion” layer. It doesn’t share the inputs but share the outputs from the encoders of the estimator threads.






Figure 2: Embedding, Encoder and Classifier stacks for different model frameworks. Each stack yields an estimator thread while the set of classifiers that compute posterior class probabilities form the ensemble of *Multi-output* heads.

where the second index in $f_{t,\cdot}$ refers to the depth in the architecture of the estimator thread. The subsequent encoding is

$$\mathbf{u}_t = f_{t,2}(\mathbf{V}_t) = \text{Dropout}(\text{GlobalMaxPool}(\text{CNN}_t(\mathbf{V}_t))) \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{P_t}$ where P_t is the number of filters for CNN_t . We can express the estimator thread, t 's output as

$$\mathbf{g}_t = f_{t,3}(\mathbf{u}_t) = \text{Softmax}(\text{CLF}_t(\mathbf{u}_t)) \quad (8)$$

where CLF_t is a densely connected feed forward neural network. Similarly, the output of the aggregator module is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_{T+1} &= f_{T+1,3}(\{\mathbf{u}_{t \in [1, \dots, T]}\}) \\ &= \text{Softmax}(\text{CLF}_{T+1}(\text{Concatenate}(\mathbf{u}_{t \in [1, \dots, T]}))) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We also apply layer normalization [3] to \mathbf{u}_t to speed up the convergence and improve performance. Dropouts [35] appear as in equations 6 and 7. Contribution to the training loss function for a single data point is

$$\mathcal{L} = \gamma_{T+1} \text{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g}_{T+1}) + \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t \text{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g}_t) \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{y} is the one-hot representation of a label and $\gamma_{T+1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t = 1$ are tuning parameters. *The class posterior probabilities to be used for classification could be either \mathbf{g}_{T+1} or $\frac{1}{T+1}(\mathbf{g}_{T+1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{g}_t)$.* We use the latter and set $\gamma_{T+1} = \gamma_t \forall t$ in all of our experiments. We use Adam optimizer [14] throughout the paper (except fastText) and do not perform parameter tuning specific to each model to focus on the effects of architectural variations only.

The MoHE-2 model (Fig. 2d) incorporates additional non-linearities that act as a mini-aggregator module that allows the interaction of information geometries in two spaces – a function of input’s embedding (mean in our minimal framework) and input encoding spaces. For this model, Equ. 8 becomes:

$$\mathbf{g}_t = \text{Softmax}(\text{CLF}_t(\text{SLP}(\text{Concatenate}(\mathbf{u}_t, \mathbf{V}_t)))) \quad (11)$$

where SLP is a single layer perceptron with *tanh* activations. Equ. 9 is also changed accordingly for the MoHE-2 model. Dropouts appear after (LayerNorm $\leftarrow f_t(\cdot)$) and (LayerNorm $\leftarrow \text{ENC}_t$) stacks.

We use CNN as the encoder in this paper. It can be replaced by any other encoders such as RNNs, LSTMs, transformers [37] etc. Exploration of arbitrary encoder variations/combinations beyond the scope of this paper. Furthermore, we restrict ourselves to seven estimator threads and one aggregator module purely for computational reasons of using a single 8-GPU card server.

2.2 Adding Feature Engineering to MoHEs


One of the greatest advantages of the MoHE framework is its ability to accept domain knowledge as additional metadata. It can add new estimator threads corresponding to individual metadata fields or multiple of them, thus preserving the structure of the data. On the other hand, if rich meta-data is just appended to main text, forming just another longer text sequence – as is the case for fastText, it leads to loss of structure and strong coupling of meta-data parameters.

To this end, we feed such auxiliary information, or the products’ metadata to the MoHEs in two different ways. The first method, dubbed *method-1* hereafter, for MoHE-1 is depicted in Fig. 3. The meta-data inputs are embedded, encoded, and the encodings concatenated with the inputs to all the classifiers (CLF layers) including the aggregator module (AGG). Multiple types of metadata could be given to a *single* “metadata estimator thread” or *separate* meta-data estimator threads depending on data/encoder types. Method-1 is applicable to MoHE-2 in exactly the same way as MoHE-1.

In the second method, dubbed *method-2* hereafter, the metadata threads are identical to that of method-1 but their outputs are given to SLPs in the MoHE-2 model shown in Fig. 2d, instead of directly to the classifiers. Method-2 is only applicable for MoHE-2. The aggregator module does not take any input from the metadata threads in this case. We employ basic text (1-dimensional) CNNs with a *kernel size of one* for the metadata encoders.

2.2.1 Feature Metadata specifics for MoHE Models. The metadata or “*features*” that we have used here, appear only in one of the datasets – a large scale Japanese product catalog. There are multiple metadata values available for each item, such as various identification numbers related to the products, description, price, “tags”, image urls, and so on. For example, many merchants/shops sell products in only certain categories, and therefore “shop_ID” can be a strong feature for label correlation. A similar signal is

Figure 3: The threads on the right of estimator thread T are the “meta estimator threads” that take as input any desired metadata dubbed *MetaInput*.



“tag_ID”, that refers to an attribute type of a product. In this paper, we make use of the maker/brand and shop tags as features and descriptions as another metadata feature.

As mentioned in §2.2, the meta estimator threads employ CNNs with kernel sizes of *one* as their encoders, so as to make them serve as keyword finders. For “descriptions”, however, we keep only nouns, adjectives, and adverbs, and omit repeating words. The description is thus a sequence of part-of-speech tagged tokens and we set the window size to one here as well. This “*feature engineering*” of description fits long sentences within a maximum length of 120. The length is so set since 90% of the descriptions have length ≤ 120 . We use the Mecab³ tokenizer [13] for tokenizing and extracting parts of speech from Japanese product titles and descriptions.

We show in Table 6 that using metadata for MoHE-1/2 models, *performance on the validation set improves by 3% absolute in macro-F1 scores*. Further, ablation studies show that all three “*features*” used together yield best performance.

3 DATASETS AND PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS

We first touch upon some definitions that are used throughout this paper. A **catalog item** is an item that exists in the product catalog, which is organized as a taxonomy. All catalog items are assigned to the leaf nodes of the taxonomy tree.

3.1 Preliminary Concepts

DEFINITION 3.1.1. Genre path: *It is the path from the root to a leaf in a product catalog taxonomy. The root is at level 0 and each node in the path from the root increments the level. Denote each node in the path to be n_l , where l is a certain 0-indexed level. The full genre path for an item x in the product catalog is $n_0 > \dots > n_l > \dots > n_L$, where L is the leaf level for that path.*

DEFINITION 3.1.2. Level one genres: *These refer to the genres that are immediately reachable from the root node. The names of these genre nodes, (or modifications) usually appear in the front end as “departments” selection dropdown in a search query box.*

DEFINITION 3.1.3. Level one genre path: *Level one or L1 genre path is the sequence of nodes identified by $n_1 > \dots > n_l > \dots > n_L$*

DEFINITION 3.1.4. Head, Torso, Tail: *Let a genre path be labeled up to level l i.e. $n_0 > \dots > n_l$. Additionally there are no item assignments to any internal node of the taxonomy tree. If we sort the n_l s in descending order of item counts, then the set $\{n_l\}^{(\text{Head})}$ are those n_l that cover 70% of all items that belong to all nodes at level l . The set $\{n_l\}^{(\text{Torso})}$ are those nodes, n_l , that cover the next 20% of items and the set $\{n_l\}^{(\text{Tail})}$ are those nodes, n_l , that cover the last 10% of items. For our experiments we set $l = 1$ to obtain head, tail and torso segments corresponding to level one genres in the training set. See §7 for a plot of the histograms.*

DEFINITION 3.1.5. User session: *For a given time period, the product catalog is a static catalog of items with possible updates to quantities and prices. This catalog becomes highly dynamic when the user interface of the search engine for the product items record user interactions for each item that is retrieved through search queries*

Q. These interactions result in time slices of activities per user called User sessions.

3.2 Datasets

For our experiments, we use two datasets – a Japanese product catalog with item metadata from a major e-commerce company in Japan, Rakuten Ichiba, and an English product catalog that was released as part of a data challenge in SIGIR 2018 [17]. The latter dataset does not have any metadata. We dub the first dataset the *Rakuten Ichiba* dataset, which is a sample from the full catalog. This dataset is almost entirely in Japanese. English words and characters, however, do appear sometimes. There are 38 level one genres with $\approx 13K$ leaf nodes. Some statistics of the training data size are shown in Table 3. The training, validation and evaluation datasets have 23.7M, 2.96M and 1.18M items respectively. Please refer to §7 for frequency distribution of items in the level one genres.

Since the Rakuten Ichiba dataset is much larger in size, training a flat classifier is often suboptimal. We thus deploy a two level classifier similar to that used in [6]. We only report scores from the 38 level one classifiers.


Attached to each catalog item is a list of privacy preserved sessions, each of which belong to a particular user. Each session is defined over a time span and records events such as the queries issued, search results for the queries, clicked items in the results, page views, whether the clicked item was added to cart and purchased, etc. – see Fig. 4. Not all fields, e.g. *dwell_time*, are made available to us due to GDPR⁴ restrictions. Query attribute fields such as *tag_ID* are mostly missing and hence not used in experiments in §5.6.

Rakuten hosted a product taxonomy classification data challenge as part of the SIGIR’18 E-Com Workshop. The details of the data challenge and the dataset used are mentioned in [17], and we do not repeat it here. We utilize that dataset, which is in English, as our second dataset to compare models. The SIGIR’18 E-Com Data Challenge dataset, dubbed *SIGIR’18-DC* dataset henceforth, is a relatively small dataset of catalog items from *www.rakuten.com* consisting of 800K training and 200K evaluation items. The labels of the items are arranged in an anonymized taxonomy tree consisting of a total of 3008 leaf nodes. For this dataset, we use a flat classification scheme similar to what has been used in [17].

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

For all experiments, the Rakuten Ichiba dataset has been partitioned into training, development and *validation* sets, all of which are sampled from the same data distribution. This distribution of items **has no sampling bias** in terms of purchase behavior and includes a large sample of items from purchased and non-purchased items and a minor percentage of historical curated items whose genres have been manually corrected. The data has noisy labels to the

Figure 4: Dynamic catalog. Attaching User sessions to each catalog item.



³<https://taku910.github.io/mecab/>

⁴<https://gdpr.eu/>

Table 1: Baseline thread parameters. The thread indices are ordered from left to right as shown in Fig. 2. The input sequence lengths are set to 60 for word based tokenization and 100 for character based tokenization since greater than 90% of titles are shorter than 60 words and 100 characters in length. For the SIGIR’18-DC dataset, the default settings of CNN Kernel sizes for character tokenization is smaller since the average length of English words is ≈ 5 characters and we use sequential multiples of 5. “bi-grams” is by tokens.

Threads	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tokenization	word	word	word	char	char	char	bi-gram
CNN Kernel Size [Rakuten Ichiba]	3	4	5	5	15	25	3
CNN Kernel Size [SIGIR’18-DC]	3	4	5	5	10	15	3
Number of Filters	100	100	100	300	300	300	100
Input Length	60	60	60	100	100	100	60

extent of 20% based on internal assessment. We use a *sampling of genres based on purchased items from user sessions to validate this figure of 20%* in §5.6.

We also have a non-overlapping *evaluation set* for the Rakuten Ichiba dataset, where annotators have sampled items based on GMS (Gross Merchandise Sale) values and corrected the mis-predicted genres from a previous model. However, for all experiments with the Rakuten Ichiba dataset in this section, we only use the validation set for model comparison. For the SIGIR’18-DC dataset, the challenge evaluation set is the set of 200K items that is mentioned in [17].

Configurations for MoHE Threads. Each estimator thread t is an embedding, encoder and classifier stack with output layer g_t :

$$g_t = \text{CLF}_{t,3}(\text{LayerNorm}(\text{ENC}_{t,2}(\text{EMB}_{t,1}(x)))) \quad (12)$$

Each thread has different parameters and input tokenization types as summarized in Table 1. The parameter values are obtained using minimal manual tuning over a development set for our Ensemble model. The word embedding dimension is set to $\min(\frac{C}{2}, 100)$ where C is the number of leaf nodes for each level one genre. This setting substantially reduces the number of parameters and is set following baseline models mentioned in [17]. This embedding dimension is set for every model framework except fastText Autotune NNI and GCP AutoML. Finally, the dropout values are set to 0.1. We

Table 2: BERT vs. MoHE-2 comparison on 4 randomly selected $L1$ genres from Rakuten Ichiba dataset and full SIGIR’18 E-Com dataset. Bold numbers denote cases where MoHE-2 significantly outperforms BERT at 95% confidence interval for bootstrap sampling [17].

Categories	Comparison parameters	BERT	MoHE-2
<i>Rakuten Ichiba Product Catalog Dataset</i>			
Musical Instruments	Macro-F1	0.743	0.743
# items: 162472	Training Time (hrs)	7.0	0.1
# classes: 295	Number of Parameters (M)	110.2	22.9
Beverages	Macro-F1	0.808	0.816
# items: 187629	Training Time (hrs)	7.3	0.1
# classes 42	Number of Parameters (M)	110.0	4.9
Shoes	Macro-F1	0.712	0.733
# items: 410691	Training Time (hrs)	15.3	0.3
# classes: 83	Number of Parameters (M)	110.1	17.5
Computers & Networking	Macro-F1	0.694	0.707
# items: 462906	Training Time (hrs)	20.0	0.3
# classes: 270	Number of Parameters (M)	110.2	47.0
<i>Rakuten.com SIGIR’18 E-Com Workshop Data Challenge Dataset</i>			
All categories	Macro-F1	0.433	0.472
# items: 712761	Training Time (hrs)	32.0	1.8
# classes: 3008	Number of Parameters (M)	112.3	65.1

experiment with incrementally adding seven estimator threads to all model architectures. The results are shown in Fig. 5.

The baseline configurations are used for building models for both Rakuten Ichiba and SIGIR’18-DC datasets. In this paper, we *do not tune* the parameters/properties of the estimator threads for each genre. Tuning can be performed using many publicly available software packages for neural networks⁵.

5 EXPERIMENTS AND EVALUATION

Macro-F1 scores induce equal weighting of genre performance and hence are a much stricter standard and that is the measure that we use henceforth for comparing models. For all models except AutoML and fastText NNI, the scores reported are averages of five runs. We note that our Ensemble of CNNs baseline (i.e. MoHE without the coupling) is a strong classifier and outperforms MoE and Aggregator baselines significantly. Additionally, MoHE-2 outperforms Ensemble significantly on the validation set.

⁵Microsoft’s Neural Network Intelligence (NNI): <https://github.com/Microsoft/nni> and Ray Tune: <https://docs.ray.io/en/latest/tune/index.html>




Figure 5: Plots of Macro-F1 values for the MoE, Aggregator, Ensemble, MoHE-1 and MoHE-2 models from level one genre path classifiers for the Rakuten Ichiba dataset. The leaf nodes for classification correspond to the level one genres, which are organized into head, torso and tail segments. Overall, there are 38 level one genres and hence 38 *groups* of level one classifiers. Each of the 38 groups represents a set of estimator threads corresponding to a particular classification framework.

Table 3: Baseline model performance comparison (Micro-F1/Macro-F1) for the representative nine genres from the *validation set*. GCP AutoML* ignores rare categories while training. The support set for categories during its evaluation is thus smaller leading to higher Micro-F1 scores being reported by GCP AutoML. The numbers in bold for the MoHE-2 column are statistically significant to both fastText Autotune NNI and Ensemble under Bootstrap Sampling test with 95% confidence interval as used in [17]. Note that MoE, Aggregator, fastText, Ensemble, MoHE-1 and MoHE-2 are *not tuned to individual genres*.

Categories	Training data size	Number of leaf nodes	MoE	Aggregator	GCP AutoML*	fastText	fastText Autotune NNI	Ensemble	MoHE-1	MoHE-2
Sampling of categories from Rakuten Ichiba Product Catalog Dataset										
<i>Head (Top three of eleven level one genres ordered by item counts)</i>										
Books	2927065	833	0.694/0.593	0.720/0.628	0.374*/NA	0.735/0.619	0.737/0.611	0.739/0.649	0.740/0.655	0.755/ 0.674
Household Goods, Stationery & Craft	2311231	596	0.820/0.753	0.850/0.791	0.670*/NA	0.857/0.794	0.857/0.797	0.855/0.797	0.856/0.798	0.862/ 0.808
Flowers, Gardening and DIY	1989608	776	0.738/0.579	0.791/0.630	0.575*/NA	0.797/0.608	0.800/0.618	0.794/0.639	0.794/0.637	0.801/ 0.653
<i>Torso (Top three of nine level one genres ordered by item counts)</i>										
Smartphones and Tablet PCs	726504	45	0.969/0.784	0.973/0.810	0.970*/NA	0.974/0.815	0.974/0.822	0.975/0.829	0.976/0.835	0.976/ 0.836
Women's Fashion	572892	105	0.899/0.791	0.913/0.815	0.903*/NA	0.912/0.821	0.915/0.832	0.922/0.824	0.922/0.833	0.923/0.831
Kids, Baby and Maternity	541637	464	0.851/0.734	0.869/0.766	0.846*/NA	0.872/0.753	0.868/0.764	0.882/0.778	0.881/0.786	0.882/ 0.782
<i>Tail (Top three of eighteen level one genres ordered by item counts)</i>										
Shoes	340078	80	0.789/0.681	0.814/0.707	0.797*/NA	0.824/0.722	0.829/0.731	0.829/0.725	0.829/0.728	0.829/ 0.733
Appliances	324940	323	0.831/0.742	0.852/0.771	0.843*/NA	0.854/0.764	0.860/0.772	0.864/0.781	0.862/0.778	0.863/ 0.778
Diet and Health	273066	361	0.761/0.689	0.777/0.706	0.747*/NA	0.780/0.673	0.782/0.704	0.797/0.732	0.796/0.725	0.797/ 0.730
Rakuten.com SIGIR'18 E-Com Workshop Data Challenge Dataset										
All categories	712761	3008	0.780/0.392	0.805/0.443	0.841*/NA	0.795/0.395	0.804/0.446	0.816/0.458	0.818/0.461	0.820/ 0.472

5.1 BERT vs. MoHE-2

Transformer based deep learning models involving self-attention and large-scale pre-training are used almost ubiquitously now-a-days to solve various language tasks. To this end, we compare the MoHE-2 framework with BERT [7] for a preliminary comparison on randomly selected 10% of level one genres from the Rakuten Ichiba dataset and all genres from the SIGIR'18 E-Com dataset. Table 2 shows that MoHE-2 *significantly outperformed* BERT for most genres along all aspects of Macro-F1, compute time and model size. Details of the BERT model hyperparameters are mentioned in §7.

The main issue with BERT is that it is a more generalized multi-task model where fine-tuning is dependent on a large-scale language model, which is trained according to specific objectives of next word prediction based on a suitably chosen context. For the case of classification of item titles, the NSP (Next Sentence Prediction) objective of BERT is irrelevant if we are to even pre-train on item titles and so is SOP (Sentence Order Prediction) of ALBERT [16]. RoBERTa [20] removes the NSP objective, however, its training time does not meet our business SLA. Hence, we drop BERT and similar models from future comparisons in this paper.

5.2 Effect of Number of Estimator Threads

We start with analyzing the importance of adding successive estimator threads to the model frameworks and compare the graphs in the three plots shown in Figs. 5a, 5b and 5c. As mentioned in §1, the MoE model is still *a single classifier and has a loose generalization bound* and it performs worst amongst all models compared.

Based on the original MoE model in [11], we can only use one type of input that is shared with the “*experts*” and the “*gate*” and we choose the configuration shown for estimator thread 1 in Table 1. Because of this constraint, it also doesn't show much variation in performance since the estimator threads differ only in random initialization of the input embedding. MoE thus *suffers from bias in input selection* that may also explain its poor performance. The classification performance shown in Fig. 5 with regards to Macro-F1 scores for the level one genre paths of the head segment is overwhelmingly dominated by the MoHE-2 model. For the level one genre paths that belong to the torso and tail segments, MoHE-2 also

outperforms Ensemble at seven estimator threads. The additional mini-aggregators introduced in MoHE-2 show improvements.

Classification using only the Aggregator module of the MoHE models is an improvement over the MoE model where all the “*expert*” decisions are *fused*. As mentioned in §2.1, we set the number of estimator threads to 7.

5.3 Model Comparison for Selected Genres

Comparison of MoHE with MoE [11], Aggregator Framework (Fig. 1), GCP AutoML, fastText [12], fastText Autotuned with NNI and finally the Ensemble framework is shown in Table 3. We first sort the level one genres in descending order of item frequency and segment them into head, torso and tail segments. We then choose nine categories – the largest three, each from head, torso and tail segments. We compare against industry standard GCP AutoML and fastText tuned with Microsoft's NNI. The nine categories have been chosen to run GCP AutoML within the budget allotted to us. We run GCP AutoML for at most a day for each of the nine genres. As of this writing, fastText Autotune⁶ is not stable for the larger Rakuten Ichiba dataset. Out of the box, GCP AutoML constrains the volume of data ingestion, including skipping rare categories thereby hindering apples-to-apples comparison. It also reports Micro-F1 scores in batch mode and obtaining Macro-F1 scores incur additional cost and thus we don't report them in Table 3. We drop GCP AutoML from further comparisons.

We find that our proposed MoHE frameworks with our default setting of parameters (see Table 1) often perform better than other baselines despite the fact that they consist of lightweight CNN architectures *without being tuned* for a specific genre or dataset. The gains are obtained more for the head and torso genres and since we do not specifically model category imbalance, the performance on the tail categories are **not** significantly better to both fastText Autotune NNI and Ensemble but to the underlined one. The performance of MoHE-2 model is even better for the SIGIR'18 E-Com dataset that has much less label noise and lower number of classes.

⁶<https://fasttext.cc/docs/en/autotune.html>

5.4 Summary of Evaluations for all Genres

In this section, we briefly *summarize* the quantitative evaluations for the models and frameworks mentioned in this paper – MoE model, Aggregator framework, fastText Autotune NNI model, Ensemble framework, MoHE-1 framework and MoHE-2 framework. We compare the MoHE frameworks without adding metadata for the Rakuten Ichiba dataset to be fair to the SIGIR’18 E-Com dataset, which does not carry any metadata.

Table 4: Macro-F1 scores from the classifiers discussed here on the validation set from Rakuten Ichiba dataset.

Rakuten Ichiba Product Catalog Dataset			
Classifiers	Head	Torso	Tail
MoE	0.659	0.722	0.738
Aggregator	0.693	0.746	0.757
fastText Auto-tuned NNI	0.689	0.747	0.754
Ensemble	0.710	0.768	0.771
MoHE-1	0.715	0.770	0.771
MoHE-2	0.722	0.770	0.773

Table 4 shows the comparative performance of our proposed model framework against the baselines. Here too, the model frameworks MoHE-2 perform best. For obtaining the results from SIGIR’18 E-Com dataset, in Table 5, the classifiers have been set up as flat classifiers. In this case too, MoHE-2 outperforms all other models and frameworks compared here. In Table 3, GCP AutoML shows highest Micro-F1 for this dataset due to a *smaller support set*.

Table 5: Macro-F1 scores from the models and frameworks discussed here for the test set from SIGIR’18-DC dataset.

Rakuten.com SIGIR’18 Data Challenge Dataset	
Classifiers	Full evaluation data
MoE	0.392
Aggregator	0.443
fastText Auto-tuned NNI	0.446
Ensemble	0.458
MoHE-1	0.461
MoHE-2	0.472

For all results in tables 6, 4 and 5, numbers in bold means that they are significantly better than all other numbers in the same column with statistical significance being measured using bootstrap sampling [17] with 95% confidence interval.

5.5 Ablation Studies for MoHE Metadata

We now compare our proposed MoHE frameworks with and without the use of metadata features as a conclusion to the discussion in §2.2. Based on the ablation studies shown in Table 6, both “shop_ID” and “tag_ID” turn out to have strong correlations with labels. Effectiveness of descriptions largely depends on genres, yet including tokens from descriptions with chosen parts of speech improves overall performance. By utilizing all three types of metadata, the largest level one genres gain 2 – 3% macro-F1 performance depending on the framework, and we have observed that some of the tail genres gain more than 10%. By a design choice, the values for “shop_ID” and “tag_ID” are given to the same metadata thread while description is given to a separate metadata estimator thread.

Table 6: Macro-F1 values for the MoHE-(1/2) classifiers without and with metadata for level one genres in the validation set. Notations for the added meta data values are meta-1 (shop_ID), meta-2 (shop_ID+tag_ID), and meta-3 (shop_ID+tag_ID+description). As noted in §2.2, method-1 and method-2 are two different ways of adding metadata to MoHE frameworks.

Rakuten Ichiba Product Catalog Dataset			
Classifiers	Head	Torso	Tail
MoHE-1, without meta data	0.715	0.770	0.771
MoHE-1, meta-3 (method-1)	0.742	0.794	0.793
MoHE-2, without meta data	0.722	0.770	0.773
MoHE-2, meta-1 (method-2)	0.738	0.783	0.783
MoHE-2, meta-2 (method-2)	0.741	0.792	0.789
MoHE-2, meta-3 (method-2)	0.745	0.797	0.793

Table 6 shows that for all head, torso and tail segments for $L1$ genres, MoHE-2, meta-3 (method 2) performs best although not statistically significant from MoHE-1, meta-3 (method-1) for the tail segment.

5.6 Evaluating Models using User Sessions


We now direct our attention to the most pressing problem of continuous model evaluation for large scale e-commerce catalog classification without repeatedly having human-in-the-loop annotation. We use data from user interactions with the catalog, *i.e.* user sessions, to obtain *possible End-user Perspective*, or EuP (*pronounced “Yup”*), scores for a given labeling of a dataset. In a nutshell, the EuP scores show users’ confidence on trusting a labeling of a dataset given the information need reflected in their queries that trigger purchase events. We say possible since users don’t interact will all catalog items. So, why do we need EuP scores?

1. Users searching for a product *usually* select an item if the genre of the product generally matches that of their queries. This is especially true for purchased items.

2. Assignment of genres to catalog items are based either on merchant uploads that could be incorrect or genre assignments from previous models trained on data with label noise. Some labels can change over time based on business needs or fixes by the QA team. For instance, Fig. 6b shows a business need to restructure the category for a tail item after which the item’s genre path becomes more relevant to search queries that retrieve the item. As such, the genre paths for the catalog items may not completely match those that are frozen when model training begins. The mismatch is much less pronounced for the validation set (that is obtained from the training set) than for an evaluation set that has been curated.

3. Models need to be evaluated using real and updated data, and A/B testing through the primary search interface on a continuous basis is not feasible for *all* or *a majority of* genres.

These observations have led us to review model evaluation using implicit customer feedback and validation. We aim to find a correlation measure between EuP scores obtained from an *evaluation set* to those from the *validation set* to understand the approximate noise in the labels that will affect model performance. More specifically, using EuP scores we want to **quantitatively estimate an approximate amount of label noise** from items that have been purchased for a subset of genres. We use anonymized user sessions and catalog data made available to us by Rakuten Ichiba.



(a) Plot of query length in characters vs. frequency obtained from user sessions. Queries are obtained from sessions corresponding to items purchased in the evaluation set.

(b) X-axis represents time of user interactions with a particular tail item. The time span is around one year. The Y-axis is the query character overlap with the item’s genre path

Figure 6: Left Figure: 75% of the queries are at least 5 character long. Right Figure: A category restructuring happens at the time where the red vertical line appears. After that time queries with length > 5 have more overlap with the item’s genre path for 90% threshold.

Evaluating Models with Customer Validation: The evaluation set is a one-off set of ground truth genres that is sampled from a distribution over GMS and covering all level one genres. Manual corrections of the genres induce large covariate shift.

For a given dataset (evaluation, validation or even training), we select a subset of items that have been **purchased** at least once over a period of one year. For each such session for which there is a query of length ≥ 5 – see Fig. 6a, we compute overlap of query characters with the genre path names of the items. Heuristically, the coverage threshold is set to be $> 90\%$ to collect (*provided genre path* (y_l^+), *item genre path* (y_l)) pairs. Items in the catalog are labeled with y_l and are stored as *genre_IDs for items* (see Fig. 4). The *provided genre paths* are the ground truth labels for evaluation set and training set labels for the validation set. Thus for a particular genre path, there are mappings $y_l^+ \rightarrow \{y_l^{(i)}\}$ with i being an item in the user sessions. We then compute the accuracy of agreement of y_l^+ to $\{y_l^{(i)}\}$ and denote this agreement to be the EuP score for y_l^+ .

Using user session data, out of a total of $\approx 13K$ training genres, the evaluation set has 3,731 and the validation set has 5,751 genres. Their intersection has 3,478 genre paths on which all EuP scores in Tables 7 and 8 are obtained.

Table 7: Average EuP scores for 3,478 level one genre paths from the out-of-distribution evaluation set that have item purchases. The individual F1 scores are weighted with genre specific EuP scores.

	Head	Torso	Tail
Average EuP scores for ground truth labels.			
All L1 genres	0.771	0.810	0.756
EuP score weighted F1s			
fastText Auto-tuned NNI	0.465	0.500	0.477
Ensemble	0.500	0.547	0.505
MoHE-2	0.492	0.541	0.501

Table 7 shows average EuP scores across all level one genre paths for the head, torso and tail segments. Since the evaluation set is out-of-distribution, we will expect the scores to be less. The scores are indeed low and indicative of the 20% label noise as mentioned in §1, when we compare them to those in Table 8 and we measure them for purchased items only. For the evaluation set, as expected, fastText Autotune NNI has fitted extremely well to the noisy training set, much more than MoHE-2, whereas Ensemble has handled covariate

shift better. This trend is seen even without the EuP weights, where the scores are 10% higher for all classifiers. Note that there is no purchased item selection bias while *training models*.

When we consider the validation set that is in-distribution, the EuP scores are much higher since the *provided genre path* labels are from the validation set as shown in Table 8. Here, the scores follow the general trend where MoHE-2 $>$ Ensemble $>$ FastText and are higher here than those shown in Table 4 since the number of genres is much less due to the user interaction and query overlap criterion filter. From a practical standpoint, reporting meaningful comparison numbers to business heads is critical for project sustenance. To this end, reporting EuP scores based on categories that customers are interacting with may be better than reporting a full spectrum of “science KPI” numbers only as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 8: Average EuP scores for 3,478 level one genre paths from the in-distribution validation set that have item purchases. The individual F1 scores are weighted with genre specific EuP scores.

	Head	Torso	Tail
Average EuP scores for validation labels.			
All L1 genres	0.948	0.957	0.911
EuP score weighted F1s			
fastText Autotuned NNI	0.741	0.759	0.727
Ensemble	0.744	0.771	0.736
MoHE-2	0.750	0.772	0.738

The Pearson correlation coefficient between the validation and evaluation EuP scores for the 3,478 categories is only 0.193 indicating a significant level of covariate shift in the evaluation data. To conclude this section, we propose an open problem on defining item reachability for *non-purchased* items in a catalog with the eventual goal of measuring a classifier on expected revenue. In the interest of space, we refer the interested reader to §7.1.

6 CONCLUSION

We propose a lightweight Neural Network ensemble framework for product classification that is adaptable enough to include structured metadata, which are difficult to include in heavyweight language models like BERT. This novel neural ensemble classification framework preserves the best of ensemble of independent models and model fusion. We additionally propose a novel way of measuring label discrepancy between training and evaluation sets using user interactions with the catalog. To the best of our knowledge, our approach is unique and unlike those found in [36, 38, 40].

REFERENCES

- [1] Yaser S. Abu-Mostafa, Malik Magdon-Ismael, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. 2012. *Learning From Data*. AMLBook.
- [2] Hesam Amoualian, Parantapa Goswami, Pradipto Das, Pablo Montalvo, Laurent Ach, and Nathaniel R. Dean. 2021. An E-Commerce Dataset in French for Multi-modal Product Categorization and Cross-Modal Retrieval. In *Advances in Information Retrieval - 43rd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2021, Virtual Event, March 28 - April 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part I (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 12656)*, Djoerd Hiemstra, Marie-Francine Moens, Josiane Mothe, Raffaele Perego, Martin Potthast, and Fabrizio Sebastiani (Eds.). Springer, 18–31.
- [3] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2016. Layer Normalization. arXiv:1607.06450 [stat.ML]
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford,

- Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfbcb4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf>
- [5] Ali Cevahir and Koji Murakami. 2016. Large-scale Multi-class and Hierarchical Product Categorization for an E-commerce Giant. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee, Osaka, Japan, 525–535. <https://aclanthology.org/C16-1051>
- [6] Pradipto Das, Yandi Xia, Aaron Levine, Giuseppe Di Fabbrizio, and Ankur Datta. 2017. Web-Scale Language-Independent Cataloging of Noisy Product Listings for E-Commerce. In *EACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 969–979.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186.
- [8] David Eigen, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Ilya Sutskever. 2014. Learning Factored Representations in a Deep Mixture of Experts. In *ICLR Workshop*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1312.4314.pdf>
- [9] David I. Inouye, Pradeep Ravikumar, Pradipto Das, and Ankur Datta. 2017. Hyperparameter Selection under Localized Label Noise via Corrupt Validation. In *Learning with Limited Labeled Data (NeurIPS Workshop)*.
- [10] Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. 2015. Batch Normalization: Accelerating Deep Network Training by Reducing Internal Covariate Shift. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 37* (Lille, France) (*ICML ’15*). JMLR.org, 448–456.
- [11] R. A. Jacobs, M. I. Jordan, S. J. Nowlan, and G. E. Hinton. 1991. Adaptive Mixtures of Local Experts. *Neural Computation* 3 (1991), 79–87.
- [12] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. Bag of Tricks for Efficient Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Valencia, Spain, 427–431. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/E17-2068>
- [13] Nobuhiro Kaji and Masaru Kitsuregawa. 2014. Accurate Word Segmentation and POS Tagging for Japanese Microblogs: Corpus Annotation and Joint Modeling with Lexical Normalization. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Doha, Qatar, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/D14-1011>
- [14] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*.
- [15] Meelis Kull, Miquel Perelló-Nieto, Markus Kängsepp, Telmo de Menezes e Silva Filho, Hao Song, and Peter A. Flach. 2019. Beyond temperature scaling: Obtaining well-calibrated multi-class probabilities with Dirichlet calibration. In *NeurIPS*, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett (Eds.), 12295–12305. <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/nips/nips2019.html#KullPKFSF19>
- [16] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2020. ALBERT: A Lite BERT for Self-supervised Learning of Language Representations. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [17] Yiu-Chang Lin, Pradipto Das, Andrew Trotman, and Surya Kallumadi. 2019. A Dataset and Baselines for E-Commerce Product Categorization. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (Santa Clara, CA, USA) (ICTIR ’19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 213–216. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341981.3344237>
- [18] Zachary C. Lipton, Yu-Xiang Wang, and Alexander J. Smola. 2018. Detecting and Correcting for Label Shift with Black Box Predictors. In *ICML (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 80)*. PMLR, 3128–3136.
- [19] Chenxi Liu, Barret Zoph, Maxim Neumann, Jonathon Shlens, Wei Hua, Li-Jia Li, Li Fei-Fei, Alan Yuille, Jonathan Huang, and Kevin Murphy. 2018. Progressive Neural Architecture Search. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*.
- [20] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>
- [21] Jiaqi Ma, Zhe Zhao, Xinyang Yi, Jilin Chen, Lichan Hong, and Ed H. Chi. 2018. Modeling Task Relationships in Multi-Task Learning with Multi-Gate Mixture-of-Experts. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (London, United Kingdom) (KDD ’18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1930–1939.
- [22] Thomas Minka. 2003. Estimating a Dirichlet distribution. (01 2003). <https://tminka.github.io/papers/dirichlet/minka-dirichlet.pdf>
- [23] A. Mittal, K. Dahiya, S. Agrawal, D. Saini, S. Agarwal, P. Kar, and M. Varma. 2021. DECAF: Deep Extreme Classification with Label Features. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*.
- [24] Steven Nowlan and Geoffrey E Hinton. 1991. Evaluation of Adaptive Mixtures of Competing Experts. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, R. P. Lippmann, J. Moody, and D. Touretzky (Eds.), Vol. 3. Morgan-Kaufmann.
- [25] Y. Prabhu, A. Kag, S. Gopinath, K. Dahiya, S. Harsola, R. Agrawal, and M. Varma. 2018. Extreme multi-label learning with label features for warm-start tagging, ranking and recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*.
- [26] Y. Prabhu, A. Kag, S. Harsola, R. Agrawal, and M. Varma. 2018. Parabel: Partitioned label trees for extreme classification with application to dynamic search advertising. In *The International ACM World Wide Web Conference (The Web Conference)*.
- [27] Y. Prabhu, A. Kusupati, N. Gupta, and M. Varma. 2020. Extreme regression for dynamic search advertising. In *The ACM International WSDM Conference*.
- [28] Alexander Ratner, Stephen H. Bach, Henry R. Ehrenberg, Jason A. Fries, Sen Wu, and Christopher Ré. 2020. Snorkel: rapid training data creation with weak supervision. *Vldb J.* 29, 2-3 (2020), 709–730.
- [29] O. Saha, A. Kusupati, H. V. Simhadri, M. Varma, and P. Jain. 2020. RNNPool: Efficient Non-linear Pooling for RAM Constrained Inference. In *NeurIPS*.
- [30] D. Saini, A. K. Jain, K. Dave, J. Jiao, A. Singh, R. Zhang, and M. Varma. 2021. GalaXC: Graph neural networks with labelwise attention for extreme classification. In *Proceedings of The ACM International World Wide Web Conference*.
- [31] Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Exploiting Cloze-Questions for Few-Shot Text Classification and Natural Language Inference. In *EACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 255–269.
- [32] Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. It’s Not Just Size That Matters: Small Language Models Are Also Few-Shot Learners. In *NAACL-HLT*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2339–2352.
- [33] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc V. Le, Geoffrey E. Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously Large Neural Networks: The Sparsely-Gated Mixture-of-Experts Layer. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net. <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/iclr/iclr2017.html#ShazeerMMDLHD17>
- [34] Dan Shen, Jean David Ruvini, Manas Somaiya, and Neel Sundaresan. 2011. Item Categorization in the E-Commerce Domain. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (Glasgow, Scotland, UK) (CIKM ’11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1921–1924.
- [35] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: A Simple Way to Prevent Neural Networks from Overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15, 56 (2014), 1929–1958. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/srivastava14a.html>
- [36] Adith Swaminathan, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, Miroslav Dudík, John Langford, Damien Jose, and Imed Zitouni. 2017. Off-Policy Evaluation for Slate Recommendation. In *NeurIPS*. Curran Associates Inc., 3635–3645.
- [37] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NeurIPS*, I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [38] Liang Wu, Diane Hu, Liangjie Hong, and Huan Liu. 2018. Turning Clicks into Purchases: Revenue Optimization for Product Search in E-Commerce. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference (Ann Arbor, MI, USA)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 365–374.
- [39] Yandi Xia, Aaron Levine, Pradipto Das, Giuseppe Di Fabbrizio, Keiji Shinzato, and Ankur Datta. 2017. Large-Scale Categorization of Japanese Product Titles Using Neural Attention Models. In *EACL (2)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 663–668.
- [40] Xuan Yin and Liangjie Hong. 2019. The Identification and Estimation of Direct and Indirect Effects in A/B Tests through Causal Mediation Analysis. In *The 25th International ACM SIGKDD Conference (Anchorage, AK, USA)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2989–2999.
- [41] Barret Zoph and Quoc V. Le. 2017. Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning. In *ICLR*. Toulon, France. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.01578>

7 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

For Ichiba, model is cl-tohoku/bert-base-japanese-whole-word-masking from HuggingFace (Parameter size: 110 M) For SIGIR, model is bert-base-uncased from huggingface (Parameter size: 110 M) They are all the base model, which are 12 layers.

For more information: <https://huggingface.co/cl-tohoku/bert-base-japanese-whole-word-masking>, <https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

Figure 7: L1 histogram.




Table 9: BERT parameter settings.

model	Bert
batch_size	128
gpu	4
optimizer	Adam
learning rate	5e-5
epochs	40

7.1 Open Problem: Evaluating Models for Item Reachability

For business goals, a final question remains – what is the impact of *full genre path* classification i.e. do we stop classification at an intermediate level or go down to the leaves? *The motivation here is to simulate revenue impact through item classification only.* “Item reachability” is the degree to which an item in the catalog is reachable from a node in the taxonomy. We define item reachability from a generative viewpoint but pose its definition as an open problem.

For any internal node n_l of a genre path \vec{p}_L , which has S_l siblings at level l , a particular item $x_i \in \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ is reachable with uniform distribution over $[1, N]$ if we ignore all of the M children of node n_l . Assume that the M children have item counts $[N_1, \dots, N_M]$. Instead, if we generate more specific *sub-topics*, i.e. the child genres of n_l and sample the item from the sub-topic, then reachability improves. The generative story for an item x_i thus becomes:

- Sample a node n_l with some probability of user verification.
- Sample a prior over proportions: $\theta_m \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$
- Sample a child m of $n_l \sim \text{Mult}(\theta_m) : m \in \text{children of } n_l$

Algo. 1 produces an “Item Reachability” score for each item x in a held-out (here validation) set that has **not** been purchased or “added-to-cart”. The score is defined for its genre path ending at node n_l . Instead of generating a child c_m of n_l , we use the *provided genre path* till level L , y_L^+ as a guide to select c_m and hence θ_m and α_m . For estimating Dirichlet parameters in Algo. 2, we use the open source implementation⁷ of Thomas Minka’s paper [22]. The 20% label noise used in estimating proportions and shown in line 8 is distributed randomly over the other child genres.

⁷<https://github.com/ericsh/Dirichlet>

Algorithm 1: Item Reachability

input : Set of genre paths $\{[n_0 > \dots > n_L]\}$, evaluation level l , predictions from classifier g , EuP scores for nodes in the genre paths from validation set.
output: List of item reachability scores for every node n_l
Data: X : The training set.
Data: X_{ho} : The held-out set for items not purchased or added-to-cart

- 1 $\theta = \text{estimate_theta}(X)$; // Use Maximum Likelihood;
- 2 $\alpha = \text{estimate_alpha}(X)$; // Use Algo. 2;
- 3 $i_r \leftarrow \text{dict}$;
- 4 **foreach** sample x of the held-out set X_{ho} **do**
- 5 $f_g(x) = \mathbb{1}_{[g(x)_l=y_l^+]} \times \text{EuP}(y_l^+)$; // normalized EuP over level l ;
- 6 $f_{c_m}(x) = \theta_{c_m}$; // c_m is the child of n_l ;
- 7 $f_{\theta_m}(x) = \theta_{c_m}^{\alpha_{c_m}-1}$;
- 8 $i_r[c_m] \leftarrow [i_r[c_m]; f_g(x) \times f_{c_m}(x) \times f_{\theta_m}(x)]$
- 9 **return** i_r

Algorithm 2: Estimating Dirichlet Parameters

input : A selection of the training dataset X , labeled using y^+ . The evaluation level l to obtain y_l^+ .
output: Dirichlet parameters α for every genre node n_l .

- 1 **foreach** sample x_i from X **do**
- 2 $k^{(n_l)} \leftarrow \text{genre for node } n_l \text{ from } y_l^+$;
- 3 **if** x_i has been “added to cart” or “purchased” **then**
- 4 $\eta_{i,k^{(n_l)}} \leftarrow 0.95$; $\eta_{i,-k^{(n_l)}} \leftarrow \zeta$; // random subdivision of 0.05;
- 5 **else**
- 6 $\eta_{i,k^{(n_l)}} \leftarrow 0.8$; // accounting for 20% label noise;
- 7 $ran \leftarrow \text{normalize}_{S-1}(\text{rand}(S-1) \times 0.2; j = 0)$;
- 8 **foreach** $z \neq k$ with $z = 1, \dots, S_l$ **do**
- 9 $\eta_{i,z^{(n_l)}} \leftarrow ran[j++]$;
- 10 **return** $\alpha \leftarrow \text{estimate_Dirichlet}(\{\eta_{k^{(n_l)}} : [\eta_{k^{(n_l)}}^T]\})$;

Table 10: Item Reachability from levels three and four. X_{ho} consists of items in the *validation set* from the 3, 478 genre paths that are *not purchased* or “added-to-cart” and *irrespective of our overlap criterion*. Reachability improves when classification is performed till level 4 and is better for MoHE-2. The jump is however better for Ensemble. We leave further analysis as an open problem.

Classifiers	R3: $n_{l=3} > \dots > n_{L=5}$	R4: $n_{l=4} > \dots > n_{L=5}$	R4-R3
Ensemble	39.790%	41.453%	1.663%
MoHE-2	39.910%	41.531%	1.621%

Table 10 shows *mean* item reachability scores for Ensemble and MoHE-2 classification frameworks from levels 3 and 4 to leaves. Based on our reachability definition for non-purchased items, there is $\approx 2\%$ gain. Assuming that 80% of 400M items are not bought, and that 2% of this is lost in reachability if we consider classification only till level 3, we lose opportunity for 6.4M items. If the median sale price of such items is \$10, then potential revenue lost is \$64M not considering sale volume. Higher accuracy may not always mean higher revenue, unless we optimize for revenue in training loss.