Analyzing the Impact of Acoustic Features on Music **Recommendation for Children Across Age Groups** Erkin Başol

Introduction

- Collaborative filtering is a widely used algorithm in music recommender systems [1].
- Music Recommender Systems are generally targeted towards adults [2].
- Children have distinct music preferences and needs [2].
- Despite their diverse preferences, there is a lack of recommender systems designed for children that can optimally serve them.
- Acoustic features influence children's music preferences [3]; however, recommenders that employ individual acoustic features are lacking.
- The goal is to determine which acoustic features most enhance the performance when incorporated into a Collaborative Filtering algorithm for children.

Research Question

To what degree can the incorporation of different acoustic features improve the performance of a CF-based recommender system for children?

Experimental Setup

- Top-10 offline recommendation experiments on users aged 15–18 (279 users per group).
- In recommenders trained: 1 baseline + 10 extended with individual acoustic feature values, extending item-KNN by replacing binary interaction values with acoustic feature content values.
- Compare extended models to baseline on ranking and diversity metrics to find features that most improve performance that could be employed in child-centric recommenders.

Data Preprocessing

- Use LFM-2B dataset [4] for listening events of children, and LFMacoustic track features.
- Use listening events with complete track features for users aged 1.
- Focus on the year 2012; split data into Training (Jan–May), Validati (Aug–Oct) sets.
- Preprocess to maximize the number of users while maintaining suf reduce sparsity, and balance age groups by retaining only those fro
- Final dataset contains 1116 users (279 per age group), with an ave interactions in the test set, 10.50 in the validation set, and 38.63 4700 distinct songs.

Reference

Responsible Professor: Sole Pera Supervisor: Robin Ungruh TU Delft CSE3000 Research Project e.basol-1@student.tudelft.nl https://github.com/Protestak/RP_Project

	Evaluation Metrics	
-BeyMS dataset [5] for	Mean Reciprocal Rank – First hit	
_2-18.	 Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain – Rank quality 	4
ion (Jun–Jul), and Test	Hit Rate – Hit Probability	
fficient interactions to	 Intra-List Diversity – Item variety 	
om 15 to 18. erage of 11.62	 Catalog Coverage – Catalog reach 	•
in the training set, across		1

5	
s, and Challenges. New York, NY: Springer US, 2022, pp. 927–971. [Online]. Available: https:	
children's music listening behavior," in Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, ser. ps://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3478856	
Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft, a8f	- (
en," in Advances in Information Retrieval, C. Hauff, C. Macdonald, D. Jannach, G. Kazai, F. M. Nardini, F. Pinelli,	
//doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3784765	• L
music perception: A systematic review on its behavioural physiological and clinical correlates" bioRxiv 2023	– F
have perception. A systematic review of its benavioural, physiciological, and enniour correlates, biotwir, 2020.	

Results and Discussion	Resu	lts a	and	Discu	ussion
------------------------	------	-------	-----	-------	--------

Model	HitRate@10	MRR@10	1
	Age Gr	oup 15/16	
Item-KNN (Baseline Model)	0.1326/0.1147	0.0361/0.0320	0.0
Item-KNN+Acousticness	0.1326/0.1183	0.0402/0.0306	0.0
Item-KNN+Instrumentalness	0.1577/0.1183	0.0416/0.0382	0.0
Item-KNN+Loudness	0.1470/0.1183	0.0390/0.0318	0.0
Item-KNN+Mode	0.1613/0.1039	0.0418/0.0324	0.0
	Age Gr	oup 17/18	
Item-KNN (Baseline Model)	0.0968/0.1075	0.0181/0.0302	0.0
Item-KNN+Acousticness	0.1039/0.1219	0.0203/0.0315	0.0
Item-KNN+Instrumentalness	0.1111/0.1183	0.0276/0.0315	0.0
Item-KNN+Mode	0.1434/0.1398	0.0390 /0.0387	0.0

Table 1. Performance Metrics by Age Group. Significant improvements over the baseline are bolded.

• Mode is the most prominent and impactful feature, consistently improving recommendations for users aged 15 and 17. • Mode strongly influences emotions, with major modes evoking happiness and minor modes suggesting melancholy [6]. • For the ages 16 and 18, no feature significantly outperformed the baseline, indicating less consistent preferences. Instrumentalness and acousticness boost performance for age 15, with instrumentalness improving NDCG and acousticness enhancing MRR.

• Mode and instrumentalness reduce item coverage while significantly improving performance, highlighting a trade-off between accuracy and diversity, whereas features like acousticness and loudness maintain coverage and support more balanced recommendations.

• Loudness significantly improves recommendations for age 15, likely due to a preference for energetic music [2].

Responsible Research

Ethical research: Used anonymized, historical datasets to avoid direct interaction with minors and ensure privacy compliance. **Reproducibility:** Open-source code with full pipeline, parameters, and documentation is provided on GitHub.

Conclusion

Extending CF-based recommender systems with mode, instrumentalness, and acousticness can optimize the performance of recommenders for children and improve the recommendations quality. This contribution suggests that these features can improve an already widely used CF-based recommender, enabling it to better serve children.

Limitations & Future Work

Limited sample: Needs more users for generalizability. **Outdated data:** Preferences in 2012 may not reflect current trends. **Implicit feedback:** No explicit ratings in the dataset to confirm intent. **Live testing:** Test these extended models in real-world systems using online evaluation. **Recent data:** Collect newer, rating-based datasets for accuracy.





NDCG@10 Coverage@10

0187/0.0182 0.3503/0.3569 0200/0.0190 0.3448/0.3567 0226/0.0180 0.3280/0.3202 0200/0.0180 0.3503/0.3531 0219/0.0162 0.3076/0.3127

0099/0.0163 0.3756/0.3714 0116/0.0168 0.3773/0.3695 0123/0.0167 0.3416/0.3446 0169/0.0196 0.3208/0.3263

^[1] M. Schedl, P. Knees, B. McFee, and D. Bogdanov, Music Recommendation Systems: Techniques, Use Case //doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-2197-4_24

^[2] L. Spear, A. Milton, G. Allen, A. Raj, M. Green, M. D. Ekstrand, and M. S. Pera, "Baby shark to barracuda: Analyzing RecSys '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 639–644. [Online]. Available: http [3] I. Papadimitriou, "Leveraging children's music preferences to enhance the recommendation process," Master's thesis, Netherlands, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://repository.tudelft.nl/file/File_a38a6a7a-2fd3-4a89-b58e-e905a4ec3

^[4] R. Ungruh, A. Bellogín, and M. S. Pera, "The impact of mainstream-driven algorithms on recommendations for childre F. Silvestri, and N. Tonellotto, Eds. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2025, pp. 67–84.

^[5] P. Müllner, D. Kowald, M. Schedl, C. Bauer, E. Zangerle, and E. Lex, "Lfm-beyms," May 2020. [Online]. Available: https [6] G. Carraturo, V. Pando-Naude, M. Costa, P. Vuust, L. Bonetti, and E. Brattico, "The major-minor mode dichotomy in n [Online]. Available: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2023/03/18/2023.03.16.532764