

How Audit Methodologies Can Impact Our Understanding of YouTube’s Recommendation Systems

Sarmad Chandio, Daniyal Pirwani Dar, Rishab Nithyanand

{sarmad-chandio, rishab-nithyanand}@uiowa.edu
mdar@cs.stonybrook.edu

Abstract

Data generated by audits of social media websites have formed the basis of our understanding of the biases presented in algorithmic content recommendation systems. As legislators around the world are beginning to consider regulating the algorithmic systems that drive online platforms, it is critical to ensure the correctness of these inferred biases. However, as we will show in this paper, doing so is a challenging task for a variety of reasons related to the complexity of configuration parameters associated with the audits that gather data from a specific platform.

Focusing specifically on YouTube, we show that conducting audits to make inferences about YouTube’s recommendation systems is more methodologically challenging than one might expect. There are many methodological decisions that need to be considered in order to obtain scientifically valid results, and each of these decisions incur costs. For example, should an auditor use (expensive to obtain) logged-in YouTube accounts while gathering recommendations from the algorithm to obtain more accurate inferences? We explore the impact of this and many other decisions and make some startling discoveries about the methodological choices that impact YouTube’s recommendations. Taken all together, our research suggests auditing configuration compromises that YouTube auditors and researchers can use to reduce audit overhead, both economically and computationally, without sacrificing accuracy of their inferences. Similarly, we also identify several configuration parameters that have a significant impact on the accuracy of measured inferences and should be carefully considered.

1 Introduction

Auditing content recommendation systems is becoming increasingly important. As social media platforms and the algorithms they employ continue to have an increasing impact on our socio-political realities, auditing them (accurately) has become an increasingly important task for many reasons. After all, these audits, often focused on algorithmic recommendation systems, play a significant role in drafting effective regulation around online platforms and algorithms (whi 2022) and developing a better understanding of the role of algorithms in political polarization (Barberá 2020), spread of misinformation (Hussein, Juneja, and Mitra 2020),

and other societal behaviors. For example, focusing on the YouTube platform, prior work has uncovered several concerning aspects of the algorithmic recommendation systems such as its propensity to create filter-bubbles (Tomlein et al. 2021), recommend age-inappropriate content (Papadamou et al. 2019), misinformation (Tomlein et al. 2021; Hussein, Juneja, and Mitra 2020), and even extremist content (Ribeiro et al. 2020a; Papadamou et al. 2020). However, these works often appear to contradict each other — e.g., prior work has shown that YouTube recommendation systems cause a mainstreaming effect (i.e., promoting popular content over niche content) (Ledwich and Zaitsev 2019) while also showing its tendency to promote niche and extremist content (Ribeiro et al. 2020a). Formulating effective regulation and developing a meaningful understanding of the impact of algorithms on society is challenging in these scenarios where contradictory findings from algorithm audit studies are commonplace. *This work (1) shows that auditing methodologies are one source for such contradictory results and (2) suggests approaches to reduce their occurrence.*

Conceptually, designing a recommendation algorithm audit is simple. Due to the opacity of the algorithms being audited, researchers rely on what is referred to as the “sock-puppet” audit approach (Sandvig et al.). Here, the audit can be generalized into a simple three-step process.

Create sock-puppets. Sock-puppets or personas that aim to impersonate real human users are created. The goal is to use automation tools, typically web crawlers, to provide the underlying recommendation system a set of interactions from which it may learn certain characteristics about the sock-puppet. In the context of YouTube, this may involve having the sock-puppet load a set of videos (referred to as the training set) that provide a base from which the recommendation algorithms learn user behaviors and preferences.

Measure the recommendation tree. In this step, a seed interaction that generates recommendations is performed by the sock-puppet. This set of recommendations forms the first layer of the recommendation tree. Often, the recommendations themselves are interacted with recursively to form a deeper tree of recommendations. Applied to YouTube, this step involves providing the sock-puppet with a seed video from which all recommendations are gathered. This is followed by then loading the videos associated with each of

these recommendations themselves to fill the recommendation tree.

Hypothesis testing. Finally, given a (set of) recommendation tree(s) associated with sock-puppets of different characteristics, hypotheses about the underlying recommendation algorithm are tested and inferences about them are made.

In practice, algorithm audits are challenging and can force methodological compromises. Although simple at first glance, there are several key decisions in each step of the previously described process that are often overlooked. For example, when conducting crawls to construct sock-puppets, researchers are faced with the decisions of what videos to use as part of their sock-puppet training set, how many videos to include in this training set, and what video to use as their seed, amongst others. The uncertainty about the impact that each video might have on the gathered recommendations makes these decisions challenging. Complicating matters, even when rigorous and sound rationale are applied to the above questions, are the high dollar and computational costs associated with methodological rigor.

Methodological compromises due to high dollar costs. Online platforms, including YouTube, make it difficult to automate the creation of the number of accounts required for a meaningful audit — they serve CAPTCHAs to (or perform outright blocking of) web automation tools seeking to create accounts and often require verified phone numbers for each account. The costs of circumventing these challenges can be prohibitively high and force compromises that may impact the validity of their inferences. For example, researchers may simply associate each sock-puppet with a unique browser (cookie) and bypass the difficulties (and high costs) associated with obtaining verifiable phone numbers for each sock-puppet. However, such circumvention is often done in the hopes that the accuracy of any inferences drawn from the audit are not harmed — i.e., they operate on the assumption that YouTube’s recommendations treat logged-in users in the same way as non-logged-in users with YouTube’s cookie in their browser.

Methodological compromises due to high computational costs. Further, crawling videos is computationally expensive and time consuming when crawlers encounter large numbers of hour-long (or longer) videos. This, combined with the need to gather large amounts of data for statistically sound hypothesis testing, can require 1000’s of hours of machine time for a single audit. This poses another dilemma: should one pay the high computational costs associated with watching the entirety of each video and should all paths of the recommendation tree be traversed to make valid conclusions? Although the alternatives of simply sampling sections of the tree and not watching videos to completion are more tractable, it remains unclear if they have an impact on the subsequent recommendations gathered by the crawl.

Simply put, *there are currently no best-practices or guidelines for sock-puppet-style audits on platforms such as YouTube.* In this paper, we specifically focus on YouTube and seek to fill this gap by answering the following research questions.

RQ1. What is the relationship between sock-puppet training set, recommendation seed, and recommendation

trees? (§3) We begin by studying the impact that the training set and seed have on the recommendation trees they generate. Specifically, we conduct an experiment in which we train four sets of sock-puppets using all combinations of two distinctly different seeds and training sets. We then analyze the recommendation trees they generate to understand how recommendations change with alterations to the seed and training set.

RQ2. What is the impact of reducing dollar costs during audits? (§4) We investigate the consequences of one of the most commonly observed cost-saving measures adopted by YouTube auditors — avoiding the use of real YouTube accounts for each sock-puppet and instead relying on browser cookies to leak a sock-puppet’s identity to YouTube. We conduct this analysis by comparing the recommendation trees generated by four sets of sock-puppets that reflect commonly observed practices in audit research. These sets of sock-puppets are identical in every way except for their method of maintaining YouTube account ‘state’.

RQ3. What is the impact of reducing computational costs during audits? (§5) Finally, we consider the consequences of compromises that are associated with reducing computational costs. We specifically focus on the impact of time spent on each sock-puppet training video and the depth/breadth of recommendation tree exploration. We do so by training sets of sock-puppets that “watch” videos to varying levels of completion and measuring the differences in their gathered recommendation trees. We then study the characteristics of the nodes sampled from all recommendation trees gathered in our study to identify differences in their properties based on their location in the tree.

2 Methodology

In total, we conduct eleven experiments (*Cf.* Table 1) in which we alter specific audit parameters. We use the gathered recommendation trees from these audits to identify the impacts of varying parameters. In this section, we describe our audit configuration selections and analysis methodologies.

2.1 Configuration parameters

Sock-puppet training sets (T_{niche} , T_{main}). In all 11 experiments, we begin by training our sock-puppets with the videos contained in either T_{niche} or T_{main} . A previous study (Papadamou et al. 2021) shows that 22 videos are enough to personalize the YouTube video recommendations, whereas we decided to with 32 videos¹ for each of our training sets.

The niche training set (T_{niche}). The videos in T_{niche} were manually curated to represent fringe (e.g., conspiracy theories) and relatively unpopular (lower number of views) content. The videos in this set were chosen from fringe subreddits such as *r/climateskeptics* and *r/theworldisflat*, amongst others. Videos in this set were advocating for the position associated with the subreddit topic (e.g., pro flat-earth). On average, videos in T_{niche} had received 25K views.

¹The full list of videos in each training set is available at https://osf.io/3j5u8/?view_only=c2e21b99dbc3470e86bc9e904b39e6d3

The mainstream training set (T_{main}). Each video in T_{main} was curated to cover the same topic as their niche counterpart, except that they were sourced from a YouTube search of the topic (e.g., ‘flat earth debunked’). The most popular videos from the search results (in terms of views) were added to T_{main} . The videos in T_{main} represent the ‘mainstream’ views and advocate for the highly accepted world view of the topics (e.g., earth is not flat). On average, videos in T_{main} had 5.9M views.

This approach of training set construction offers two sharply differing inputs to the recommendation algorithms so that any effect of training set on recommendations is measurable.

Recommendation tree seeds (s_{niche} and s_{main}). Seed videos are the starting point from which recommendation trees are gathered (i.e., the root of the recommendation tree). Similar to our training sets, we used one of two seeds (s_{niche} and s_{main}) which were selected based on the intuition that they would have sharply differing impacts on the recommendation tree. The s_{niche} video used in our experiments was a fringe political video on the topic of illegal immigration with 7.1K views and the s_{main} video was a very popular mainstream video focused on ‘Slapgate’ (sla 2022) with over 3.8M views. The topics of the seed videos were intentionally chosen (1) to not overlap with the any of the videos from the T_{main} or T_{niche} so that effects from the training sets could be distinguished from those of the seed, and (2) to not overlap with each other to maximize any measurable differences between their recommendation trees. Observing an absence of differences in recommendation trees generated from s_{niche} and s_{main} would indicate that the seed has a marginal influence on the observed recommendations.

Account status (A_{full} , A_{cookies} , and A_{clear}). To improve our understanding about whether the recommendation algorithm works differently when audits operate under different YouTube account assumptions, we gather recommendation trees using four different types of account assumptions. (1) A_{full} represents audits in which crawlers are logged into freshly created YouTube accounts before training and recommendation gathering begins. This is representative of the ideal case where each sock-puppet has its own fresh YouTube account. (2) A_{cookies} represents audits where crawlers are not logged in but maintain YouTube’s cookies in their browser throughout the crawl. This is representative of the most common crawls observed in audit literature. (3) A_{clear} represents audits where crawlers conduct crawls while logged in and clear their watch history before the same account is used for another crawl. This approach is used to allow account reuse by different sock-puppets.

Watch times ($W_{100\text{pc}}$, $W_{50\text{pc}}$, $W_{25\text{pc}}$, $W_{10\text{pc}}$). Training sock-puppets can be computationally expensive owing to the long lengths of videos typically contained within the training sets. To understand whether videos in the training set need to be watched to completion, we gather recommendation trees from four crawlers all configured identically except that they watch each of the training videos to different levels of completion before moving on to the next video. $W_{100\text{pc}}$, $W_{50\text{pc}}$, $W_{25\text{pc}}$, and $W_{10\text{pc}}$ watch videos to 100%, 50%, 25%, and 10% of completion, respectively.

Interactions (I_{get} , I_{click}). Programming crawlers to perform actual clicks on hyperlinks is a challenging task due to difficulties with reliability. A commonly used alternative is to instead obtain links by parsing the DOM and having the browser load the link of interest. Unfortunately, the absence of actual clicks is also a signature used by common bot-detection tools and may result in server-side differential treatment (Singh et al. 2017; Khattak et al. 2016; Ahmad et al. 2020; Jueckstock et al. 2021). We conduct an experiment to understand whether clicking on recommended videos impacts subsequent recommendations. I_{click} represents an audit in which each crawler actually performs a mouse click on videos to load them during the recommendation tree crawl. I_{get} represents an audit in which each crawler simply obtains the video’s URL from the DOM and instructs the browser to load that URL.

Breadth of exploration (P_{left} , P_{right}). YouTube’s recommendations are dynamically loaded and recommendation options often continue to appear while a user scrolls down the page. This increases the width of the recommendation tree at each level. In our pilot tests, we observed that the maximum number of recommendations was at least 40 for each video (and much higher in many cases). We conduct analyses on the videos that appear at the top of the recommendation list during a recommendation tree crawl (i.e., the left-most path in the tree denoted by P_{left}) and those that appear at the bottom of the recommendation list (i.e., the right-most path in the tree denoted by P_{right}).

Depth of exploration (D_{top} , D_{bottom}). Finally, we consider the importance of performing deep crawls on measured characteristics of the recommendation tree. We do this by analyzing the characteristics of all videos observed after just loading the seed video (i.e., the 1st level in the recommendation tree denoted by D_{top}) and comparing them with the characteristics of all videos observed at the 10th level of the tree (i.e., the bottom of *our* gathered recommendation trees denoted by D_{bottom}).

2.2 Data gathering

Minimizing the influence of latent confounding variables. Recommendation trees are influenced by a large number of variables, some in researchers’ control (e.g., our configuration parameters) and others not. In our study, we make a best-effort attempt to minimize these latent effects with the following approaches.

Accounting for updates to the search index. Due to large amounts of new content being created on YouTube, there are continuous changes to the search index and recommendation candidate lists. Therefore, two crawls gathering recommendations at time periods that are far spaced apart, may not be comparable due to vastly different recommendation possibilities. We mitigate such impacts by synchronizing the crawls conducted in each experiment such that for every crawler using one configuration to gather a recommendation tree, there is another synchronized crawler using the alternate configuration to gather the comparison recommendation tree. This synchronization is done at the node level — i.e., we ensure that each tree arrives at the exact same node position in its respective recommendation tree within,

Question	Parameter	Configurations	#trees	#videos
RQ1	Training set	$T_{\text{main}}, T_{\text{niche}}$	16	32K
	Seed video	$s_{\text{main}}, s_{\text{niche}}$	16	32K
RQ2	Accounts	$A_{\text{full}}, A_{\text{cookies}}$	8	14K
		$A_{\text{full}}, A_{\text{clear}}$	8	13K
RQ3	Watch Time	$W_{100\text{pc}}, W_{50\text{pc}}$	8	15K
		$W_{50\text{pc}}, W_{25\text{pc}}$	8	15K
		$W_{25\text{pc}}, W_{10\text{pc}}$	8	15K
	Interaction	$I_{\text{get}}, I_{\text{click}}$	8	16K
	Breadth	$P_{\text{left}}, P_{\text{right}}$	all*	69K
Depth	$D_{\text{top}}, D_{\text{bottom}}$	all*	35K	

*Data from all trees were used in analysis for these parameters.

Table 1: **Experiments.** The ‘Parameter’ column indicates the parameter whose values were modified in each experiment and the ‘Configuration’ column indicates the values assigned to the parameter in the experiment. The ‘# trees’ column indicates the total number of recommendation trees gathered for analysis and the ‘# videos’ column indicates the total number of recommendations observed in these trees.

at most, a few seconds of its counterpart. Therefore trees gathered using alternate configurations of the same parameter are comparable.

Accounting for distributed infrastructure and effects of geolocation. As shown in prior work (Hannak et al. 2013), web servers may be distributed across a wide region and servers in different locations or data centers may have inconsistencies in their search indices or perform geo-specific recommendations. To mitigate these effects on our gathered trees, we conduct all our data gathering experiments from the same location and use a static DNS entry for YouTube which ensures that all our content requests and interactions with the platform are served by web servers, at the very least, in the same region.

Accounting for A/B testing. Platforms have been known to conduct A-B testing on their users while testing new features or algorithm updates (Facebook 2022). We make a best-effort attempt to mitigate the effects of such testing by gathering data from *at least eight identical and synchronized crawls for each parameter tested in our study.*

Collecting recommendation trees. Once a sock-puppet has been trained and has a seed video, we begin exploration of the recommendation tree. Unfortunately, complete exploration of a recommendation tree is infeasible due to the need for one sock-puppet for each configuration being tested for each tree being gathered for each path being traversed. This is necessary due to the fact that prior watched videos will impact future recommendations and therefore a sock-puppet can only perform one-way (downward) traversals of the recommendation tree. Further, We are collecting at least 40 recommendations for each video. Therefore, a recommendation tree of depth n will have at least 40^n paths from root to leaf node each needing a unique sock-puppet. In our traversals of the tree, we explored five unique paths — the left-most path (comprised of the first recommendation at each node), the right-most path (comprised of the last recommendation




Figure 1: A recommendation tree generated based on 5 sock-puppets. Flat arrows shows the unique recommendation path taken by each sock-puppet. Starting from the seed, each node represents a video recommended by the parent node.

at each node), and three pre-selected paths from the middle (sampled with zipfian weights to account for a preference for videos higher in the recommendation list). We explore each of these paths simultaneously, using a unique but identically trained, configured, and seeded sock-puppet dedicated to each, to a depth of 10 and record all recommendations along the way. We stitch these paths and observations together to obtain a subset of the complete recommendation tree upon which our analysis is conducted. We gather at least four such trees for each parameter configuration while ensuring synchronization with alternately configured audits. An example of such a tree is shown in Figure 1. In this figure, each path represents the set of videos that form the sock-puppets, nodes represent videos, and directed edges between any two nodes (*parent, child*) indicate that the *child* was recommended after direct interaction with the *parent*. The root node of this tree represents the seed video used to generate the first set of recommendations.

2.3 Recommendation tree characteristics

In our analysis, we focus on studying the popularity, channel diversity, and topics of videos observed in a recommendation tree. We select these parameters since platform audits often focus on them (or their variations) to identify echo-chamber, rabbit-holing, or mainstreaming effects caused by recommendation algorithms.

Popularity of recommended content. Popularity of recommended content, measured using video views as a proxy, can capture the algorithm’s tendency to recommend niche or mainstream content. We record the distribution of views observed in recommended videos at each node. A recommendation tree largely containing videos with low popularity at each node suggests the tendency to recommend niche content for the associated sock-puppet configuration. Conversely, a tree largely containing videos with high popularity at each node suggests the tendency to recommend mainstream content for the associated sock-puppet configuration. Significant differences in the within- and across-group differences would suggest that one of the two configurations tends to more mainstream (popular) recommendations than the other.

Channel diversity of recommended content. Each video about a topic reflects the perspective of the channel that uploaded it. Therefore, we use the diversity of channels in the trees as a proxy for the range of perspectives provided by the recommended content. We measure this by recording

the entropy of channels observed in the recommended content at each node. A recommendation tree with a high entropy of recommended content at each node indicates high recommendation diversity and suggests the absence of a rabbit-holing effect. Significant differences in the within- and across-group differences between the trees generated by two configurations would suggest that one of the two configurations tends to show less diverse recommendations than the other.

Semantic similarity of recommended content. We extract the titles and text descriptions associated with each video observed in our tree. We then perform standard NLP preprocessing operations on these texts (i.e., tokenization, stop-word & URL removal, removal of tokens observed in more than 50% of our dataset, and lemmatization). We combine these processed texts for all videos observed at each node in a tree and use it as a representation of the topics observed in the recommendations at that node. In order to perform semantic comparisons between any two nodes, we use the SpaCy document similarity method (SpaCy 2022) which uses a bag-of-words approach to compute the cosine similarities between the average of all word vectors in a text. While this approach is limited in that it does not capture polarity of content (e.g., anti-vaccine text and text from arguments refuting the anti-vaccine texts will have high similarity), our manual validation found that they captured the similarity of the topics in texts. We also tested other semantic (Latent Semantic Indexing (Rosario 2000)) and lexicographic (Latent Dirichlet Allocation (Blei, Ng, and Jordan 2003)) approaches for measuring similarity but found them to perform poorly at capturing topical similarity for our dataset. A pilot-study in which pairs of videos deemed to be very similar (by SpaCy’s docsim, LDA, LSA) were randomly sampled and their texts were manually evaluated to verify similarity. Based on this, we identified SpaCy’s docsim as best. Significant differences in the within- and across-group differences between trees generated by two configurations suggest that one of the two configurations results in measurably different recommended topics.

2.4 Comparison of Audit Configurations

Each of our experiments result in two sets of recommendation trees — one set for each audit parameter configuration being tested (e.g., A_{full} and $A_{cookies}$). Trees in each set are gathered in synchronization with each other. Given these sets of recommendation trees, we compute the *across-group* (e.g., between A_{full} and its synchronized $A_{cookies}$ tree) and *within-group* (e.g., between two synchronized A_{full} (or, $A_{cookies}$) trees) differences along the three dimensions described in §2.3. We describe this process below.

Recording characteristics of a recommendation tree node. Let n_{ij} denote a traversed node (i.e., viewed video) located on path P_i and at depth j in a recommendation tree and r_{ijk} denote the k^{th} recommendation observed at n_{ij} . At each node n_{ij} we record: (1) a popularity scalar value $pop(n_{ij}) = \mu(\text{views}(r_{ij,1}) \dots \text{views}(r_{ij,40}))$ representing the view counts of all observed recommended videos at this node; (2) a channel entropy scalar value $div(n_{ij}) = \text{entropy}(\text{channel}(r_{ij,1}), \dots, \text{channel}(r_{ij,40}))$

representing the diversity of channels in the recommended videos at this node; and (3) a document vector $doc(n_{ij}) = \text{docvec}(\text{desc}(r_{ij,1}), \dots, \text{desc}(r_{ij,40}))$ which represents the document vector associated with the video descriptions obtained from all recommended videos at this node.

Comparing characteristics of recommendation trees. Given two recommendation trees T and T' , we compute the differences in characteristics in a node position-dependant manner — i.e., we compute differences in the popularity vector, channel entropy, and document vector for each node position in T and T' . These differences are computed as follows:

$$\delta_{pop}(T, T') = \text{mean}([\forall i, \forall j : pop(n_{ij}) - pop(n'_{ij})])$$

$$\delta_{div}(T, T') = \text{mean}([\forall i, \forall j : div(n_{ij}) - div(n'_{ij})])$$

$$\delta_{sem}(T, T') = \text{mean}([\forall i, \forall j : \text{docsim}(\text{docvec}(n_{ij}), \text{docvec}(n'_{ij}))])$$

These values effectively capture the mean node-to-node differences between T and T' . This node-to-node comparison is possible because all trees gathered in our study traversed the same set of paths in the recommendation tree. Maintaining this node position dependence in tree comparisons is important because it handles differences in characteristics that might arise from the position of a node in the recommendation tree. For example, comparing the top recommendation at depth=1 from T with the 40th recommendation at depth=10 from T' could result in misattributing differences in tree characteristics that arise from changes in recommendation ranks to the impact of an audit configuration change.

Computing within- and across-group differences. Given two auditing configurations \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' which generate the sets of trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , respectively, we compute: (1) the *within-group differences* as the distribution of differences in characteristics observed between trees within \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' ; and (2) the *across-group differences* as the distribution of differences observed between trees across \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' . These are denoted by:

$$\Delta_x^{within}(\mathcal{T}) = [\forall (T_i, T_j) \in (\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}) : \delta_x(T_i, T_j)]$$

$$\Delta_x^{across}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = [\forall (T_i, T_j) \in (\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}') : \delta_x(T_i, T_j)]$$

$$\forall x \in \{pop, div, sem\}$$

The within-group differences, computed over all trees generated with identical audit configurations, allow us to establish a *baseline* of characteristic variations caused by factors outside the control of the auditor (e.g., probabilistic recommendation algorithm, A/B testing, etc.). The across-group differences showcase the differences caused by the change in audit configuration *and* external factors.

Quantifying the impact of audit parameter configurations. Given distributions Δ_x^{within} and Δ_x^{across} associated with configurations $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}')$, we use bootstrapping with 1M samples (DiCiccio and Efron 1996; Efron 1987) to create 95% confidence intervals around the mean within- and across-group differences. We also use these bootstrapped samples to compute 95% confidence intervals around the effect size — i.e., *the difference between the within- and across-group differences bootstrap samples*. Let $[CI_{lower}, CI_{upper}]$ be the $N\%$ confidence interval for the effect size.

Parameters		Video Popularity (Views in millions)				Channel Diversity (Entropy in bits)				Content Semantics (Similarity score)			
Fixed	Varied	μ_{views}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	μ_{entropy}	Effect(95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	Effect(95% CI)	Effect(99% CI)	μ_{effect}	
s_{main}	T_{main}	7.15	[0.34, 1.33]	[0.19, 1.49]	0.84	3.63	[-0.16, 0.17]	[-0.21, 0.22]	0.00	[-0.02, -0.00]	[-0.02, 0.00]	-0.01	
	T_{niche}	4.94				3.49							
s_{niche}	T_{main}	4.32	[1.46, 2.19]	[1.35, 2.30]	1.82	3.38	[-0.27, 0.19]	[-0.34, 0.26]	-0.04	[-0.04, -0.02]	[-0.05, -0.01]	-0.03	
	T_{niche}	1.80				3.26							
T_{main}	s_{main}	10.71	[0.73, 2.31]	[0.50, 2.56]	1.51	3.17	[-0.14, 0.14]	[-0.18, 0.18]	0.00	[-0.04, -0.02]	[-0.04, -0.02]	-0.03	
	s_{niche}	7.78				2.97							
T_{niche}	s_{main}	4.93	[2.68, 3.05]	[2.62, 3.11]	2.87	4.02	[0.12, 0.45]	[0.07, 0.51]	0.28	[-0.05, -0.02]	[-0.05, -0.01]	-0.03	
	s_{niche}	1.72				3.44							

Table 2: Impact of changes caused by varying training sets (top 2 rows) and seeds (bottom 2 rows). Columns represent the mean node values observed in each group for a particular characteristic, the 95% and 99% confidence intervals for the measured effect sizes (i.e., difference between within- and across-group differences; Cf. §2.4), and the mean effect size. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant effect size at the corresponding confidence level.

We say that the effect is statistically significant at this confidence level if and only if ($CI_{\text{lower}} \leq CI_{\text{upper}} < 0$) or ($CI_{\text{upper}} \geq CI_{\text{lower}} > 0$) — i.e., *iff N% of the bootstrapped samples have observed effect sizes of the same polarity*. In our work, we report the 95% and 99% confidence intervals for effect sizes. We also report the average effect size as the mean of all effect sizes observed in the bootstrap samples.

3 Training sets and seeds

Experiment setup. Our goal is to measure the impact of training sets and seeds on the characteristics of recommendation trees generated by an audit. To accomplish this, we gathered 32 recommendation trees from four different audit configurations: eight trees each from an audit using T_{main} and s_{main} , T_{main} and s_{niche} , T_{niche} and s_{main} , and T_{niche} and s_{niche} . We split each of these into two sets of four and refer to them as ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{main,main}}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{main,main}}$), ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{main,niche}}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{main,niche}}$), ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{niche,main}}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{niche,main}}$), and ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{niche,niche}}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{niche,niche}}$) respectively. These trees were gathered in synchrony (Cf. §2.2) in order to facilitate accurate within- and across-group comparisons (Cf. §2.4). By splitting each of our sets of eight trees into two sets of four, we avoid reusing trees for testing multiple hypotheses.

Measuring impact of a training set change. To uncover the impact of the training set used in an audit on the characteristics of recommendation trees, we compute the means, 95% and 99% confidence intervals associated with the within-group differences, across-group differences, and effect sizes (Cf. §2.4) obtained from two analyses: (1) comparing $\mathcal{T}_{\text{main,main}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{niche,main}}$ — i.e., using the same mainstream seed while varying the training set; and (2) comparing $\mathcal{T}_{\text{main,niche}}$ with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{niche,niche}}$ — i.e., using the same niche seed while varying the training set.

Measuring impact of a seed change. We repeat our methodology for the following analyses: (1) comparing $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{main,main}}$ with $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{main,niche}}$ — i.e., varying the seed while using a mainstream training set focused on controversial topics; and (2) comparing $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{niche,main}}$ with $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{niche,niche}}$ — i.e., varying the seed while maintaining a fringe and controversial training set.

Results. Our results are summarized in Table 2. In general, we find that altering the characteristics of the training set or the seed *always* impacts the popularity of the videos

observed in an audit. This, however, is not the case for the channel diversity and semantics. More specifically, our analysis yields the following insights.

There appears strong evidence of a ‘recency bias’ in recommendations. Paying attention to the bottom two rows of Table 2, we see that the effects of altering the seed from a niche video to a mainstream video are nearly always statistically significant and of high magnitude, with only one exception when channel diversity is recorded using T_{main} for training. The (significant) effects on the popularity and entropy of recommended videos are also higher than the effects observed on alterations of the training set (top two rows). The most notable effects of altering seeds are in the ‘popularity’ dimension where the mean effect of switching a seed video from niche to mainstream results in video recommendations that, on average, have 1.51M and 2.87M more views when trained with T_{main} and T_{niche} , respectively. We only find marginal (yet significant) changes in the semantics of recommended videos, however — i.e., recommendations are between 1-5% less semantically similar after switching seeds from mainstream to niche. This suggests that, independently of the training set used, the choice of seed can drastically alter the characteristics of a recommendation tree and the audit inferences. Extrapolating this finding suggests that the most recent video will have an outsized impact on future recommendations.

Channel diversity is not always dependent on the training set and seed. Our analysis shows that the channel diversity is largely unaffected by the choice of training set and seed. Only one exception occurs: when seeds are altered for a T_{niche} training set audit (Cf. row four in Table 2). Here we see the effect of switching from s_{main} to s_{niche} reduces the channel diversity by an average of 0.28 (entropy in bits) at each node. While it appears that this finding lends credence to the claims of the algorithms rabbit-holing tendencies, it is important to note that this decrease only appears when the audit has only interacted with fringe content (in the training set and the seed). Given that the effect disappears when any other interaction occurs, this finding could be explained by the small number of creators addressing the topic of the niche content.

Takeaways. Taken together, these results put a different perspective on YouTube’s recommendation system and the

Parameters	Video Popularity (Views in millions)				Channel Diversity (Entropy in bits)				Content Semantics (Similarity score)		
	μ_{views}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	μ_{entropy}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}
A_{full}	9.20				3.36						
A_{cookies}	7.72	[-0.90, 0.99]	[-1.20, 1.29]	0.05	3.57	[-0.11, 0.31]	[-0.18, 0.36]	-0.01	[-0.02, -0.00]	[-0.03, 0.00]	-0.01
A_{clear}	12.34	[1.82, 3.46]	[1.54, 3.70]	2.65	3.55	[-0.03, 0.53]	[-0.12, 0.62]	0.26	[-0.05, -0.01]	[-0.05, -0.01]	-0.03
A_{full}	8.47				2.86						

Table 3: Impact of changes caused by varying login status (row 1) and purging watch history (row 2). Columns represent the mean node values observed in each group for a particular characteristic, the 95% and 99% confidence intervals for the measured effect sizes (i.e., difference between within- and across-group differences; Cf. §2.4), and the mean effect size. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant effect size at the corresponding confidence level.

audits that study it. Not only do researchers need to pay particular attention to training and seeding, but also must understand that their measurements of recommended videos are heavily dependent on the *most recent* nodes already traversed by their sock-puppets. Specifically, it appears that the recency bias can lead to a single video overwhelming the effects of a large number of prior videos — thus impacting the final inferences from the audit. Generally, we recommend that audit inferences (e.g., presence of a mainstreaming effect) are conditioned: (1) on the specific characteristics of the training set and seed; and (2) on the specific strategies used to select nodes from a recommendation tree.

4 Dollar-Cost Saving Configurations

Experiment setup. In this section, we focus on understanding the impact of commonly used sock-puppet account management strategies on the recommendation trees generated by them.

Measuring the effectiveness of cookie-based sock puppets. To find out the differences in cookie based sock puppets against real accounts, we gathered four recommendation trees for $\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{cookies}}$ each. All the parametric configurations for these two sets were kept identical except $\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$ was using a logged in profile while $\mathcal{T}_{\text{cookies}}$ was not logged in, but was maintaining YouTube cookies. Both $\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{cookies}}$ used the $(T_{\text{main}}, s_{\text{main}})$ training set and seed.

Measuring the effectiveness of clearing account history. To verify whether clearing account history does indeed purge the watch history effect (i.e even after deleting watch history, user keeps getting similar recommendations), we collected four recommendation trees for $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{full}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{clear}}$ each. Both $\mathcal{T}'_{\text{full}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{clear}}$ were using logged in profiles and were using $(T_{\text{main}}, s_{\text{main}})$ training set and seed. However, before collecting recommendations based on seed s_{main} , watch history of $\mathcal{T}_{\text{clear}}$ was deleted.

To gain insights into the measurable effects of different account management strategies, we compute the means, 95% and 99% confidence intervals associated with within-group differences, across-group differences, and effect sizes.

Results. The results are summarized in Table 3. Our analysis yielded two conclusive results.

Audits do not need fresh accounts for each sock-puppet. First, focusing on the impact of changing between a sock-puppet with a logged-in YouTube account ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$) and one which only maintains its browser cookies ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{cookies}}$), we found that there were no significant differences in any measured characteristics of their recommendations. This

presents significant cost-saving opportunities that arise from being able to associate a sock-puppet with a browser instance rather than having to navigate the barriers associated with automating account creation and phone number verification.

The potential for account reuse by clearing history There is a significant difference in popularity and content semantics for $\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$ sock-puppets when compared with identically configured and synchronized $\mathcal{T}_{\text{clear}}$ sock-puppets, suggesting that, by clearing history $\mathcal{T}_{\text{clear}}$ has purged the popularity-context and topic-context (picked up during training phase) which $\mathcal{T}_{\text{full}}$ still maintains. Simply put, by clearing account history one might be able to reuse an account for a large-scale study — particularly where the popularity and content semantics are being measured (e.g., in audits quantifying mainstreaming and rabbit-holing effects). However, we do not make the claim that clearing watch history is equivalent to getting a fresh account (a fresh account would mean Google doesn’t have any data stored for the profile at the back end, which we did not check for).

Takeaways. These findings present an opportunity for auditors to save huge dollar-costs involved in account creation and curation. We have shown that a browser that maintains YouTube cookies is as good as YouTube account. Furthermore, account re-use (after clearing history) is a viable option for auditors studying the platform for its popularity and content semantics.

5 Computational Compromises

Experiment setup. In this section, we analyse the impact of three compromises that may be made to save computational resources: (1) watching only a pre-determined fraction of each video in the recommendation tree; (2) using the `driver.get(URL)` method of selenium rather than automating user clicks on recommended videos; and (3) performing low-depth and narrow-breadth audits.

Measuring impact of video watch times. To answer the question of whether audits need to ‘watch’ videos to completion, we gathered and analyzed four recommendation trees in which the audit ‘watched’ all videos to completion ($\mathcal{T}_{w=100}$), eight trees in which the audit only ‘watched’ videos to 50% of their total duration ($\mathcal{T}_{w=50}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{w=50}$), and four trees in which the audit only ‘watched’ videos to 25% of their total duration ($\mathcal{T}_{w=25}$). Both sets of audits used the $(T_{\text{main}}, s_{\text{main}})$ training set and seed.

Measuring impact of interaction mechanics. We gathered four recommendation trees where the audit actually lo-

Parameters	Video Popularity (Views in millions)				Channel Diversity (Entropy in bits)				Content Semantics (Similarity score)			
	μ_{views}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	μ_{entropy}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	Effect (95% CI)	Effect (99% CI)	μ_{effect}	
$W_{100\text{pc}}$	7.69				3.74							
$W_{50\text{pc}}$	7.84	[-0.86, 0.28]	[-1.04, 0.46]	-0.29	3.51	[-0.23, 0.22]	[-0.30, 0.29]	0.00	[-0.03, -0.00]	[-0.03, 0.00]	-0.01	
$W_{50\text{pc}}$	12.13				3.21							
$W_{25\text{pc}}$	9.55	[-3.52, 1.53]	[-4.28, 2.34]	-1.03	3.60	[-0.41, 0.15]	[-0.50, 0.25]	-0.13	[-0.03, 0.00]	[-0.03, 0.01]	-0.01	
$W_{25\text{pc}}$	14.11				3.61							
$W_{10\text{pc}}$	13.59	[-2.10, 0.43]	[-2.51, 0.83]	-0.85	3.47	[-0.56, 0.12]	[-0.67, 0.24]	-0.22	[-0.03, 0.00]	[-0.04, 0.01]	-0.01	
I_{click}	7.62				3.79							
I_{get}	6.93	[-0.59, 0.64]	[-0.79, 0.82]	0.02	3.88	[-0.20, 0.11]	[-0.24, 0.16]	-0.04	[-0.02, 0.00]	[-0.02, 0.00]	-0.01	
P_{left}	8.33				3.72							
P_{right}	7.47	[-0.65, 0.98]	[-0.91, 1.25]	0.16	3.33	[-0.03, 0.20]	[-0.07, 0.24]	0.08	[-0.03, -0.02]	[-0.03, -0.02]	-0.02	
D_{top}	13.73				4.59							
D_{bottom}	5.97	[5.04, 6.67]	[4.78, 6.92]	5.86	3.12	[1.05, 1.24]	[1.02, 1.26]	1.14	[-0.02, -0.01]	[-0.03, -0.01]	-0.02	

Table 4: Impact of changes caused by varying video watch times (rows 1-3), interaction mechanisms (row 4), recommendation selection strategy (row 5), and crawl depth (last row). Columns represent the mean node values observed in each group for a particular characteristic, the 95% and 99% confidence intervals for the measured effect sizes, and the mean effect size. Values in bold indicate a statistically significant effect size at the corresponding confidence level.

cated and clicked the recommendations video links ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{click}}$) and four trees where the audit simply identified the URL of the recommended videos and fetched the video with a `driver.get(URL)` command (\mathcal{T}_{get}). Both sets of audits used the $(\mathcal{T}_{\text{main}}, \mathcal{S}_{\text{main}})$ training set and seed.

Measuring the impact of crawl-breadth and -depth. We analyzed the characteristics of the leftmost and rightmost paths of all 96 recommendation trees gathered in this study ($\mathcal{T}_{\text{left}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{right}}$). These correspond to the paths obtained from only clicking the top and bottom recommendation at each video, respectively. We also analyzed the characteristics of the recommendations observed at depth 1 and 10 for all 96 trees obtained in this study (\mathcal{T}_{top} and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{bottom}}$).

Like before, in each of these analyses, we compute the means, 95% and 99% confidence intervals associated with within-group differences, across-group differences, and effect sizes.

Results. Our results are shown in Table 4. Notably, besides configurations with varying crawl depth, none of our changes yielded statistically significant differences in their measured recommendation characteristics. This has several key implications for auditors.

Videos do not need to be watched to completion. In all our audit configurations that varied video watch time fractions, there was no statistical relationship between change in the characteristics of recommended videos and the audit’s configured watch fraction. This is a surprising finding that suggests even watching 10% of a video impacts the subsequent recommendations to no different extent as watching 100%. Upon further investigation, we discovered evidence showing that YouTube only requires a watch time of 30 seconds for a ‘view’ to be registered (Parsons 2017; Funk 2020). Based on these previous findings, we hypothesize that this same 30-second watch threshold is also used to determine whether a video should impact subsequent recommendations. Since the videos in our recommendation trees were much longer than 300-seconds (with many being between 20-60 minutes long), even watching 10% of the video would register as a ‘view’. This finding that videos do not need to be watched to any specific fraction of completion, but

rather to a fixed watch time threshold, presents a promising (accuracy-independent) computational cost-saving avenue for future auditors.

It is unnecessary to automate clicks on recommended videos. Our analysis showed no statistically significant differences between any recommendation tree characteristics observed in \mathcal{T}_{get} and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{click}}$. This suggests that using browser automation tools (e.g., Selenium webdriver’s action chains (Selenium 2022)) to explicitly click on video links is unnecessary. Without sacrificing on accuracy of audit inferences, this allows auditors to replace a computationally expensive, high programmer overhead, and unreliable approach to navigate to subsequent recommendations with the simple and reliable approach of programming browsers to fetch specific URLs in the DOM.

Crawl depth impacts recommendation characteristics. Our analysis on the impact of crawl-depth yield statistically significant results for all recommendation tree characteristics. Specifically, we notice that nodes at the top of the recommendation tree generally appear to be more significantly more popular, diverse, and less semantically similar to recommendations at the bottom of the tree. This finding once again showcases the possibility of a strong recency bias that impacts recommendations. Interestingly, we do not see statistically significant differences between the highest- and lowest-recommended videos — suggesting that auditors need to pay specific attention to the depth of their crawls.

Takeaways. Our analysis yields two significant computational cost-savings for researchers. Specifically, finding that videos do not need to be watched to completion and that clicking on videos causes no different outcomes than simply ‘getting’ the URL associated with the video reduces the computational and engineering overhead associated with an audit. In addition, our work highlights that different depths of a recommendation tree could result in different recommendation characteristics. To account for these effects, it is important that any inferences from an audit are conditioned on the depth of the trees that were used.

6 Related work

Audits of YouTube’s recommendation system. This paper was inspired by a recent influx of YouTube audit research which often showed contrary results. For instance, Lutz et al. (Lutz et al. 2021) provided evidence of the absence of a rabbit-holing effect while demonstrating a mainstreaming effect for a variety of political ideologies. Other work (Ledwich and Zaitsev 2019; Munger and Phillips 2022; Husseinmardi et al. 2021; Makhortykh and Urman 2020) has also challenged the notion of rabbit-holing on YouTube and shown evidence of recommendations swaying users towards mainstream and neutral content. Contrary to these findings, Haroon et al. (Haroon et al. 2022) provided evidence that YouTube pushes users towards increasingly biased and radical political content on ‘up-next’ and homepage recommendations. These findings are complementary to another body of work (Bryant 2020; Ribeiro et al. 2020b; Tomlein et al. 2021; Kirdemir and Agarwal 2021; Papadamou et al. 2019, 2021) which have argued that YouTube recommendations have promoted polarization in the political, scientific, and health-related domains. Unlike these previous efforts, our goal is not to support or undermine specific theories about YouTube’s tendency to impact polarization. Rather, we aim to uncover the possible reasons for these differences and provide guidelines to avoid such confusion and contradictions within the auditing community. More recently, Hussein et al. (Hussein, Juneja, and Mitra 2020) showed how demographics of a user profile altered recommendations from YouTube. In a study focusing on YouTube’s demonetization algorithm, Dunna et al. (Dunna et al. 2022) found evidence that the recommendation and demonetization algorithms were linked. There are also numerous publications from Google describing the recommendation algorithm used for YouTube. These have suggested the use of user profiles, watch histories, video watch times, and click-through rates as features in their content ranking algorithm (Zhao et al. 2019; Tang et al. 2019; Fu et al. 2016; Covington, Adams, and Sargin 2016; Zhao et al. 2015; Brodersen, Scellato, and Wattenhofer 2012; Davidson et al. 2010). These descriptions informed our choice of audit parameters.

Improving the reliability of crawler-based research.

There have been similar efforts to ours in the Internet measurement community. These have largely focused on facilitating more reliable and reproducible research in the realm of Web measurement and privacy. Yadav et al. (Yadav and Goyal 2015) studied a set of open-source web crawlers and showcased how each was suitable for different use cases. More recently, Ahmed et al. (Ahmed et al. 2020) showed the impact that different crawlers had on measurement and security research inferences. Along similar lines, Zeber et al. (Zeber et al. 2020) and Jueckstock et al. (Jueckstock et al. 2021) also showed how the choice of crawler and configuration could harm the repeatability of an experiment. Our work extends these efforts by identifying platform-specific audit challenges.

7 Concluding Remarks

Limitations. Fundamentally, our work is a best-effort study to understand the impact of different audit methodological decisions on recommendations gathered from YouTube — one of the highest streamed video-hosting platforms (Duò 2023). While our audit has a YouTube-limited scope, it helps pave way for other auditing studies across different video platforms. Thus, our study is not without limitations. First, we ourselves are computationally and economically limited and had to make decisions about crawl parameters to explore. This impacted our ability to (1) perform exploration of more paths in each recommendation tree; (2) conduct more than eight synchronized tree explorations; and (3) explore recommendation trees to a greater depth. We take care to mitigate any incorrect inferences that might result from these limitations by only performing like-for-like node- and position-dependent comparisons and ensuring that any differences measured in our study account for the general probabilistic nature of the recommendation algorithm by measuring across-group differences and comparing them with within-group differences. Second, there are latent effects that cannot be controlled from our external vantage point which is effectively measuring a black-box system. We do our best to identify several of these (e.g., A/B testing, data center location, measurement location, etc.) and attempt to counter each of them. However, it is possible that unaccounted effects might still impact our results. Finally, we acknowledge that our choice of a training set and seed video might ultimately not be sufficient to observe all effects of interactions on the recommendation system. Regardless, we provide useful data points for consideration to a community grappling with a large number of contradictory results.

Conclusions. This work showcased the effect of audit configurations on the characteristics of recommendation trees generated by them. Specifically, we showed that although training sets do have a statistical impact on recommendations, their effects can be significantly dampened by a ‘recency bias’ in YouTube’s recommendations (§3). Therefore, specific care needs to be taken when selecting videos to view in an audit. More importantly, these decisions need to be disclosed and any audit inferences *must* be conditioned on them. Our analysis of different types of auditing profiles (§4) showed that the expensive task of obtaining clean YouTube accounts would not yield significantly different outcomes than simply maintaining the YouTube cookie for the entire duration of an audit. Further, our findings also suggest that account reuse can be possible by using the ‘clear history’ feature provided by YouTube. Finally, our analyses of various computational compromises in audits (§5) show that audits do not need to watch a specific fraction of a video for it to impact subsequent recommendations (rather, a preset threshold appears sufficient), challenging automation tasks such as programming cursor clicks on videos do not need to be performed by auditors, and that the depth of a crawl can impact characteristics of the recommendation tree (and should therefore be used to condition any reported inferences from audits).

References

2022. Readout of White House Listening Session on Tech Platform Accountability. The White House Briefing Room. URL <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/09/08/readout-of-white-house-listening-session-on-tech-platform-accountability/>.
2022. Will Smith–Chris Rock slapping incident - Wikipedia. Wikipedia. URL https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Will_Smith%E2%80%93Chris_Rock_slapping_incident.
- Ahmad, S. S.; Dar, M. D.; Zaffar, M. F.; Vallina-Rodriguez, N.; and Nithyanand, R. 2020. Apophanies or Epiphanies? How Crawlers Impact Our Understanding of the Web. WWW '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Barberá, P. 2020. Social media, echo chambers, and political polarization. *Social media and democracy: The state of the field, prospects for reform* 34.
- Blei, D. M.; Ng, A. Y.; and Jordan, M. I. 2003. Latent Dirichlet Allocation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* .
- Brodersen, A.; Scellato, S.; and Wattenhofer, M. 2012. YouTube around the world: geographic popularity of videos. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2187836.2187870>.
- Bryant, L. V. 2020. The YouTube algorithm and the alt-right filter bubble. *Open Information Science* 4(1): 85–90.
- Covington, P.; Adams, J.; and Sargin, E. 2016. Deep Neural Networks for YouTube Recommendations. RecSys '16. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450340359.
- Davidson, J.; Liebald, B.; Liu, J.; Nandy, P.; Van Vleet, T.; Gargi, U.; Gupta, S.; He, Y.; Lambert, M.; Livingston, B.; and Sampath, D. 2010. The YouTube Video Recommendation System. RecSys '10. Association for Computing Machinery.
- DiCiccio, T. J.; and Efron, B. 1996. Bootstrap confidence intervals. *Statistical science* 11(3): 189–228.
- Dunna, A.; Keith, K.; Zuckerman, E.; Vallina-Rodriguez, N.; O'Connor, B.; and Nithyanand, R. 2022. Paying Attention to the Algorithm Behind the Curtain: Bringing Transparency to YouTube's Demonetization Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (ACM CSCW 2022)*. URL <https://sparta.cs.uiowa.edu/people/rishab/papers/cscw-2022-demon.pdf>.
- Duò, M. 2023. 10 best video hosting solutions to consider in 2023 (free vs paid). URL <https://kinsta.com/blog/video-hosting/#:~:text=YouTube,YouTube%20homepage&text=YouTube%20is%20the%20largest%20video,month%2C%20nothing%20even%20comes%20close>.
- Efron, B. 1987. Better bootstrap confidence intervals. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 82(397): 171–185.
- Facebook. 2022. Facebook A/B testing. URL <https://www.facebook.com/business/help/1738164643098669?id=445653312788501>.
- Fu, B.; Chi, E.; Cao, P.; Yang, R.; and Singh, S. 2016. Video WatchTime and Comment Sentiment: Experience from YouTube.
- Funk, M. 2020. How Does YouTube Count Views? It's more tricky than you think! Tubics. URL <https://www.tubics.com/blog/what-counts-as-a-view-on-youtube>.
- Hannak, A.; Sapiezynski, P.; Molavi Kakhki, A.; Krishnamurthy, B.; Lazer, D.; Mislove, A.; and Wilson, C. 2013. Measuring Personalization of Web Search. WWW '13. Association for Computing Machinery. doi: 10.1145/2488388.2488435. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488388.2488435>.
- Haroon, M.; Chhabra, A.; Liu, X.; Mohapatra, P.; Shafiq, Z.; and Wojcieszak, M. 2022. YouTube, The Great Radicalizer? Auditing and Mitigating Ideological Biases in YouTube Recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10666* .
- Hosseinmardi, H.; Ghasemian, A.; Clauset, A.; Mobius, M.; Rothschild, D. M.; and Watts, D. J. 2021. Examining the consumption of radical content on YouTube. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(32): e2101967118.
- Hussein, E.; Juneja, P.; and Mitra, T. 2020. Measuring misinformation in video search platforms: An audit study on YouTube. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 4(CSCW1): 1–27.
- Jueckstock, J.; Sarker, S.; Snyder, P.; Beggs, A.; Papadopoulos, P.; Varvello, M.; Livshits, B.; and Kapravelos, A. 2021. Towards Realistic and Reproducible Web Crawl Measurements. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021, WWW '21*. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Khattak, S.; Fifield, D.; Afroz, S.; Javed, M.; Sundaresan, S.; McCoy, D.; Paxson, V.; and Murdoch, S. J. 2016. Do You See What I See? Differential Treatment of Anonymous Users. In *NDSS*.
- Kirdemir, B.; and Agarwal, N. 2021. Exploring Bias and Information Bubbles in YouTube's Video Recommendation Networks. In *International Conference on Complex Networks and Their Applications*, 166–177. Springer.
- Ledwich, M.; and Zaitsev, A. 2019. Algorithmic Extremism: Examining YouTube's Rabbit Hole of Radicalization. *CoRR* abs/1912.11211. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.11211>.
- Lutz, M.; Gadaginmath, S.; Vairavan, N.; and Mui, P. 2021. Examining Political Bias within YouTube Search and Recommendation Algorithms. In *2021 IEEE Symposium Series on Computational Intelligence (SSCI)*, 1–7. IEEE.
- Makhortykh, M.; and Urman, A. 2020. THE GREAT RANDOMIZER: USING VIRTUAL AGENTS FOR AUDITING THE EFFECTS OF YOUTUBE RECOMMENDATION ALGORITHM ON IDEOLOGICALLY-CHARGED NEWS CONTENT DISTRIBUTION. *AoIR Selected Papers of Internet Research* .

- Munger, K.; and Phillips, J. 2022. Right-wing YouTube: A supply and demand perspective. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 27(1): 186–219.
- Papadamou, K.; Papasavva, A.; Zannettou, S.; Blackburn, J.; Kourtellis, N.; Leontiadis, I.; Stringhini, G.; and Sirivianos, M. 2019. Disturbed YouTube for Kids: Characterizing and Detecting Disturbing Content on YouTube. *CoRR* abs/1901.07046. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.07046>.
- Papadamou, K.; Zannettou, S.; Blackburn, J.; Cristofaro, E. D.; Stringhini, G.; and Sirivianos, M. 2020. Understanding the Incel Community on YouTube. *CoRR* abs/2001.08293. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08293>.
- Papadamou, K.; Zannettou, S.; Blackburn, J.; Cristofaro, E. D.; Stringhini, G.; and Sirivianos, M. 2021. "It is just a flu": Assessing the Effect of Watch History on YouTube's Pseudoscientific Video Recommendations .
- Parsons, J. 2017. How Long Until Watching a YouTube Video Counts as a View? GrowTraffic. URL <https://growtraffic.com/blog/2017/08/youtube-video-counts-view>.
- Ribeiro, M. H.; Ottoni, R.; West, R.; Almeida, V. A. F.; and Meira, W. 2020a. Auditing Radicalization Pathways on YouTube. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3351095.3372879. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372879>.
- Ribeiro, M. H.; Ottoni, R.; West, R.; Almeida, V. A. F.; and Meira, W. 2020b. Auditing Radicalization Pathways on YouTube. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Rosario, B. 2000. Latent semantic indexing: An overview. *Techn. rep. INFOSYS* .
- Sandvig, C.; Hamilton, K.; Karahalios, K.; and Langbort, C. ????. Auditing algorithms: Research methods for detecting discrimination on internet platforms .
- Selenium. 2022. Selenium Action Chains. URL https://www.selenium.dev/selenium/docs/api/py/webdriver/selenium.webdriver.common.action_chains.html.
- Singh, R.; Nithyanand, R.; Afroz, S.; Pearce, P.; Tschantz, M. C.; Gill, P.; and Paxson, V. 2017. Characterizing the Nature and Dynamics of Tor Exit Blocking. In *26th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 17)*. Vancouver, BC: USENIX Association.
- SpaCy. 2022. SpaCy linguistic features. URL <https://spacy.io/usage/linguistic-features>.
- Tang, J.; Belletti, F.; Jain, S.; Chen, M.; Beutel, A.; Xu, C.; and H. Chi, E. 2019. Towards Neural Mixture Recommender for Long Range Dependent User Sequences. *WWW '19*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313650>.
- Tomlein, M.; Pecher, B.; Simko, J.; Srba, I.; Móro, R.; Stefancova, E.; Kompan, M.; Hrcckova, A.; Podrouzek, J.; and Bieliková, M. 2021. An Audit of Misinformation Filter Bubbles on YouTube: Bubble Bursting and Recent Behavior Changes. In *RecSys '21: Fifteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 27 September 2021 - 1 October 2021*. doi:10.1145/3460231.3474241. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474241>.
- Yadav, M.; and Goyal, N. 2015. Comparison of Open Source Crawlers-A Review.
- Zeber, D.; Bird, S.; Oliveira, C.; Rudametkin, W.; Segall, I.; Wollsen, F.; and Lopatka, M. 2020. The Representativeness of Automated Web Crawls as a Surrogate for Human Browsing. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020, WWW '20*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3366423.3380104>.
- Zhao, Z.; Cheng, Z.; Hong, L.; and Chi, E. H. 2015. Improving User Topic Interest Profiles by Behavior Factorization. *WWW '15*.
- Zhao, Z.; Hong, L.; Wei, L.; Chen, J.; Nath, A.; Andrews, S.; Kumthekar, A.; Sathiamoorthy, M.; Yi, X.; and Chi, E. 2019. Recommending What Video to Watch next: A Multitask Ranking System. *RecSys '19*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3298689.3346997. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3298689.3346997>.