

IDNP: Interest Dynamics Modeling using Generative Neural Processes for Sequential Recommendation

Jing Du
The University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia
jing.du2@unsw.edu.au

Zesheng Ye
The University of New South Wales
Sydney, Australia
zesheng.ye@unsw.edu.au

Lina Yao
CSIRO's Data 61 and UNSW
Sydney, Australia
lina.yao@unsw.edu.au

Bin Guo
Northwestern Polytechnical
University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China
guobin.keio@gmail.com

Zhiwen Yu
Northwestern Polytechnical
University, China
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China
zhiwenyu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Recent sequential recommendation models rely increasingly on consecutive short-term user-item interaction sequences to model user interests. These approaches have, however, raised concerns about both short- and long-term interests. (1) *short-term*: interaction sequences may not result from a monolithic interest, but rather from several intertwined interests, even within a short period of time, resulting in their failures to model skip behaviors; (2) *long-term*: interaction sequences are primarily observed sparsely at discrete intervals, other than consecutively over the long run. This renders difficulty in inferring long-term interests, since only discrete interest representations can be derived, without taking into account interest dynamics across sequences. In this study, we address these concerns by learning (1) multi-scale representations of short-term interests; and (2) dynamics-aware representations of long-term interests. To this end, we present an Interest Dynamics modeling framework using generative Neural Processes, coined IDNP, to model user interests from a functional perspective. IDNP learns a global interest function family to define each user's long-term interest as a function instantiation, manifesting interest dynamics through function continuity. Specifically, IDNP first encodes each user's short-term interactions into multi-scale representations, which are then summarized as user context. By combining latent global interest with user context, IDNP then reconstructs long-term user interest functions and predicts interactions at upcoming query timestep. Moreover, IDNP can model such interest functions even when interaction sequences are limited and non-consecutive. Extensive experiments on four real-world datasets demonstrate that our model outperforms state-of-the-arts on various evaluation metrics.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems; • Computing methodologies → Neural networks.

KEYWORDS

Interest Modeling, Neural Processes, Sequential Recommendation

1 INTRODUCTION

As user interests are of vital importance in sequential recommendation, various works intend to cooperate user interests with user




Figure 1: An example of long- and short-term interests.

feedback[42]. User interests are generally viewed from two aspects: short-term interests and long-term interests. Fig.1 shows a user's favorite actress is *Anne Hathaway* who starred in *One Day*. Watching *One Day* piqued this user's interest in *Romance* films, leading to several watches on this genre. Observe that the interaction of this user over a short period seems to be driven by a short-term interest(movie genre), but it is also the result of long-term interest(favorite actress). When interest in *Romance* films disappeared, the next interaction thus comes to *Interstellar* because of *Anne Hathaway*. It implies that, while short-term interest appears to be more evident, it is also essential to take long-term interest into account, since both sides jointly determine the outcome of interactions in the long run.

The interaction sequences develop as a user interacts with different items over time. There are several short-term sequences throughout a long-term user interaction history. Modeling short-term interests and aggregating them into a long-term representation has been a general approach to sequential recommendation models. The studies of Hidasi et al. [16] and Iv et al. [25] focus on the latest interaction of each sequence, but neglect to note that short-term interests may vary dramatically between sequences. In contrast, temporal relationships across short-term sequences are considered in [37] and [43], by combining current preference with past short-term interests using Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Multi-level Attentions.

Nonetheless, previous works still suffer from limitations in capturing both short- and long-term interests. On the one hand, there

has been reliance on strictly ordered short-term interactions, where the next step is expected to be affected by the previous step immediately. However, this ignores the user’s skip behaviors, indicating that a specific interest may not result in successive interactions [30]. For instance, a user might browse clothing while interspersing them with clicks on cosmetics items. Thus, the assumption of strictly ordered interactions may obscure the modeling of different interests. On the other hand, user’s long-term interest remains stable and guides the interactions, along with short-term interests within each time frame. For example, favourite brand and color always influence users’ purchasing of clothes, electronic devices and household appliances. The literature [2, 41, 43] has primarily aggregated long-term interest from a series of consecutive short-term sequences using autoregressive models like RNNs. Most short-term sequences, however, only occur scattered throughout rather than consecutively, causing autoregressive models difficult to capture temporal dependencies. Moreover, long-term interests are complex and implicit, which cannot be easily inferred from short-term user behavior with a simple aggregation, but also requires examining interest dynamics across different short-term sequences.

To this end, we obtain multi-scale representations for short-term interests, by handling the user’s skip behaviors using dilated convolutions with extended receptive fields. As for long-term modeling, we adapt Neural Processes (NPs) [13, 14] to model user interests from a functional perspective, representing each user’s long-term interest as a continuous function instantiation. As aforementioned, the training of neural networks (NNs) requires huge amounts of consecutive interaction sequences. Instead, NPs combine the advantages of NNs and probabilistic inference, relaxing the consecutive constraints while requiring fewer interaction sequences to achieve considerable performance. NPs perform Bayesian inference for function approximation, without designing a specific prior form but rather by learning it implicitly from empirical observations of the function. This enables us to incorporate short-term sequences as function observations and then identify the relationship between short- and long-term interest as the interest dynamics. Then one can predict what items will be interacted with at a given query time, even without extensive interaction data. Moreover, this prior can even lead to fast adaptation to new users with few interactions since it is based on observations of a set of users.

In light of this, we propose modeling Interest Dynamics framework, empowered by Neural Processes (IDNP), to predict interactions for a query timestep. We first use an *Attentive Interest Encoder* to capture multi-scale short-term interests while jointly attending to the importance of different time frames. The short-term interests are then summarized as permutation-invariant user context defining the interest dynamics, derived by two paths: A deterministic path with query time attended, and a latent path conditioned by a global latent interest variable, in a *Dual Dynamics Inference* module. Finally, we adapt the interest dynamics to recover the shape of user interest function and predict next interaction by *Interest Decoder*. IDNP optimizes both the likelihood of next-item predictions and the distance between predicted and observed interest functions. To our knowledge, we are the first to apply NPs to interest modeling. IDNP exploits the interest dynamics, i.e., a prior captured from empirical observations, to recommend next items for users with limited and non-consecutive sequences. To summarize our contribution:

- We propose an **Interest Dynamics** modeling framework based on generative **Neural Processes** (IDNP), considering user’s long-term interest as a continuous function. IDNP adapts the interest dynamics and generates item predictions for any query timestep, by recovering the interest function with very limited interaction sequences.
- We present an *Attentive Interest Encoder*, which models short-term interests at multiple scales to handle skip behavior, and aggregates short-term interests into user context.
- We design *Dual Dynamics Inference* to model user interest dynamics, with a query-specific deterministic path and a latent path representing the global user interest.
- We use *Interest Decoder* to reconstruct long-term interest function and predict items to be interacted of query time.
- We evaluate IDNP on four real-world datasets, outperforming state-of-the-arts under few-shot settings.

2 RELATED WORK

The existence of temporal interaction data has contributed to the popularity of sequential recommendation. The prominence of neural networks (NNs) in the last decade has led to an surge in NN-based approaches, such as Recurrent Neural Network (RNN)-based models [5, 9, 15, 17, 18, 24] and Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)-based models [30, 36, 38, 40, 41].

For RNN-based models, GRU4REC [15] first introduce Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) [16] into sequential recommendation, in which data augmentation and embedding dropout strategy are applied to prevent over-fitting. KV-MN [17] capture attribute-level user preference by incorporating knowledge-based information into RNN. Then, SASRec [18] apply multi-head self-attention to aggregate behaviors with different weights. STAMP [24] and LSTeM [9] combine Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) model with self-attention to deal with long sequences. For CNN-based models, Caser [30] and NextItNet [41] stack item embeddings to form a sequential interests "image" and capture sequential features using CNN. Further works [36, 38] strive to improve convolution kernels. GRec [40] bypass the "left-to-right" autoregressive style but also take future data into account. However, NNs-based models are primarily geared towards short-term interests, relying on many consecutive interactions to model long-term dynamics. This presents a challenge when predicting with limited and scattered interaction data.

Recent meta-learning empowered recommenders [7, 21, 31] cast recommendation with limited interactions as few-shot learning problem [11]. In general, one can categorize gradient-based [28], metric-based [3, 29, 33], and model-based approaches [10, 13, 14, 27]. For gradient-based methods, MeLU [22] fit a candidate selection strategy into a standard model-agnostic meta-learning [12] framework to determine distinct items for customized preference estimation. MetaTL [34] extract dynamic transition patterns between users, to provide accurate reasoning about sequential interactions. In metric-based approaches, a distance metric is learned in the embedding space that determines the similarity between query and training instances. Accordingly, Meta-LSTM [26] bridge gradient-based meta-learner with metric-based models for reducing the required number of iterative steps. On this basis, s^2 Meta [8] learn to automatically control the learning process, including parameter

initialization and update strategy. Nevertheless, they fail to account for the interest dynamics across short-term sequences, as well as the relationship between short- and long-term interests.

Neural Processes (NPs) [13, 14] refers to a family of generative model-based meta-learning approaches, proposed for function approximations. Following Bayesian inference, NPs map function input $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ to the output space $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ with an implicit prior, which takes form of a jointly Gaussian conditional distribution on function observations. The generative nature enables NPs to reconstruct functions from limited observations. The characteristics of NPs have been applied on either few-shot image completion [13, 14, 19], image recognition [35], or cross-domain recommendation [23]. Still, the interest dynamics perspective has yet to be explored.

Our study use NPs to model interest dynamics, taking scattered short-term user interests as input for long-term interest function reconstruction and next-item prediction at any query time frame.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first formulate our recommendation setting and then detail how NPs can be applied therein.

3.1 Problem Statement

Say we have a user set \mathcal{U} and an item set \mathcal{I} , with $|\mathcal{U}|$ users and $|\mathcal{I}|$ items. Denote training users as $\mathcal{D}^{train} = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|}$. Each user u_i has a user-item interaction sequence $Q^{u_i} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$ (abbreviated as $Q_{1:n}^{u_i}$, where $t_j (1 \leq j \leq n)$ is the j -th item interacted with user u_i). We then divide each interaction sequence into short subsequences through a sliding window of width L with step size as 1. Thus, each user u_i derives a subsequence set $S^{u_i} = \{Q_{1:L}^{u_i}, Q_{2:L+1}^{u_i}, \dots, Q_{n-L+1:n}^{u_i}\}$.

Given a new user $u_q \notin \mathcal{D}^{train}$ with only L interactions ($L \leq n$), we seek a model that can describe new user's interests based on the training set $\mathcal{S} = \{S^{u_1}, \dots, S^{u_{|\mathcal{U}|}}\}$ and predicts the user preferences of all items \mathcal{I} for any query time, using limited interactions. Top- k preferences are recommended as the next-basket items that will occur in the user-item interaction sequence $Q_{L:L+k}^{u_q}$. Notably, both training and query users have limited user-item interactions, i.e., few-shot prediction in the case of N is small.

3.2 Neural Processes for Interest Dynamics

For a set of function instantiations sampled from a global function family, Neural Processes (NPs) learn to approximate functions by deriving an implicit function prior and reconstructing function values, based on function observations. NPs can thus be applied to capture interest dynamics (priors) from user-item interactions (observations), recover the interest function for each user, and predict what next item will be interacted with in a query time.

Assume, the interaction subsequence set \mathcal{S}_u of each user u indicates a set of discrete sampled observations from a continuous user interest function $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. We omit the user index u and slightly abuse the notation with \mathcal{X} to denote \mathcal{S} for brevity, \mathcal{Y} refers to the preferences toward \mathcal{I} . Consider a set of interaction-interest tuples $\mathcal{O} = \{(x_1, y_1) \dots (x_N, y_N)\}$ from a specific user, where x_i refers to an interaction subsequence, y_i is a distributed preference representation over all items for the next timestep. \mathcal{O} constitutes a function instantiation of f , and defines a joint distribution over

every (x_i, y_i) ,

$$\Phi_{x_{1:N}}(y_{1:N}) = \int p(y_{1:N}|x_{1:N}, f) p(f) df \quad (1)$$

NPs model such a predictive distribution for \mathcal{O} , by randomly sampling N_c tuples from \mathcal{O} to form the context set $C = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_c}$, also a target set $\mathcal{T} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_t}$, which is a superset of context set C plus $N_t - N_c$ additional tuples. As such, the predictor is trained on C and evaluated on \mathcal{T} . Noticeably, NPs can make predictions conditioning on arbitrary size N_c of C as well as the size N_t of \mathcal{T} .

In this way, the distribution $p_\theta(y_{\mathcal{T}}|x_{\mathcal{T}}; C)$ on every query interaction window $x_q \in \mathcal{T}$ from the target set can be expressed, with the assumption that they are independent of one another

$$p_\theta(y_{\mathcal{T}}|x_{\mathcal{T}}; C) = \int \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, C) p(f) df \quad (2)$$

The parameterization of f involves a neural network f_θ with a latent variable z , having observed the context set. Specifically, NPs empirically conclude an implicit form $p_\theta(z|C)$ of prior $p(f)$ from observations C , and derive a generative model on the target set $p_\theta(y_{1:N_t}|x_{1:N_t}, z)$. Consequently, Bayesian inference can be used to infer the next-item preferences over the entire target set,

$$\begin{aligned} p_\theta(y_{\mathcal{T}}|x_{\mathcal{T}}; C) &= \int p_\theta(z|C) p_\theta(y_{\mathcal{T}}|x_{\mathcal{T}}, z) dz \\ &= \int p_\theta(z|C) \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Marginalizing z provides flexible predictive distributions from the same context set, but also renders intractability when optimizing model parameters, which can be addressed by amortized variational inference [14], resulting in the evidence lower-bound (ELBO) as

$$\begin{aligned} \log p_\theta(y_{\mathcal{T}}|x_{\mathcal{T}}, C) &= \log \int p_\theta(z|C) \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, z) dz \\ &= \log \int p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T}) \frac{p_\theta(z|C)}{p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T})} \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, z) dz \\ &\geq \int p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T}) \left(\log \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, z) + \log \frac{p_\theta(z|C)}{p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T})} \right) dz \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|\mathcal{T})} \left[\log \prod_{q=1}^{N_t} p_\theta(y_q|x_q, z) \right]}_{\text{desired log-likelihood}} - \underbrace{\text{KL} [p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T}) || p_\theta(z|C)]}_{\text{KL divergence}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\text{KL} [p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T}) || p_\theta(z|C)]$ is the Kullback-Liebler (KL) divergence of z on target set \mathcal{T} and context set C . Hence, the inference of next-item interest is equivalent to maximizing the desired log-likelihood while minimizing the KL divergence between approximate posterior of target \mathcal{T} and conditional prior on context C . Specifically, the interest dynamics are represented as $p(z|C)$. This can then be used to estimate the preference of next item of




Figure 2: Overview of IDNP, including *Attentive Interest Encoder*, *Dual Dynamics Inference* and *Interest Decoder*. Each user’s sequence is randomly divided into context set and target set. *Attentive Interest Encoder* captures short-term user interest representations from multiple scales and assign different importance. *Dual Dynamics Inference* is composed of *Deterministic inference* (solid line) and *latent inference* (dotted line), deriving attentive interests representation r_d and the latent global interests z , respectively. Both representations together with query interest representation r_q are fed into the *interest decoder* to obtain predictive interests representation d_q , which concatenate with e_u to predict interactive probability of all items through a fully-connected layer.

a query interaction window x_q . More importantly, learning interest dynamics with NPs accepts non-consecutive input interaction subsequences, as well as reconstructing the interest function.

Accordingly, NPs are mainly implemented in three components

- An encoder that maps user’s short-term interaction subsequences x_i into short-term representations r_i ;
- An aggregator that collects all r_i as a permutation-invariant user context r , parameterizing the global latent interest $z \sim N(\mu(r), I\sigma(r))$, assuming $p(z|C)$ to be conditionally Gaussian distributed;
- A decoder that takes z and the query location x_q , and predicts preferences of next item y_q so as item to be interacted.

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Overview

The overall structure of IDNP is shown in Fig 2, divided as *Attentive Interest Encoder*, *Dual Dynamics Inference* and *Interest Decoder*.

For a user with a context set of subsequences, IDNP learns to predict the next interaction item of every query location (subsequence) from the target set. In *Attentive Interest Encoder*, we apply convolutions on each context short-term subsequence to obtain multi-scale short-term interest representations. We then calculate their position-aware representations using self-attention. *Attentive Interest Encoder* serves as the *Encoder* of NPs (detailed in Section 4.2). Then, in *Dual Dynamics Inference*, we infer the interest dynamics from two perspectives: deterministic path and latent path. Deterministic path summarizes the user context with query location additionally considered using cross-attention, while latent path parameterizes a conditional Gaussian prior attended by a latent variable as global interest. The interest dynamics from context set are obtained from both paths. *Dual Dynamics Inference* is in line

with the *Aggregator* of NPs (detailed in Section 4.3). Finally, in *Interest Decoder*, the output of deterministic path and latent path are concatenated with the query subsequence and, together with the user embedding, are transformed to a $|I|$ -dimensional vector to predict the user preferences over all items, at query location. Top-k items will then be recommended. *Interest Decoder* resembles the *Decoder* of NPs (detailed in Section 4.4).

The following describe the structure of above three components and the objective function used to optimize IDNP.

4.2 Attentive Interest Encoder

Taking interaction subsequences as input, IDNP first obtains a multi-scale representation of each of the context subsequences $Q_c(1 \leq j \leq N_c)$, having their relative importance according to the query subsequence, implemented with dilated convolution [39] and self-attention [32].

4.2.1 Multi-scale Short-term Interests. First, we randomly initialize the user embedding e_u and item embeddings $e_i(1 \leq i \leq L)$, where $e_u, e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and d is the dimension of embedding. For the j -th subsequence $Q_{j:j+L-1}^{u_i}$, we stack L interacted item embeddings to form an “image” $P \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. Standard temporal convolution is considered effective in extracting short-term interest [30], if the consecutive L interactions are resulted from a single interest. Yet, users appear to engage in skip behavior, i.e., consecutive interactions driven by multiple interests. For this, we adopt dilated convolution kernels to handle non-consecutive behavior. Fig 3 showcases the difference between standard and dilated kernels with the same convolution stride. Dilated kernels can extend the receptive field of temporal convolutions without increasing parameters [41], they degenerate to standard kernels when dilation $s = 0$.




Figure 3: Dilated temporal interaction convolution with different dilations. h is the convolution stride, d is the embedding size, L is the length of subsequence. They differ in receptive fields. The larger the dilation, the more interactions within a kernel are skipped.

We apply three different dilations, i.e., $s = 0, 1$, and 2 , to handle consecutive and non-consecutive behavior simultaneously. We also set up a number of $n_s = \sup \frac{L+s}{s+1}$ different kernels at multiple scales for each dilation. For example in the case of $s = 0$, there are L kernels with different kernel sizes $h_s^{(i)}$, ranging from 1 to L . All the kernels share the same stride as 1 . Each resulted feature map $c_s^{(i)}$ by a convolution kernel applied on the entire P represents one of short-term user interests,

$$c_s^{(i)} = f_{\text{cnn}}(P; P_{1:h_s^{(i)}+s}, k_s^{(i)}), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, \sup \frac{L+s}{s+1} \quad (5)$$

where $k_s^{(i)}$ is the i -th kernel with size of $h_s^{(i)}$ in the group of dilation s . $P_{1:h_s^{(i)}+s}$ denotes the receptive field of that kernel. The feature maps of each dilation group are then averaged and concatenated to obtain the multi-scale features F_j of short-term interest for L interactions within the j -th subsequence.

$$F_j = \left\|_{s=0}^2 \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} c_s^{(i)} \right\| \quad (6)$$

where $\|$ denotes vector concatenation. We concatenate three averaged feature vectors into one as the representation for j -th subsequence.

4.2.2 Attentive Encoder. Vanilla NPs [14] ignore relative positioning between subsequences within a long user-item interaction sequences. This issue can be mitigated by taking their distance into account using self-attention [19, 32].

Specifically, we set up an attentive encoder, obtaining a position-aware short-term interests representation r_j of j -th short-term interest representation F_j , calculated by Scaled dot-product attention (SDPA), given by

$$r_j = \text{SDPA}(Q_r, K_r, V_r) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{Q_r K_r^T}{\sqrt{d_r}}\right) V_r \quad (7)$$

$$\text{with } Q_r = F_j W_r^Q, K_r = F_j W_r^K, V_r = F_j W_r^V$$

where d_r is the dimension of r_j , W_r^Q, W_r^K, W_r^V are linear operators that transform F_j to the query space Q_r , key space K_r , and value space V_r , respectively.

4.3 Dual Dynamics Inference

For any user, each of the short-term interaction subsequences is passed through *Attentive Interest Encoder* for short-term interest representations r_i , which are then summarized in two inference paths, as the interest dynamics of that user.

4.3.1 Deterministic Path. Consider short-term interest representations of context set $r_i (i = 1 \dots N_c)$ and a query subsequence F_q from target set. The short-term interests are aggregated into a deterministic query-specific contextual representation tailored to the query. In this way, each query can draw more upon the context points relevant to its location. Therefore, we use a time-sensitive interest aggregator to produce the deterministic user contextual representation r_d with cross-attention [32] between context and query.

$$r_d = \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \frac{\exp(F_i, F_q)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_c} \exp(F_j, F_q)} r_i \quad (8)$$

where the importance of each r_i for aggregation is determined by the distance between context subsequence F_i and target subsequence F_q . This is implemented by another SDPA with query outside the context set.

In contrast to mean aggregation in vanilla NPs, IDNP's deterministic path learns to aggregate the context set with respect to different query subsequences. This enables it to dynamically derive a highly flexible deterministic interest dynamics solely from empirical observations, without violating the permutation-invariance condition.

4.3.2 Latent Path. NPs assume observed function instantiations come from a common generating process, as does IDNP, which assumes each user's long-term interaction sequence is a function instantiation of the underlying global interest function family, as the function prior $p(f)$. In practice, NPs sample a global latent variable z and conclude an Gaussian prior $p(z|C)$ conditioning on context set C . Analogously in IDNP, we set up a latent path to model the latent global interest z behind short-term interests, describing how the long-term interest function can be generated and inducing the correlations between short-term interests.

To derive $p(z|C)$, we first summarize the attentive representations of C using a mean-aggregation,

$$r_l = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{j=1}^{N_c} r_j \quad (9)$$

It follows that $p(z|C)$ can be parameterized with a NN, which samples $z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(r_l), I\sigma(r_l))$ by predicting its mean and variance using two non-linear transformations, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(r_l) &= W_\mu (\text{ReLU}(W_h r_l + b_h)) + b_\mu \\ I\sigma(r_l) &= W_\sigma (\text{ReLU}(W_h r_l + b_h)) + b_\sigma \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We further apply reparameterization trick [20] for differentiable sampling of z from the parameterized conditional Gaussian distribution as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \mu(r_l) + I\sigma(r_l) \odot \epsilon_i \\ \text{with } \epsilon_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(0), I) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where \odot refers to element-wise multiplications.

Unlike deterministic dynamics \mathbf{r}_d that directly adapts to the query location, latent dynamics \mathbf{z} combines the short-term observations with the global latent, resulting in that short-term interests are correlated in their marginal distributions, as in Eq. 3.

4.4 Interest Decoder

For a subsequence of interest \mathcal{Q}_q , IDNP reconstructs the user interest function therein, and accordingly predicts the preference of following items within *Interest Decoder*. To do so, we first obtain the short-term representation F_q of query just as context subsequence. The interest function in regard to query can then be recovered with a non-linear transformation, taking both deterministic dynamics \mathbf{r}_d and latent dynamics \mathbf{z} as additional input,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_q &= \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_d \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{b}_d) \\ \text{with } \mathbf{r} &= \mathbf{r}_d \parallel \mathbf{z} \parallel F_q \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where \parallel denotes vector concatenation.

Since we are interested in what item will be of interest to the user following a query subsequence, the interest function is finally mapped into a preference representation $\mathbf{y}_q^{(u)}$ over all items with a non-linear transformation on the concatenation of user embedding \mathbf{e}_u and interest representation \mathbf{d}_q ,

$$\mathbf{y}_q^{(u)} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_p \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d}_q \\ \mathbf{e}_u \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{b}_p) \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{|I| \times 2|d|}$ and $\mathbf{b}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|}$ are model parameters. $\sigma(x) = 1/(1 + e^{-x})$ is a Sigmoid non-linear activation that calculates the probability of user u interacting with each of the items, denoted as preference representation $\mathbf{y}_q^{(u)}$.

4.5 Loss Function

As mentioned in Section 3.2, NPs are optimized by 1) maximizing log-likelihood and 2) minimizing KL divergence between approximate posterior of target \mathcal{T} and conditional prior on context \mathcal{C} .

IDNP optimizes the log-likelihood, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_\theta(z, \mathcal{T})} [\log p_\theta(y_q | x_q, z)]$ in terms of mean absolute error (MAE) for explicit feedback whereas binary cross-entropy (BCE) for implicit feedback. In high-dimensional cases, though, KL divergence is shown to be ineffective [4], since it is not a symmetrical metric and not workable when two distributions have disjoint support. As such, we replace KL divergence with Wasserstein distance [1] for the optimization of IDNP.

We denote $p_\theta(z|\mathcal{T})$ and $p_\theta(z|\mathcal{C})$ as $P_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ for simplicity. Formally, the Wasserstein distance between distribution $P_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = \inf_{\gamma \sim \Gamma(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}})} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \gamma} [\|x - y\|] \quad (14)$$

where $\Gamma(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}})$ is the set of all possible joint distributions of $P_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{C}}$ combined. $\mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \gamma} [\|x - y\|]$ is the expectation of the distance between (x, y) under γ . As $\inf_{\gamma \sim \Gamma(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}})}$ is computationally intractable, we follow the solution as in [1], using Sinkhorn-Knopp's matrix scaling algorithm[6]. The approximated Wasserstein distance is then given by:

$$\mathcal{W}(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}}) = \frac{1}{K} (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim P_{\mathcal{T}}} [f_u^\omega(x)] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P_{\mathcal{C}}} [f_u^\omega(x)]) \quad (15)$$

The specific value of K has no effect on gradient unless it is positive infinity. As such, the overall objective function of IDNP is

derived by

$$\mathcal{L} = \min_{\Theta} \{\mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}} + \mathcal{W}(P_{\mathcal{T}}, P_{\mathcal{C}})\} \quad (16)$$

where Θ refers to all the model parameters, \mathcal{L}_{NLL} is the negative log-likelihood implemented with either MAE or BCE as aforementioned.

Table 1: Statistics of datasets

Datasets	Users #	Items #	Interactions	Sparsity	Rating
MovieLens	6,040	3,400	999,620	95.16%	explicit
Gowalla	29,858	40,981	1,027,370	99.92%	implicit
Yelp	31,668	38,048	1,561,406	99.87%	implicit
Amazon-book	52,643	91,599	2,984,108	99.94%	explicit

5 EXPERIMENTS

We present empirical studies that examine the following research questions:

- RQ 1) Does the proposed IDNP outperform other recommendation models under few-shot setting?
- RQ 2) Are all the modules introduced beneficial for IDNP? Specifically, what effects does a) Attentive Interest Encoder; b) NPs-based inference; and c) Wasserstein distance have on performance?
- RQ 3) Is there any relationship between different hyper-parameters and model performance?

5.1 Experimental Setup

5.1.1 Datasets. We compared IDNP with start-of-the-arts on four public datasets: MovieLens¹, Gowalla², Yelp³ and Amazon-book⁴. MovieLens and Amazon-book contain explicit feedback, while Gowalla and Yelp are implicit feedback datasets. Details of the datasets are listed in table 1.

5.1.2 Methods for comparison. To evaluate the performance of IDNP, we compare IDNP with 7 state-of-the-arts, including both NN-based sequential recommendation and meta-learning based recommendation models.

- (1) *Caser*[30]: This is a CNN-based sequence embedding recommendation model. It embeds all interaction items into an image and learns features using convolutional filters.
- (2) *GRU4REC*[15]: This sequential recommendation model incorporates recurrent neural network (RNN) for recommendation.
- (3) *SASRec*[18]: This is a sequential model based on self-attention and RNN to capture long-term semantics.
- (4) *NextItNet*[41]: A sequential recommendation model with a stack of dilated convolution blocks to increase the receptive fields for user-item interactions.
- (5) *GRec*[40]: This is a sequential recommendation model based on the encoder-decoder framework. It uses past and future data to train the model through a gap-filling mechanism.

¹<https://grouplens.org/datasets/MovieLens/>

²<https://snap.stanford.edu/data/loc-Gowalla.html>

³<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>

⁴<http://jmcauley.ucsd.edu/data/amazon/>

Table 2: Overall Comparisons of Model Performances. (best scores are marked in bold and the second best scores are indicated with underline. The hyperparameter of IDNP is set as $L=5$, $N_c=10$, $d=64$).

Dataset		MovieLens			Gowalla			Yelp			Amazon-book		
Metrics		Hit@1	Recall@1	NDCG@1	Hit@1	Recall@1	NDCG@1	Hit@1	Recall@1	NDCG@1	Hit@1	Recall@1	NDCG@1
k=1	Caser	0.0083	0.0002	0.4007	0.0033	0.0017	0.4549	0.0010	0.0012	0.5412	0.0020	0.0002	0.7086
	NextItNet	<u>0.1088</u>	0.0003	<u>0.4517</u>	0.0020	0.0012	0.4422	0.0007	0.0014	0.5626	0.0015	0.0001	0.7354
	GRU4REC	0.0081	0.0002	0.3927	0.0032	0.0016	0.4458	0.0011	0.0013	0.5053	0.0024	0.0003	0.6544
	SASRec	0.0040	0.0014	0.4514	0.0033	0.0022	0.4232	0.0027	0.0016	0.4493	0.0026	0.0001	0.5285
	GRec	0.0114	0.0006	0.4069	0.0015	0.0014	0.4642	0.0019	0.0015	0.4816	0.0017	0.0004	0.6358
	MeLU	0.0731	0.0037	0.3903	<u>0.0045</u>	0.0023	<u>0.4949</u>	0.0038	<u>0.0019</u>	<u>0.5882</u>	0.005	0.0003	0.6675
	MetaTL	0.0584	0.0078	0.3125	0.0033	0.0065	0.4150	<u>0.0059</u>	0.0017	0.4515	0.0034	<u>0.0004</u>	0.7458
	IDNP	0.1375	0.0081	0.4853	0.0260	<u>0.0041</u>	0.5025	0.0113	0.0022	0.6677	<u>0.0047</u>	0.0005	0.7634
Metrics		Hit@5	Recall@5	NDCG@5	Hit@5	Recall@5	NDCG@5	Hit@5	Recall@5	NDCG@5	Hit@5	Recall@5	NDCG@5
k=5	Caser	0.0580	0.0020	0.5168	0.0049	0.0022	<u>0.6982</u>	0.0027	0.0016	0.5781	0.0011	0.0006	0.7929
	NextItNet	<u>0.1541</u>	0.0018	0.7624	0.0069	0.0024	0.6528	0.0017	0.0013	0.5849	0.0054	0.0003	0.6583
	GRU4REC	0.0723	0.0037	0.6288	0.0062	0.0026	0.6721	0.0031	0.0014	0.6002	0.0010	0.0006	0.7341
	SASRec	0.0341	0.0022	0.5728	0.0161	0.0028	0.6214	0.0025	0.0013	0.5713	0.0026	0.0002	0.5894
	GRec	0.1063	<u>0.0159</u>	0.6145	<u>0.0356</u>	0.0043	0.6630	0.0187	0.0017	<u>0.6338</u>	<u>0.0059</u>	0.0004	<u>0.8384</u>
	MeLU	0.0114	0.0019	0.6073	0.0262	<u>0.0055</u>	0.6661	0.0094	<u>0.0019</u>	0.5973	0.0044	0.0012	0.8222
	IDNP	0.1994	0.0208	<u>0.6499</u>	0.076	0.0123	0.7108	<u>0.0123</u>	0.0027	0.6417	0.0070	<u>0.0007</u>	0.8706
	Metrics		Hit@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10	Hit@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10	Hit@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10	Hit@10	Recall@10
k=10	Caser	0.1019	0.0034	0.5442	0.0114	0.0016	0.7089	0.0056	0.0028	0.7053	0.0011	0.0007	0.7706
	NextItNet	<u>0.3429</u>	0.0018	<u>0.5859</u>	0.0123	0.0004	0.6945	0.0040	0.0022	0.6483	0.0111	0.0003	0.7010
	GRU4REC	0.0379	0.0019	0.4973	0.0087	0.0008	<u>0.7535</u>	0.0054	0.0017	0.6911	0.0020	0.0005	0.8531
	SASRec	0.0064	0.0003	0.5922	0.0307	0.0015	0.5661	0.0053	0.0023	0.5913	0.0048	0.0002	0.7566
	GRec	0.1621	0.0133	0.5823	0.0379	0.0031	0.6755	0.0114	0.0024	0.6061	0.0031	0.0004	0.7213
	MeLU	0.2216	0.0332	0.5745	<u>0.0453</u>	<u>0.0029</u>	0.7410	<u>0.0151</u>	<u>0.0025</u>	<u>0.6377</u>	<u>0.0064</u>	<u>0.0026</u>	0.8384
	IDNP	0.3722	0.0424	0.6499	0.093	0.015	0.7831	0.0339	0.0039	0.7968	0.0120	0.0030	0.9113

- (6) *MeLU*[22]: It proposes an evidence candidate selection strategy to generate reliable candidates with meta-learning.
(7) *MetaTL*[34]: It learns the transition patterns of users through the model-agnostic meta-learning (MAML) framework.

We use 3 metrics to evaluate all models: Hit@K, Recall@K, and NDCG(Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain)@K ($K=1, 5, 10$). k refers to the length of next-basket interactions following the query user-item interaction subsequence. Our results from MetaTL are only shown when $k = 1$, since MetaTL can only predict the immediate next item.

5.1.3 Experimental Settings. For each dataset, users are randomly divided into training set(80%), test set(5%), and validation set(15%), with no overlap between. Caser, SASRec, GRU4REC, GRec, NextItNet, MeLU and MetaTL are implemented with their official open-source code. We modify the data preprocessing and sequence dividing processes to fit our settings. In order to make MeLU work without profiles, we replace profile embedding with random initialization. To create the few-shot settings, we cap the length of interaction sequence n of each user to 20 (MovieLens), 16 (Gowalla), 24 (Yelp), and 24 (Amazon-book), respectively. We zero-pad the interaction sequence when users have fewer interactions than the threshold. We search the size of subsequences L in the range from 5 to 10. The size of each user’s context set N_c is randomly sampled within 1 to 10 for each epoch, and the size of target set N_t is fixed to 15. The training batch size for Amazon-book is 64, whereas the others are set to 32. We use Adam for model optimization with learning rate $3e-4$. We use early stopping to prevent overfitting. It generally takes 70 epochs for all models to converge on four datasets. The random seed is set to 1234. For testing, we directly evaluate the performance on each user in the test set using L interactions.

5.2 Overall Performance(RQ 1)

Table.2 shows the experimental results on the four datasets with different lengths $k = 1, 5, 10$ of next-basket prediction. The best results across all experiments are bolded, and the second-best results are underlined.

All three evaluation metrics indicate that IDNP performs best on all datasets. On MovieLens, IDNP outperforms any other models in all metrics, especially Hit and NDCG. When $k = 1$, IDNP improves over the SOTA model (NextItNet) by 2.87% and 3.36% in hit@1 and NDCG@1, respectively. When $k = 10$, IDNP shows 0.3722, 6.24%, and 64.99% in Hit@10, Recall@10 and NDCG@10, providing 0.98%, 2.92%, and 5.57% improvements over the second-best methods, respectively. In particular, IDNP outperforms the other models on Yelp with regard to NDCG, improving 7.95% ($k = 1$) and 9.15% ($k = 10$) over the second-best model, respectively.

5.2.1 Meta-learning Benefits Few-shot Prediction. It is necessary to collect sufficient interaction data per user for NN-based models to capture user interest from interaction behavior. Thus, NN-based models suffer more from limited data amount than meta-learning based ones. The performance of meta-learning based models has been shown to outperform NN-based sequential recommendation models under such a few-shot prediction setting. IDNP consistently demonstrates superiority over all other models, even when compared to other meta-learning models.

5.2.2 Dilated Convolution Captures User Interests. Both NextItNet and GRec show competitive performances among NN-based sequential recommenders due to the dilated convolution they applied. Dilated convolution is effective in extending to larger receptive

Table 3: Ablation Study on MovieLens

Model Structure					Metric					
Variants	D	A	N	W	Hit@1	Recall@1	NDCG@1	Hit@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10
CNN	×	×	×	×	0.0091	0.0003	0.3961	0.1050	0.0025	0.5460
DCNN	✓	×	×	×	0.0113	0.0017	0.4695	0.0110	0.0036	0.5607
AIE	✓	×	×	×	0.0457	0.0020	0.4199	0.0260	0.0082	0.6018
DCNN+ANP	✓	×	×	×	0.0920	0.0171	0.5897	0.0718	0.0296	0.6556
AIE+ANP	✓	✓	✓	×	0.1597	0.0298	0.6013	0.3322	0.0521	0.6895
IDNP	✓	✓	✓	✓	0.1964	0.0338	0.6488	0.3723	0.0624	0.7097

fields without increasing model parameters. This seems particularly desirable when limited interaction data is available.

5.2.3 Temporal Modeling Limits Model Capacity. GRec is the most consistently performing NN-based model that considers future interaction patterns as far as few-shot setting is concerned. This somewhat exhibits similar effects as in IDNP that leaps over the limitations of “left-to-right” temporal modeling. Built upon NPs, IDNP learns to infer user interest dynamics, premised on order-invariant context interactions, which negates such a limitation as well. Despite limited observations, IDNP can recover interest functions by learning a global latent interest family that gives rises to correlations between short- and long-term interactions.

5.3 Ablation Study(RQ 2)

Upon discussion in Section 5.2, we further conduct ablation studies to quantify the effects of the modules introduced to IDNP and see if they are truly beneficial. We specifically compare five variants that removes certain designs of IDNP: 1) *CNN*: that removes dilated convolution (D), self-attention (A) in Encoder and NP-based inference (N). 2) *DCNN*: that removes (A) and (N). 3) *AIE*: that removes (N), and keeps short-term interest encoder only. 4) *DCNN+ANP* that removes (A) and performs NP-based inference, but without Wasserstein distance (W); 5) *AIE+ANP* that uses self-attention and performs NP-based inference, but without Wasserstein distance. Table 3 reports the results performed on MovieLens with the evaluation set due to page limitation.

The variant *CNN* reports the lowest performance with only 54.60% in NDCG@10. All three metrics are improved when it is equipped with any of the modules introduced by IDNP. By using the attentive interest encoder (A) to capture user short-term interests, the performance (Hit) is improved by 3.44% and 1.5% for $k = 1$ and $k = 10$, respectively. Following that, the NP-based inference provides a substantial improvement, shown by variants *DCNN+ANP* and *AIE+ANP*. The self-attention (A) applied to context interactions even results in improved results. We find that replacing KL-divergence with Wasserstein distance (W) further contributes to model performance. Therefore, all the modules introduced have a positive impact on the modeling of user interests.

5.4 Hyperparameter Sensitivity(RQ 3)

The choice of hyper-parameters does affect the model training. Further experiments are thus conducted on four datasets in regard to the size of context set N_c , length of the sliding window L and user/item embedding size d , as shown in Fig.4.

We first evaluate the impact of different sizes of context set N_c , with $L = 5$ and $d = 64$ are fixed. With the increase of the




Figure 4: Parameter sensitivity.

size of context set, IDNP on MovieLens shows an upward trend in Recall@10 and NDCG@10 before a slight decrease after the size exceeds $N_c = 8$. Gowalla and Yelp require a smaller size to achieve the best performance, with $N_c=7$ leading to the best performance on Gowalla and $N_c=5$ achieving the best results on Yelp. The best results on Amazon-book are produced by $N_c = 8$.

We then examine how the length of sliding window L affects outcomes, by fixing context size $N_c = 8$ and embedding size $d = 64$. Observe that MovieLens requires the most extended sliding window, i.e., $L = 10$, to achieve the best results of Recall@10 and NDCG@10. Amazon-book, however, only requires $L=6$ to achieve the best performance. The best evaluation results come from both metrics on Yelp is obtained when $L = 8$.

In terms of analyzing embedding size, we fix context size $L = 8$ and window length $N_c = 8$. We search the best outperformed embedding size of IDNP in {16, 32, 64, 128} and conduct experiments on four datasets. Using $d = 64$ in MovieLens, Yelp and Amazon-book leads to the highest results, whereas setting it to $d = 128$ brings about the best result in Gowalla. However, larger embedding size only provide 0.02% improvements in Recall@10 of Gowalla, which, however would cost more computing resources. As a result, we suggest $d = 64$ as the optimal embedding size for four datasets.

6 CONCLUSION

To capture user interest dynamics within limited user-item interaction, we propose a user Interest Dynamics modeling framework based on Neural Processes, namely IDNP. We apply dilated temporal convolution with self-attention to capture multi-scale interests with different importance in terms of relative distances. Neural Processes-based inference enables us to combine observed interactions with global latent user interests to estimate user's interest function at any query timestep. Extensive experiments demonstrate that IDNP can capture interest dynamics and produce reasonable next-basket recommendations with limited and non-consecutive interaction sequences. Our future work will focus on IDNP's ability to facilitate knowledge transfer among domains.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. 2017. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 214–223.
- [2] Ting Bai, Pan Du, Wayne Xin Zhao, Ji-Rong Wen, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2019. A long-short demands-aware model for next-item recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00066* (2019).
- [3] Luca Bertinetto, João F Henriques, Jack Valmadre, Philip Torr, and Andrea Vedaldi. 2016. Learning feed-forward one-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [4] Andrew Carr, Jared Nielsen, and David Wingate. 2019. Wasserstein Neural Processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00668* (2019).
- [5] Qiang Cui, Shu Wu, Qiang Liu, Wen Zhong, and Liang Wang. 2018. MV-RNN: A multi-view recurrent neural network for sequential recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 32, 2 (2018), 317–331.
- [6] Marco Cuturi. 2013. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [7] Manqing Dong, Feng Yuan, Lina Yao, Xiwei Xu, and Liming Zhu. 2020. Mamo: Memory-augmented meta-optimization for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 688–697.
- [8] Zhengxiao Du, Xiaowei Wang, Hongxia Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Jie Tang. 2019. Sequential scenario-specific meta learner for online recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 2895–2904.
- [9] Jiasheng Duan, Peng-Fei Zhang, Ruihong Qiu, and Zi Huang. 2022. Long short-term enhanced memory for sequential recommendation. *World Wide Web* (2022), 1–23.
- [10] Harrison Edwards and Amos Storkey. 2016. Towards a neural statistician. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.02185* (2016).
- [11] Li Fei-Fei, Robert Fergus, and Pietro Perona. 2006. One-shot learning of object categories. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 28, 4 (2006), 594–611.
- [12] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1126–1135.
- [13] Marta Garnelo, Dan Rosenbaum, Christopher Maddison, Tiago Ramalho, David Saxton, Murray Shanahan, Yee Whye Teh, Danilo Rezende, and SM Ali Eslami. 2018. Conditional neural processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1704–1713.
- [14] Marta Garnelo, Jonathan Schwarz, Dan Rosenbaum, Fabio Viola, Danilo J Rezende, SM Eslami, and Yee Whye Teh. 2018. Neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01622* (2018).
- [15] Balázs Hidasi and Alexandros Karatzoglou. 2018. Recurrent neural networks with top-k gains for session-based recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 843–852.
- [16] Balázs Hidasi, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Linas Baltrunas, and Domonkos Tikk. 2015. Session-based recommendations with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06939* (2015).
- [17] Jin Huang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Hongjian Dou, Ji-Rong Wen, and Edward Y Chang. 2018. Improving sequential recommendation with knowledge-enhanced memory networks. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*. 505–514.
- [18] Wang-Cheng Kang and Julian McAuley. 2018. Self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 197–206.
- [19] Hyunjik Kim, Andriy Mnih, Jonathan Schwarz, Marta Garnelo, Ali Eslami, Dan Rosenbaum, Oriol Vinyals, and Yee Whye Teh. 2019. Attentive neural processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.05761* (2019).
- [20] Durk P Kingma, Tim Salimans, and Max Welling. 2015. Variational dropout and the local reparameterization trick. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [21] Brenden M Lake, Tomer D Ullman, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Samuel J Gershman. 2017. Building machines that learn and think like people. *Behavioral and brain sciences* 40 (2017).
- [22] Hoyeop Lee, Jinbae Im, Seongwon Jang, Hyunsouk Cho, and Sehee Chung. 2019. Melu: Meta-learned user preference estimator for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 1073–1082.
- [23] Xixun Lin, Jia Wu, Chuan Zhou, Shirui Pan, Yanan Cao, and Bin Wang. 2021. Task-adaptive neural process for user cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 1306–1316.
- [24] Qiao Liu, Yifu Zeng, Refuoe Mokhosi, and Haibin Zhang. 2018. STAMP: short-term attention/memory priority model for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1831–1839.
- [25] Fuyu Lv, Taiwei Jin, Changlong Yu, Fei Sun, Quan Lin, Keping Yang, and Wilfred Ng. 2019. SDM: Sequential deep matching model for online large-scale recommender system. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2635–2643.
- [26] Sachin Ravi and Hugo Larochelle. 2016. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. (2016).
- [27] Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Joshua Tenenbaum, and Antonio Torralba. 2012. One-shot learning with a hierarchical nonparametric bayesian model. In *Proceedings of ICML Workshop on Unsupervised and Transfer Learning*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 195–206.
- [28] Adam Santoro, Sergey Bartunov, Matthew Botvinick, Daan Wierstra, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2016. Meta-learning with memory-augmented neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1842–1850.
- [29] Flood Sung, Yongxin Yang, Li Zhang, Tao Xiang, Philip HS Torr, and Timothy M Hospedales. 2018. Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 1199–1208.
- [30] Jiayi Tang and Ke Wang. 2018. Personalized top-n sequential recommendation via convolutional sequence embedding. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 565–573.
- [31] Manasi Vartak, Arvind Thiagarajan, Conrado Miranda, Jeshua Bratman, and Hugo Larochelle. 2017. A meta-learning perspective on cold-start recommendations for items. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [32] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [33] Oriol Vinyals, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Daan Wierstra, et al. 2016. Matching networks for one shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [34] Jianling Wang, Kaize Ding, and James Caverlee. 2021. Sequential recommendation for cold-start users with meta transitional learning. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1783–1787.
- [35] Jianfeng Wang, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Daniela Massiceti, Xiaolin Hu, Vladimir Pavlovic, and Alexandros Neophytou. 2022. NP-Match: When Neural Processes meet Semi-Supervised Learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 22919–22934.
- [36] An Yan, Shuo Cheng, Wang-Cheng Kang, Mengting Wan, and Julian McAuley. 2019. CosRec: 2D convolutional neural networks for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 2173–2176.
- [37] Haochao Ying, Fuzhen Zhuang, Fuzheng Zhang, Yanchi Liu, Guandong Xu, Xing Xie, Hui Xiong, and Jian Wu. 2018. Sequential recommender system based on hierarchical attention network. In *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [38] Jiaxuan You, Yichen Wang, Aditya Pal, Pong Eksombatchai, Chuck Rosenberg, and Jure Leskovec. 2019. Hierarchical temporal convolutional networks for dynamic recommender systems. In *The world wide web conference*. 2236–2246.
- [39] Fisher Yu and Vladlen Koltun. 2015. Multi-scale context aggregation by dilated convolutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.07122* (2015).
- [40] Fajie Yuan, Xiangnan He, Haochuan Jiang, Guibing Guo, Jian Xiong, Zhezha Xu, and Yilin Xiong. 2020. Future data helps training: Modeling future contexts for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*. 303–313.
- [41] Fajie Yuan, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Ioannis Arapakis, Joemon M Jose, and Xiangnan He. 2019. A Simple Convolutional Generative Network for Next Item Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. ACM.
- [42] Shuai Zhang, Lina Yao, Aixin Sun, and Yi Tay. 2019. Deep learning based recommender system: A survey and new perspectives. *ACM Computing Surveys*

(*CSUR*) 52, 1 (2019), 1–38.

- [43] Jing Zhu, Yanan Xu, and Yanmin Zhu. 2020. Modeling long-term and short-term interests with parallel attentions for session-based recommendation. In

International Conference on Database Systems for Advanced Applications. Springer, 654–669.