

Post-Training Attribute Unlearning in Recommender Systems

CHAOCHAO CHEN, Zhejiang University, China

YIZHAO ZHANG, Zhejiang University, China

YUYUAN LI*, Zhejiang University, China

DAN MENG, OPPO Research Institute., China

JUN WANG, OPPO Research Institute., China

XIAOLI ZHENG, Zhejiang University, China

JIANWEI YIN, Zhejiang University, China

With the growing privacy concerns in recommender systems, recommendation unlearning is getting increasing attention. Existing studies predominantly use training data, i.e., model inputs, as unlearning target. However, attackers can extract private information from the model even if it has not been explicitly encountered during training. We name this unseen information as *attribute* and treat it as unlearning target. To protect the sensitive attribute of users, Attribute Unlearning (AU) aims to make target attributes indistinguishable. In this paper, we focus on a strict but practical setting of AU, namely Post-Training Attribute Unlearning (PoT-AU), where unlearning can only be performed after the training of the recommendation model is completed. To address the PoT-AU problem in recommender systems, we propose a two-component loss function. The first component is distinguishability loss, where we design a distribution-based measurement to make attribute labels indistinguishable from attackers. We further extend this measurement to handle multi-class attribute cases with efficient computational overhead. The second component is regularization loss, where we explore a function-space measurement that effectively maintains recommendation performance compared to parameter-space regularization. We use stochastic gradient descent algorithm to optimize our proposed loss. Extensive experiments on four real-world datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed methods.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Recommender systems**; **Collaborative filtering**; • **Security and privacy** → **Social network security and privacy**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Recommender Systems, Collaborative Filtering, Attribute Unlearning

ACM Reference Format:

Chaochao Chen, Yizhao Zhang, Yuyuan Li, Dan Meng, Jun Wang, Xiaoli Zheng, and Jianwei Yin. 2018. Post-Training Attribute Unlearning in Recommender Systems. *J. ACM* 37, 4, Article 111 (August 2018), 25 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems have been widely applied in practice with great success, having a substantial influence on people's lifestyles [16, 27, 55]. The success lies in their ability to extract highly

*Corresponding author.

Authors' addresses: Chaochao Chen, zjuccc@zju.edu.cn, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China; Yizhao Zhang, 22221337@zju.edu.cn, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China; Yuyuan Li, 11821022@zju.edu.cn, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China; Dan Meng, mengdan90@163.com, OPPO Research Institute., Shenzhen, China; Jun Wang, junwang.lu@gmail.com, OPPO Research Institute., Shenzhen, China; Xiaoli Zheng, xlzheng@zju.edu.cn, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China; Jianwei Yin, zjuyjw@cs.zju.edu.cn, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM 0004-5411/2018/8-ART111

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>




Fig. 1. Illustrations of different unlearning targets.

Table 1. Difference between input unlearning and attribute unlearning in recommender systems.

	Input Unlearning	Attribute Unlearning
Unlearning target	Input data (used in training)	Latent attribute (not used in training)
Applicability of retraining from scratch	Ground truth	Not applicable

personalized information from user data. However, people have grown more aware of privacy concerns in personalized recommendations, and demand their sensitive information be protected. As one of the protective measures, *Right to be Forgotten* [11, 12, 18] requires recommendation platforms to enable users to withdraw their individual data and its impact, which impulses the study of machine/recommendation unlearning.

Existing studies on machine unlearning mainly use training data, i.e., model inputs, as the unlearning target [50]. We name this type of unlearning task as Input Unlearning (IU). As shown in Fig. 1, in the recommendation scenarios, the input data can be a user-item interaction matrix. With different unlearning targets, IU can be user-wise, item-wise, and instance-wise [15]. IU benefits multiple parties, e.g., data providers and model owners, because the target data can be i) the specified data that contains users' sensitive information, and ii) the dirty data that is polluted by accidental mistakes or intentional attack [40].

Extensive studies on IU cannot obscure the importance of Attribute Unlearning (AU), where attributes represent the inherent properties, e.g., gender, race, and age of users that have **not** been used for training (Table 1: difference in unlearning target) but implicitly learned by embedding models. Due to the information extraction capabilities of recommender systems, AU is especially valuable in the context of recommendation. Although recommendation models did not see the latent attribute, existing research has found that basic machine learning models can successfully infer users' attributes from the user embeddings learned by collaborative filtering models [19], which is also known as attribute inference attack [4, 35, 69, 70]. Therefore, from the perspective of privacy preservation, AU is as important as IU in recommender systems. However, existing IU methods cannot be applied in AU. As illustrated in Table 1, retraining from scratch (ground truth for IU) is unable to unlearn the latent attribute, i.e., not applicable for AU, since it is not explicitly utilized during training at all.

Existing but limited research on AU has focused on In-Training AU (InT-AU) [19, 26], where unlearning is performed during model training (as shown in the upper part of Fig. 2). In this paper, we focus on a more strict AU setting, namely Post-Training Attribute Unlearning (PoT-AU), where we can only manipulate the model, i.e., updating parameters, after the training is fully completed and have no knowledge about training data or other training information (as shown in the bottom part of Fig. 2). Compared with InT-AU, this setting is more practical, because of i) *data accessibility*: we may not get access to the training data or other information after training due to regulations, and ii) *deployment overhead*: non-interference with the original training process is more flexible and reduces deployment overhead. Fig. 2 presents an overview of PoT-AU in recommender systems, where user embeddings are the target of attacking and unlearning. There are two goals for PoT-AU in recommender systems. The primary goal (**Goal #1**) is to make the target attribute indistinguishable to the inference attacking, or more directly, to degrade the attacking performance. The other goal (**Goal #2**) is to maintain the recommendation performance. This goal is equally important as the primary one, since both users and recommendation platforms want to avoid having a negative impact on the original recommendation tasks.

To achieve the above two goals in the PoT-AU problem, Li et al. [43] consider it as an optimization problem concerning user embeddings. They subsequently design a two-component loss function that consists of distinguishability loss and regularization loss. Although effective for the PoT-AU problem, this method has two shortcomings. Firstly, the distinguishability loss was designed to minimize the distance between two groups of user embeddings, which leads to significant computational complexity in the case of multi-class attributes, where the number of label categories is large. Secondly, we observed that the performance of the recommendation decreases when attribute unlearning is performed, particularly in multi-class scenario. This decline in performance can be attributed to the discrepancy between the proposed parameter-space regularization loss [43] and the intended function-space regularization, as evidenced by our empirical study in Section 4.4.3. Analyzing the above two shortcomings, we identify two key challenges for PoT-AU, **CH1**: How can we reduce the computational complexity of multi-class attribute unlearning? **CH2**: How can we maintain the recommendation performance while achieving attribute unlearning?

To address these challenges, we further modify the design of both distinguishability loss and regularization loss. For **CH1**, we establish an *anchor* distribution and minimize the distance between other distributions with it. This approach reduces the computational complexity from $O(T^2)$ to $O(T)$, where T is the number of attribute categories, e.g., female and male when $T = 2$. For **CH2**, we propose a data-free regularization loss ℓ_r in the function space, which directly regularizes the function of model to preserve recommendation performance.

It is worth mentioning that this work is an extension of our previous work [43]. Compared with [43], we extend the study of binary-class attributes to the multi-class scenario, identifying the shortcomings of our previous work in this scenario, i.e., *significant computational complexity* and *limited preservation of recommendation performance*. To overcome these two shortcomings, we i) establish an anchor distribution to mitigate computational complexity, and ii) propose a data-free regularization loss in the function space to directly align recommendation performance. As will be shown in Fig. 7, there is a negative correlation between our proposed regularization loss and the similarity between recommendation performance before and after unlearning. This correlation indicates that our regularization loss is more effective than the ℓ_2 loss proposed in [43]. Furthermore, we conduct additional experiments of AU in the multi-class scenario to demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposed method. We summarize the main contributions of this paper as follows:

- We study the PoT-AU problem, which is more strict and practical than InT-AU. We identify two essential goals of PoT-AU, and propose a two-component loss function, with each component devised to target one of the aforementioned goals.
- To address **CH1**, we extend the distributional perspective distinguishability loss from binary-class attributes to the multi-class scenario by introducing an anchor distribution.
- To address **CH2**, we explore a data-free function-space measurement as the regularization loss to maintain the recommendation performance during unlearning.
- We conduct extensive experiments on four real-world datasets with in-depth analyses to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed methods regarding both unlearning (**Goal #1**) and recommendation (**Goal #2**).

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, in addition to AU, we also briefly introduce machine unlearning and recommendation unlearning to offer a comprehensive literature review.

2.1 Machine Unlearning

Machine unlearning, an emerging paradigm in the field of privacy-preserving machine learning, aims to completely remove user's data from a trained model [50]. A straightforward unlearning method is to retrain the model from scratch on the dataset that eliminates the target data. However, it is computationally prohibitive for large-scale models in real-world scenarios. Current studies on machine unlearning can be divided into two main categories based on the level of unlearning completeness.

- **Exact Unlearning** aims to ensure that the data is completely unlearned from the model, akin to retraining from scratch. Cao and Yang [13] first studied the machine unlearning problem and transformed training data points into a reduced number of summations to enhance unlearning efficiency. Bourtole et al. [9] proposed a general unlearning method, i.e. SISA (Sharded, Isolated, Sliced and Aggregated), based on partition-aggregation framework. SISA reduces the retraining overhead to subsets. Recently, Yan et al. [67] proposed a novel partition-aggregation unlearning framework, i.e., ARCANE, which partitions data by class. To enable training for each subset, ARCANE transforms the original classification task into multiple one-class classification tasks.
- **Approximate Unlearning** aims to estimate the influence of unlearning target, and directly remove the influence through parameter manipulation, i.e., updating parameters with the purpose of unlearning [22, 25, 57, 64]. Approximate unlearning relaxes the definition of exact unlearning and only provides a statistical guarantee of unlearning completeness. The influence of target data is usually estimated by influence function [37, 38]. However, it is found to be fragile in deep learning [3].

2.2 Recommendation Unlearning

Following SISA's partition-aggregation framework, Chen et al. [15] proposed an exact recommendation unlearning framework named RecEraser, which groups similar data together and uses an attention-based aggregator to enhance recommendation performance. Similarly, LASER also groups similar data together [44]. Lately, Li et al. [41] proposed a novel grouping method based on optimal transport theory to obtain partition results more effectively and efficiently. Approximate unlearning is also investigated in the context of recommendation [42, 71].

2.3 Attribute Unlearning

Existing studies of machine unlearning predominately focus on unlearning specific samples from the training data, ignoring the latent attributes that are irrelevant to the training process. Guo et al. [26] firstly studied the AU problem and proposed to manipulate disentangled representatives to unlearn particular attributes of facial images, e.g., smiling, mustache, and big nose. Specifically, the manipulation is achieved by splitting the model into a feature extractor and a classifier, and then adding a network block between them. Furthermore, Moon et al. [49] investigated AU in generative models, e.g., generative adversarial nets and variational autoencoders, by learning a transformation from the image containing the target attribute to the image without it.

As recommender systems potentially capture the sensitive information of users, e.g., gender, race, and age, AU is non-trivial in the recommendation scenario. However, representative manipulation and learning a transformation with public datasets may not be universally applicable in the context of recommendation [26]. For AU in recommendation, Ganhor et al. [19] introduce adversarial training to achieve AU for recommendation model based on variational autoencoder. This work is under the setting of In-Training AU (InT-AU), which involves manipulating the training process. Different from InT-AU, our previous work [43] and this work aim to achieve *model-agnostic* AU under the *post-training* setting (PoT-AU). This is more strict and practical because i) we can only manipulate the model parameters when training is completed, ii) as the training data or other training information, e.g., gradients, are usually protected or discarded after training, we cannot get access to them to enhance performance, and iii) it is more flexible for recommendation platforms to manipulate the model based on unlearning requests without interfering with the original process of training.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first revisit the paradigm of collaborative filtering models. Then, we specify the details of attribute inference attack. The notations used in this paper are listed in Table 2.

3.1 Collaborative Filtering

Discovering user preferences on items based on historical behavior forms the foundation of collaborative filtering modeling [34, 47, 59]. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_M\}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$ denote the user and item set, respectively. The interaction set $\mathcal{R} = \{(u, v) | u \text{ interacted with } v\}$ indicates the implicit relationships between each user in \mathcal{U} and his/her consumed items. The interaction set $\mathcal{R} = \{(u, v) | u \text{ interacted with } v\}$ indicates the implicit interaction. In general, many existing collaborative filtering approaches are designed with encoder network $f(\cdot)$ to generate low-dimensional representations of users and items $f(u), f(v) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (d is the dimension of latent space). For example, matrix factorization models typically employ an embedding table as the encoder, while graph-based models incorporate neighborhood information into the encoder. Then, the predicted score is defined as the similarity between user and item representation (e.g., dot product). Regarding the learning objective, most studies adopt the Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [53] loss or the Cross Entropy (CE) loss [32] to train the model:

$$\mathcal{L}_{BPR} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R}|} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{R}} -\log(\text{sigmoid}(s_{u,v} - s_{u,v^-})), \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}^-|} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}^-} r_{u,v} \log(s_{u,v}) + (1 - r_{u,v}) \log(1 - s_{u,v}), \quad (2)$$

Table 2. Description of Notations

Notations	Description
\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}	The set of users and items
M, N	The number of users and items
u, v	The user and item
\mathcal{R}	The set of interactions
\mathcal{R}^-	The set of sampled negative interactions
$r_{u,v}$	The interaction between u and v
$s_{u,v}$	The predicted score of recommendation model between u and v
e_u, e_v	The embedding of user u and item v
d	The dimension of user embedding
S_i	The i -th category of attribute
T	The sum of categories of attribute
θ	The user embedding matrix
\mathbb{P}_i	The distribution of user embedding with label S_i
\mathcal{H}	A hypothesis class of VC dimension
\mathcal{G}	The reproducing kernel Hilbert space with Gaussian kernel function
$Dist$	The measure of discrepancy between distributions
β	The weight of each distribution for computing anchor distribution
k	The length of top- k item lists for ranking alignment
K	The length of the recommendation list for NDCG and HR metric
ℓ_2	L2 regularization term
ℓ_u	The distinguishability loss
ℓ_r	functional regularization term
λ	The margin in ℓ_r
w	The weight of margin in ℓ_r

where v^- is a randomly sampled negative item that the user has not interacted with, \mathcal{R}^- is the set of negative samples, s denotes the predicted score. $r_{u,v}$ denotes the interaction between u and v , which is set as 1 if $(u, v) \in \mathcal{R}$ and 0 otherwise.

3.2 Attacking Setting

The process of attacking in PoT-AU problem is also known as attribute inference attack, which consists of three stages, i.e., exposure, training, and inference. In the *exposure* stage, we assume that attackers follow the setting of grey-box attack. In other words, not all model parameters but only users' embeddings and their corresponding attribute information are exposed to attackers. In the *training* stage, we assume that attackers train the attacking model on a shadow dataset, which can be generated by sampling from the original users or users from the same distribution [54]. Although shadow-dataset training will inevitably reduce attacking performance, this assumption is reasonable, since the full-dataset setting is too strong and impractical. Regarding the attack as a classification task, the attacker use user embeddings as input data and attribute information as labels. Different from [43], we extend the binary setting to multi-label scenarios in this paper. In the *inference* stage, attackers use their trained attacking models to make predictions.

Note that our paper adopts a different attacking setting compared to previous studies on defense against attribute inference attack [4, 69, 70]. Specifically, our focus in attacking is primarily on the

privacy of trained models rather than the implicit information presented in the original interaction data, aligning with the goal of attribute unlearning. This is because, access to training data is limited within the context of PoT-AU. Additionally, instead of using the top- k recommended item list (model output), we select embedding layer of collaborative filtering model as the input for the attacking model.

4 POST-TRAINING ATTRIBUTE UNLEARNING

In this section, we provide a detailed explanation of our motivation and delve into the process of the PoT-AU problem in recommender systems. Subsequently, we consider the PoT-AU problem as an optimization problem and propose a novel two-component loss function to address it.

4.1 Motivation

As shown in Fig. 2, we divide the entire process of PoT-AU into two stages, i.e., the training stage and the post-training stage. In the training stage, the recommender system trains an original collaborative filtering model using input data. To align with the post-training setting, we leave this stage untamed and assume that no additional information in this stage is available, except for the recommendation model and the attributes of users. In the post-training stage, we generate new user embedding by unlearning the original one. The updated embeddings, i.e., user embeddings after unlearning, is supposed to achieve two goals simultaneously.

- **Goal #1** (unlearning) is to make target attributes distinguishable so as to protect attribute information from attackers.
- **Goal #2** (recommendation) is to maintain the original recommendation performance, ensuring that the initial requirements of users are not compromised.

Compared with the In-Training (InT) setting, the Post-Training (PoT) setting is more challenging. Firstly, PoT-AU allows no interference with the training process. Adding network block [26], and adversarial training [19] are not applicable under this setting. Secondly, even though PoT-AU cuts down the connection with the training process, directly manipulating user embeddings by adding artificially designed noise, e.g., differential privacy [1], is inappropriate. because i) it will inevitably degrade recommendation performance, and ii) its unlearning ability is not promising, as the functional mechanism of attacking models, including complex machine learning models, is not well understood. Thirdly, PoT-AU prohibits access to the input data and other training information that could be either unavailable or under protection and cannot be used for fine-tuning user embeddings, e.g., adding noise to the embeddings and then fine-tuning to boost recommendation performance.

4.2 Two-Component Loss Function

In the context of the PoT setting, one feasible solution is to conceptualize the desired final user embeddings while temporarily disregarding the intermediate manipulation and transformation processes. As a result, we formulate the PoT-AU as an optimization problem on user embeddings. In other words, our aim is to devise a suitable loss function and leverage optimization techniques to accomplish the task. Our previous work has demonstrated the effectiveness of this approach [43].

Specifically, we propose a two-component loss function that is specifically devised to address the two goals in the PoT-AU problem, i.e., **Goal #1**: unlearning and **Goal #2**: recommendation. Each component of the loss function is tailored to achieve one of these goals. The trade-off coefficient α is introduced to get a balance between attribute unlearning and recommendation:

$$L(\theta) = \ell_u + \alpha \ell_r, \quad (3)$$




Fig. 2. Overview of Post-Training Attribute Unlearning (PoT-AU) in recommender systems. \mathcal{L}_u denotes the distinguishability loss designed for **Goal #1**, \mathcal{L}_r denotes the regularization loss designed for **Goal #2**. The orange dots represent positive items which are in the top- l positions of recommended list, while the gray dots represent the opposite. We omit other parameters in the collaborative filtering model besides embeddings for conciseness.

where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d}$ denotes user embeddings to be updated, ℓ_u and ℓ_r represent the loss for **Goal #1** and **Goal #2** respectively.

4.3 Distinguishability Loss

The core difficulty of designing a proper two-component loss function lies in defining distinguishability loss ℓ_u , which is related to the primary goal of PoT-AU, i.e., **Goal #1**: making the target attribute indistinguishable. In our previous work, we define the distinguishability from a perspective of distribution, namely Distribution-to-Distribution loss (D2D) [43]. Without loss of generality, we assume the target attribute has binary labels: S_1 and S_2 , and extend it to multi-label scenarios in Section 4.3.2.

4.3.1 Binary-Label Scenario. We consider the user embeddings with the same attribute label as a distribution, e.g., \mathbb{P}_1 denotes the embedding distribution of users with label S_1 . Inspired by Theorem 1, the distinguishability of user performance can be bounded by the \mathcal{H} -divergence of their distributions $div_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$.

THEOREM 1. [Bound on Domain Risk [5]] Let \mathcal{H} be a hypothesis class of VC dimension d . With probability $1 - \epsilon$ over the choice of samples $\theta_1 \sim \mathbb{P}_1^n$ and $\theta_2 \sim \mathbb{P}_2^n$, for every $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$R_{\theta_1}(\eta) - R_{\theta_2}(\eta) \leq \hat{div}_{\mathcal{H}}(\theta_1, \theta_2) + \beta + \gamma, \quad (4)$$

with $\beta = \sqrt{\frac{4}{n}(d \log \frac{2en}{d} + \log \frac{4}{\epsilon})} + 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}(d \log \frac{2n}{d} + \log \frac{4}{\epsilon})}$, and $\gamma \geq \inf_{\eta^* \in \mathcal{H}} [R_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\eta^*) + R_{\mathbb{P}_2}(\eta^*)]$.

In Theorem 1, $\hat{div}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the empirical \mathcal{H} -divergence, and R is the domain risk which represents the recommendation loss in our scenarios, reflecting the performance of users. For practical consideration, it is worth noting that the embeddings of all users are trained together without any attribution information. As a result, the shapes of the embedding distribution tend to be similar across different attribute labels. The difference in distributions mainly comes from their distance. Therefore, we use $dist(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$ to approximate $div_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$ and omit the constants for simplicity. We name this type of distinguishability measurement as D2D loss and define it as follows:

DEFINITION 1 (DISTRIBUTION-TO-DISTRIBUTION DISTINGUISHABILITY [43]). *Given two distributions of embedding from users with different attribute labels P_{θ_1} and P_{θ_2} , we define distribution-to-distribution distinguishability as the distance between two distributions:*

$$\ell_{u,D} = \text{Dist}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2). \quad (5)$$

Here, we apply MMD with radial kernels [63] to measure the distance of two distributions, which satisfies several properties that are required as a distance measurement, including non-negativity and exchange invariance, i.e., $\text{Dist}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \text{Dist}(\mathbb{P}_2, \mathbb{P}_1)$. Specifically, by mapping the original distributions to a reproducing kernel Hilbert space \mathcal{G} with function $\phi(\cdot)$, the MMD between \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 is defined as:

$$\text{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq 1} \|\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mathbb{P}_1}[\phi(\theta_1)] - \mathbb{E}_{\theta_2 \sim \mathbb{P}_2}[\phi(\theta_2)]\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1 \sim \mathbb{P}_1}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation with regard to distribution \mathbb{P}_1 in \mathcal{G} , i.e., kernel mean embedding, $\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{G}} \leq 1$ defines a set of functions in the unit ball of \mathcal{G} . For simplicity, we let μ to denote kernel mean embedding of the distribution \mathbb{P} , then we have $\mu(\mathbb{P}) = \int \phi(\theta) d\mathbb{P}(\theta)$. Given a collection of samples $\theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$, a natural empirical estimator [14, 61] of kernel mean embedding is given by:

$$\mu(\mathbb{P}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(\theta_i). \quad (7)$$

Thus, given n samples from $\theta_1 \sim \mathbb{P}_1$ and m samples from $\theta_2 \sim \mathbb{P}_2$, MMD can be empirically estimated [24] as:

$$\widehat{\text{MMD}}^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n \kappa(\theta_1^i, \theta_1^j) + \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \neq i}^m \kappa(\theta_2^i, \theta_2^j) - \frac{2}{nm} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \kappa(\theta_1^i, \theta_2^j), \quad (8)$$

where $\kappa(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the kernel function, i.e., Gaussian kernel function [56]. Based on MMD, we have the distinguishability loss ℓ_u :

$$\ell_u = \text{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2). \quad (9)$$

4.3.2 Multi-Label Scenario. Given that the computational complexity of MMD in binary-label scenarios is assumed to be $O(1)$, minimizing $\ell_{u,D}$ for each pair of $(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$ can become computationally prohibitive in multi-label scenarios with a large number of labels, i.e., T . In such cases, the computational complexity increases to $O(T^2)$. Moreover, note that directly minimizing $\ell_{u,D}$ of each distribution pair may lead to instability during unlearning.

To extend our proposed $\ell_{u,D}$ loss to multi-label attribute unlearning, we introduce an *anchor distribution* to reduce complexity. Specifically, given T distributions, the anchor distribution is defined as a distribution \mathbb{P}^* , which minimizes the average sum of weighted distances between itself and the aforementioned T distributions. This objective is equivalent to identifying an interpolation between several probability measures, which is also known as barycenter estimation [2]. Formally, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbb{P}} \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \cdot \text{Dist}(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_i), \quad (10)$$

where \mathbb{P} denotes an interpolation distribution of user embedding, and β_i denotes the weight of distribution \mathbb{P}_i . The weight β_i is typically determined empirically based on the size of the distribution, i.e., $|\mathbb{P}_i|/M$ [48, 60].

Previous studies [2, 17] introduce Wasserstein distance to compute barycenter. However, within the context of PoT-AU, the computational complexity of estimating Wasserstein barycenter grows exponentially when the dimension of user embedding d increases. Therefore, following our choice in binary-label scenarios (Section 4.3.1), we use the MMD distance with Gaussian kernel to estimate the barycenter for simplicity. Specifically, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbb{P}} \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \|\mu(\mathbb{P}) - \mu(\mathbb{P}_i)\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2, \quad (11)$$

which is equivalent to finding an optimal kernel mean embedding μ^* in \mathcal{H} that minimizes

$$\mu^* = \arg \min_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \|\mu - \mu(\mathbb{P}_i)\|_{\mathcal{G}}^2. \quad (12)$$

As Equation (12) is a strongly convex quadratic function of μ , the minimum is given by the first-order condition:

$$\mu^* = \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \mu(\mathbb{P}_i). \quad (13)$$

As the integral in kernel mean embedding is estimated by Equation (7), we can set $\beta_i = |\mathbb{P}_i|/M$ to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* &= \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \mu(\mathbb{P}_i) = \mu\left(\sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \mathbb{P}_i\right), \\ \mathbb{P}^* &= \sum_{i=1}^T \beta_i \mathbb{P}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Thus, we can obtain the anchor distribution by weighted interpolation, i.e., Equation (14). For the implementation, we perform sampling from the distribution of all user embeddings to estimate the anchor distribution \mathbb{P}^* without extra computational cost.

With the help of anchor distribution, we can reduce the computational complexity of ℓ_u from $O(T^2)$ to $O(T)$ by only calculating the MMD distance between the anchor distribution and the T distributions. Formally, we have:

$$\ell_u = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \text{MMD}^2(\mathbb{P}_i, \mathbb{P}^*). \quad (15)$$

With our proposed D2D distinguishability loss ℓ_u , we can not only preserve the shape of user embedding distributions, but also efficiently achieve attribute unlearning in multi-label scenarios.

4.4 Regularization Loss

To achieve **Goal #2** under the PoT setting, we introduce a data-free regularization loss, namely ℓ_r , in Equation (3). This is necessary as we lack access to training data, and therefore can only rely on regularization loss to maintain recommendation performance while conducting unlearning.

4.4.1 Regularization in Parameter Space. In previous work [43], we employ the widely acknowledged ℓ_2 norm [7] as the regularization loss, which regularizes user embedding in the parameter space. This approach is based on the intuition that closer model parameters will lead to similar

model performance, thus preserving the recommendation performance. Formally, we have:

$$\ell_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^d (\theta_{i,j} - \theta_{i,j}^*)^2, \quad (16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ denotes the original user embeddings before unlearning.

4.4.2 Regularization in Function Space. However, this intuition may be inaccurate during model training and fine-tuning. Benjamin et al. [6] found that a change in the parameter space might serve as a *poor indicator* for the change in the function space, i.e., model performance.

Similar to the scenario of PoT-AU, Continual Learning requires optimizing the model without utilizing training data while maintaining performance on the original task. Motivated by previous studies in Continual Learning [36, 45, 51], we consider a more fundamental regularization method, i.e., functional regularization, to achieve **Goal#2** without accessing training data. The function of recommendation models is to provide users with a list of recommended items by mining their preferences, thus we fetch the recommended list before unlearning as the target of regularization. Given that items positioned at the top of rank lists hold greater significance compared to those lower down [62], we only regularize the top- k recommended items for each user. Specifically, we formulate the regularization of rank list as a Learning to Rank task, and introduce a data-free rank regularization loss, denoted as ℓ_r . Instead of regularizing user embeddings in parameter space, we focus on minimizing the discrepancy in the order of top- k items in the recommended list before and after unlearning. This approach directly regularizes user embeddings in function space, aligning perfectly with **Goal#2**.

Here we use the pair-wise loss to regularize the original top- k item list [10, 52, 72]. Formally, we have:

$$\ell_{pr} = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \max(0, \hat{s}_{u_i, v_{j+1}} - \hat{s}_{u_i, v_j} + \lambda_1) + \sum_{j=1}^k \max(0, \hat{s}_{u_i, neg_j} - \hat{s}_{u_i, v_j} + \lambda_2) \right], \quad (17)$$

where v_i denotes the i -th item in the top- k list before unlearning, and \hat{s}_{v_i} denotes the score of item v_i after unlearning. We also sample k items that are not in the original top- k list as negative samples, denoted by neg_i . λ_1 and λ_2 are two margin values, which are regarded as hyper-parameters. This loss function is composed of two pairwise terms based on Hinge loss [21]. The first term aims to maximize the probability of ranking positive items in the same order as the top- k list before unlearning, while the second term aims to improve the score of items in the top- k list. However, directly regularizing the unlearning optimization with ℓ_{pr} may have a negative impact on the recommendation performance. ℓ_{pr} only considers the relative order of the items in the first k positions, but ignores the absolute difference between them. Since λ_1 and λ_2 are fixed, ℓ_{pr} may amplify the rating difference between similar items and reduce the rating difference between dissimilar items. To solve this problem, we propose an adaptive weight for λ . Specifically, we assume that the weight of margin for an item pair (v_i, v_{i+1}) should be negatively correlated to the similarity between v_i and v_{i+1} :

$$w_{v_i, v_{i+1}} \propto \frac{1}{\text{sim}(e_{v_i}, e_{v_{i+1}})}, \quad (18)$$

where sim denotes the cosine similarity between item embeddings. Following [52], we use a parametrized geometric distribution for weighting the margin:

$$w_{v_i, v_{i+1}} \propto 1 - \text{sigmoid}\left[\frac{\text{sim}(e_{v_i}, e_{v_{i+1}})}{\tau}\right], \quad (19)$$




Fig. 3. Correlation between two types of regularization losses and RBO (similarity in recommendation performance), where the x-axis and y-axis represent values of losses and RBO, respectively. Note that ℓ_2 is a parameter-space regularization, and ℓ_r is a function-space regularization. (a) Adding perturbation and calculating ℓ_2 ; (b) Adding perturbation and calculating ℓ_r . The Pearson correlation coefficients for (a) and (b) are -0.255 and -0.766 respectively.

where τ denotes the the hyperparameter that controls the sharpness of the distribution. Finally, we have:

$$\ell_r = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \max(0, \hat{s}_{u_i, v_{j+1}} - \hat{s}_{u_i, v_j} + w_{v_j, v_{j+1}} \cdot \lambda) + \sum_{j=1}^k \max(0, \hat{s}_{u_i, neg_j} - \hat{s}_{u_i, v_j} + w_{v_j, neg_j} \cdot \lambda) \right]. \quad (20)$$

By utilizing ℓ_r , we can more directly and effectively maintain the model's performance while conducting unlearning.

4.4.3 Comparison of Parameter and Function Spaces. We conduct a simulated empirical study to investigate the discrepancy between parameter and function spaces in the context of PoT-AU. Specifically, we directly add Gaussian perturbations into the original user embeddings, and repeat the process 300 times to observe the discrepancy in regularization losses and recommendation performance, i.e., model function. We use Rank Biased Overlap (RBO) [65] to measure the similarity of top@10 recommended item lists, which reflects discrepancy in the function space. Note that the perturbation budget is set as 0.5 ($\|\Delta_u\| \leq 0.5$, where Δ_u denotes the perturbation.)

Based on the visual results (Fig. 3), it is evident that there is a substantial correlation between our newly proposed function-space regularization loss ℓ_r and RBO. In contrast, the parameter-space regularization loss ℓ_2 exhibits a relatively lower correlation with RBO. Specifically, the Pearson correlation coefficient for ℓ_r is -0.766, whereas for ℓ_2 , it is merely -0.255. This observation provides evidence of the limited effectiveness of the parameter-space loss ℓ_2 in accurately measuring the changes in the function space. However, our newly proposed function-space regularization loss ℓ_r shows a stronger capability in this regard, thereby contributing to the preservation of recommendation performance. To comprehensively evaluate the proposed ℓ_r loss, we also analyze the difference between regularization in the parameter space and function space during attribute unlearning process in Section 5.2.5.

4.5 Putting Together

Incorporating the proposed distinguishability loss ℓ_u (Equation (15)) and regularization loss ℓ_r (Equation (20)), we formulate the two-component loss function (Equation (3)) for the PoT-AU problem. We apply the stochastic gradient descent algorithm [8] to optimize our proposed loss.

5 EXPERIMENTS

To comprehensively evaluate our proposed methods, we conduct experiments on four benchmark datasets and observe the performance in terms of unlearning and recommendation. We also investigate the efficiency and robustness of our proposed loss functions. We further conduct a detailed analysis of the unlearning process and compared D2D-PR with D2D-FR to showcase the superior effectiveness of D2D-FR in preserving recommendation performance. Specifically, We aim to answer the following research questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** Can our method effectively unlearning attributes under the setting of PoT-AU?
- **RQ2:** can our method maintain the recommendation performance after unlearning?
- **RQ3:** How about the efficiency of our proposed method?
- **RQ4:** What is the impact of key hyper-parameters in unlearning and recommendation performance of our proposed method?
- **RQ5:** What is the contribution of our proposed D2D-FR compared with D2D-PR?
- **RQ6:** Can our method maintain unlearning performance when the attribute inference attacker utilizes different kinds of models?

5.1 Experimental Settings

5.1.1 Datasets. Experiments are conducted on four publicly accessible datasets that contain both input data, i.e., user-item interactions, and user attributes, i.e., gender, age and country.

- **MovieLens 100K (ML-100K)**¹: MovieLens is one of the most widely used datasets in the recommendation [28, 29]. They collected users' ratings towards movies as well as other attributes, e.g., gender, age, and occupation. ML-100K is the version containing 100 thousand ratings.
- **MovieLens 1M (ML-1M)**: A version of MovieLens dataset that has 1 million ratings.
- **LFM-2B**²: This dataset collected more than 2 billion listening events, which is used for music retrieval and recommendation tasks [46]. LFM-2B also contains user attributes including gender and country. Here we use a subset of the whole dataset which includes more than 3 million ratings.
- **KuaiSAR-small**³: KuaiSAR is a unified search and recommendation dataset containing the genuine user behavior logs collected from the short-video mobile app, Kuaishou⁴. Here we use a tiny version of KuaiSAR, i.e., KuaiSAR-small. It also includes two attributes of users, namely Feat1 and Feat2.

For these datasets, we first filter out the users without valid attribute information, then we only keep the users that rated at least 5 items and the items with at least 5 user interactions following [32, 66]. The characteristics of datasets are summarized in Table 3.

To evaluate the recommendation performance, we use the leave-one-out method which is widely used in literature [32]. That is, we reserve the last two items for each user (ranked by the timestamp of interaction), one as the validation item and the other as the test item.

Regarding attribute data, we utilize three attributes, i.e., age, gender and country, from MovieLens and LFM-2B. Following [4, 19, 69], we categorize the age attribute into three groups, i.e., over-45, under-35, and between 35 and 45, while the provided gender attribute is limited to females and males. As for KuaiSAR, we utilize the encrypted one-hot anonymous categories of users as the target attribute.

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

²<http://www.cp.jku.at/datasets/LFM-2b>

³<https://kuaisar.github.io/>

⁴<https://www.kuaishou.com/>

Table 3. Summary of datasets.

Dataset	Attribute	Category #	User #	Item #	Rating #	Sparsity
ML-100K	Gender	2	943	1,349	99,287	92.195%
	Age	3				
ML-1M	Gender	2	6,040	3,416	999,611	95.155%
	Age	3				
LFM-2B	Gender	2	19,972	99,639	2,829,503	99.858%
	Country	8				
KuaiSAR	Feat1	8	21,852	140,367	2,166,893	99.929%
	Feat2	2				

5.1.2 Evaluation Metrics.

Attribute Unlearning Effectiveness. As mentioned in Section 3.1, we focus on collaborative filtering models and use *user embeddings* as the attacking and unlearning target. Here we build a strong adversary classifier, i.e., attacker:

- **MLP** [20]: Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) is a simplified two-layer neural network, which is a widely used classifier. Here the dimension of hidden layer is set as 100 and a softmax layer is used as the output layer.

To quantify the effectiveness of model unlearning, we utilize two commonly used classification metrics: Micro-F1 Score (F1) and Balanced-Accuracy (BAcc) to evaluate the performance of attribute inference attack following [19, 23]. Note that lower F1 scores and BAccs indicate better unlearning effectiveness. Following [4, 69], we use 80% of the users to train the attacker, and the remainder for testing. The results of attribute inference attack are averaged over five runs using five-fold cross-validation. To ensure a fair comparison, we tune the hyperparameters and optimize until the loss function converges, thus obtaining the optimal unlearning effectiveness.

Recommendation Effectiveness. To evaluate the performance of recommendation, we use the leave-one-out approach [33] to generate test samples. We leverage Hit Ratio at rank K (HR@ K) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain at rank K (NDCG@ K) as measures of recommendation performance. HR@ K measures whether the test item is present in the top- K list, while NDCG@ K are position-aware ranking metrics that assign higher scores to the hits at upper ranks [30, 66]. In our experiment, the entire negative item sets rather than the sampled subsets are used to compute HR@ K and NDCG@ K , this is because the sampled metrics have been observed to be unstable and inconsistent when compared to their exact version [39]. Note that we compare the recommendation performance of several methods under the condition of achieving the optimal unlearning effectiveness respectively.

5.1.3 Recommendation Models. We test our proposed methods on two different recommendation models:

- **NMF** [32]: Neural Matrix Factorization (NMF) is one of the representative models based on matrix factorization.
- **LightGCN** [31]: Light Graph Convolution Network (LightGCN) is the state-of-the-art collaborative filtering model which improves recommendation performance by simplifying the graph convolution network.

5.1.4 Unlearning Methods. Although the setting of InT-AU differs from that of PoT-AU, comparing our proposed methods with InT-AU approaches would contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the AU problem. Therefore, we compare our proposed methods with the original user embedding and two InT-AU methods.

- **Original:** This is the original model before unlearning.
- **Retrain** [68] (InT-AU): This method incorporates the aforementioned D2D loss into the original recommendation loss and retrains the model from scratch.
- **Adv-InT** [19] (InT-AU): This method uses adversarial training to achieve InT-AU for the Mult-VAE [58]. We also apply the idea of adversarial training to our tested recommendation models, i.e., NMF and LightGCN, and name it Adv-InT.
- **D2D-PR** [43] (PoT-AU): This is our previous work using a two-component loss function with D2D loss as distinguishability loss and ℓ_2 as regularization loss.
- **D2D-FR** (PoT-AU): This is a two-component loss function with our newly proposed ℓ_u as distinguishability loss and ℓ_r as regularization loss, i.e., Equation (3).

5.1.5 Parameter Settings and Hardware Information.

- **Hardware Information:** All models and algorithms are implemented with Python 3.8 and PyTorch 1.9. We run all experiments on an Ubuntu 20.04 LTS System server with 256GB RAM and NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU.
- **Recommendation Models:** All model parameters are initialized with a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.01^2)$. To obtain the optimal performance, we use grid search to tune the hyper-parameters. For model-specific hyper-parameters, we follow the suggestions from their original papers. Specifically, we set the learning rate to 0.001 and the embedding size to 32. The number of epochs is set to 20 for NMF and 200 for LightGCN.
- **Attacker:** For MLP, we set the L2 regularization weight to 1.0 and the maximal iteration to 1000, leaving the other hyper-parameters at their defaults in scikit-learn 1.1.3.
- **Unlearning:** For the two-component loss, we set the learning rate to $1e-3$. For ML-100K, ML-1M, LFM-2B and KuaiSAR, we investigate the hyper-parameter α to $\{2.5e^{-4}, 1.5e^{-6}, 5e^{-5}, 1e^{-5}\}$. The number of unlearning epochs is set to 500. For ℓ_r , the value of k is set to 20, while λ and τ are set to 0.05 and $1e3$ respectively. The λ and τ are tuned using a grid search.

We run all models 10 times and report the average results.

5.2 Results and Discussions

5.2.1 Unlearning Performance (RQ1). Unlearning the target attribute is the primary goal of PoT-AU. The performance of unlearning is evaluated by the performance of attacker, i.e., MLP. We train the attacker on training set, and report its performance on the testing set. To comprehensively evaluate attacking performance, we report two metrics, including F1 score and BAcc, in Table 4. We have the following observations from the above results. Firstly, attackers achieve an average F1 Score of 0.66 and BAcc of 0.59 on the original embedding, indicating that information on the user's attribute in user embeddings can be released to attackers. Secondly, all methods can unlearn attribute information contained in user embeddings to varying degrees. Retrain, Adv-InT, D2D-PR and D2D-FR decrease the F1 Score by 27.33%, 20.79%, 26.93%, and 27.55%, respectively, on average. Meanwhile, D2D-PR, D2D-FR and Retrain can decrease the BAcc by 37.23%, 37.6% and 37.72% on average. In comparison, Adv-InT can only decrease the BAcc by 30.97%. For binary attributes, e.g., gender, the BAcc of attacker after unlearning with D2D-FR method is equivalent to that of a random attacker, which indicates that our proposed D2D-FR can effectively unlearn the private information of recommendation models. Thirdly, as shown in Table 4, although without the access

Table 4. Results of unlearning performance (performance of attribute inference attack). The top results are highlighted in **bold**. InT-AU methods are represented in typewriter font.

Dataset	Attribute	Method	NMF		LightGCN	
			F1	BAcc	F1	BAcc
ML-100K	Gender	Original	0.6935	0.6870	0.6762	0.6784
		Retrain	0.5037	0.5025	0.5195	0.5101
		Adv-InT	0.5334	0.5673	0.5517	0.5401
		D2D-PR	0.5142	0.5074	0.5326	0.5219
		D2D-FR	0.4967	0.5016	0.5287	0.5113
	Age	Original	0.6571	0.5335	0.6514	0.5179
		Retrain	0.5653	0.3265	0.5715	0.3443
		Adv-InT	0.5974	0.3761	0.6047	0.3688
		D2D-PR	0.5627	0.3342	0.5721	0.3446
		D2D-FR	0.5474	0.3321	0.5710	0.3443
ML-1M	Gender	Original	0.7602	0.7597	0.7204	0.7175
		Retrain	0.5003	0.5009	0.5117	0.5056
		Adv-InT	0.5574	0.5551	0.5874	0.5515
		D2D-PR	0.4979	0.5118	0.5229	0.5095
		D2D-FR	0.4944	0.5035	0.5187	0.5068
	Age	Original	0.7166	0.6061	0.6994	0.5913
		Retrain	0.5667	0.3338	0.5665	0.3334
		Adv-InT	0.6125	0.3707	0.6114	0.3779
		D2D-PR	0.5664	0.3334	0.5668	0.3341
		D2D-FR	0.5665	0.3334	0.5671	0.3347
LFM-2B	Gender	Original	0.6836	0.6911	0.6679	0.6823
		Retrain	0.5135	0.5062	0.5128	0.5065
		Adv-InT	0.5547	0.5436	0.5643	0.5479
		D2D-PR	0.5139	0.5085	0.5145	0.5097
		D2D-FR	0.5121	0.5074	0.5114	0.5032
	Country	Original	0.5199	0.4257	0.5095	0.4187
		Retrain	0.2214	0.1251	0.2215	0.1249
		Adv-InT	0.2545	0.1434	0.2655	0.1572
		D2D-PR	0.2210	0.1248	0.2215	0.1255
		D2D-FR	0.2210	0.1249	0.2214	0.1247
KuaiSAR	Feat1	Original	0.4433	0.2184	0.4525	0.2207
		Retrain	0.3727	0.1427	0.3814	0.1413
		Adv-InT	0.4065	0.1608	0.4125	0.1681
		D2D-PR	0.3747	0.1429	0.3821	0.1427
		D2D-FR	0.3713	0.1427	0.3819	0.1426
	Feat2	Original	0.8261	0.8242	0.8065	0.7973
		Retrain	0.5565	0.5603	0.5556	0.5471
		Adv-InT	0.6107	0.5985	0.5957	0.5821
		D2D-PR	0.5638	0.5600	0.5574	0.5495
		D2D-FR	0.5534	0.5587	0.5543	0.5476

to training data, our D2D-based methods demonstrate comparable unlearning performance with Retrain in general.

Summary. Compared with Adv-InT, D2D-PR and D2D-FR is more effective in unlearning, which protects the user's attributes by making them indistinguishable to the attacker.

Table 5. Results of recommendation performance. The top results are highlighted in bold (except for Retrain). InT-AU methods are represented in typewriter font. The top results of InT-AU methods are underlined.

Dataset	Attribute	Method	NMF				LightGCN			
			NDCG@5	HR@5	NDCG@10	HR@10	NDCG@5	HR@5	NDCG@10	HR@10
ML-100k	Gender	Original	0.0649	0.1007	0.0835	0.1601	0.0668	0.1043	0.0859	0.1663
		Retrain	0.0646	0.1007	0.0834	0.1603	0.0667	0.1045	0.0855	0.1662
		Adv-InT	0.0623	0.0965	0.0799	0.1523	0.0644	0.1006	0.0812	0.1524
		D2D-PR	0.0645	0.0997	0.0807	0.1506	0.0657	0.1034	0.0838	0.1597
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0649</u>	<u>0.1008</u>	<u>0.0832</u>	<u>0.1591</u>	<u>0.0665</u>	<u>0.1043</u>	<u>0.0854</u>	<u>0.1659</u>
	Age	Original	0.0649	0.1007	0.0835	0.1601	0.0668	0.1043	0.0859	0.1663
		Retrain	0.0644	0.1002	0.0807	0.1531	0.0649	0.1021	0.0841	0.1574
		Adv-InT	0.0605	0.0941	0.0782	0.1497	0.0625	0.0975	0.0792	0.1556
		D2D-PR	0.0617	0.0954	0.0789	0.1485	0.0624	0.0983	0.0789	0.1545
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0642</u>	<u>0.0997</u>	<u>0.0810</u>	<u>0.1527</u>	<u>0.0651</u>	<u>0.1006</u>	<u>0.0845</u>	<u>0.1581</u>
ML-1M	Gender	Original	0.0432	0.0679	0.0574	0.1121	0.0422	0.0664	0.0562	0.1097
		Retrain	0.0431	0.0675	0.0562	0.1108	0.0421	0.0665	0.0557	0.1088
		Adv-InT	0.0408	0.0651	0.0546	0.1062	0.0397	0.0634	0.0532	0.1035
		D2D-PR	0.0414	0.0654	0.0543	0.1053	0.0405	0.0651	0.0546	0.1042
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0433</u>	<u>0.0681</u>	<u>0.0568</u>	<u>0.1104</u>	<u>0.0421</u>	<u>0.0664</u>	<u>0.0559</u>	<u>0.1087</u>
	Age	Original	0.0432	0.0679	0.0574	0.1121	0.0422	0.0664	0.0562	0.1097
		Retrain	0.0433	0.0678	0.0566	0.1092	0.0423	0.0662	0.0555	0.1081
		Adv-InT	0.0386	0.0626	0.0527	0.1064	0.0382	0.0621	0.0528	0.1058
		D2D-PR	0.0403	0.0647	0.0542	0.1078	0.0405	0.0645	0.0533	0.1056
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0432</u>	<u>0.0684</u>	<u>0.0561</u>	<u>0.1087</u>	<u>0.0422</u>	<u>0.0669</u>	<u>0.0556</u>	<u>0.1077</u>
LFM-2B	Gender	Original	0.0089	0.0151	0.0123	0.0258	0.0104	0.0176	0.0141	0.0273
		Retrain	0.0088	0.0149	0.0124	0.0261	0.0102	0.0177	0.0139	0.0270
		Adv-InT	0.0086	0.0143	0.0119	0.0252	0.0098	0.0165	0.0135	0.0265
		D2D-PR	0.0088	0.0145	<u>0.0124</u>	0.0256	0.0097	0.0168	0.0137	0.0264
		D2D-FR	0.0089	0.0151	0.0123	<u>0.0260</u>	0.0102	0.0173	0.0143	0.0271
	Country	Original	0.0089	0.0151	0.0123	0.0258	0.0104	0.0176	0.0141	0.0273
		Retrain	0.0086	0.0145	0.0112	0.0234	0.0104	0.0165	0.0135	0.0253
		Adv-InT	0.0083	0.0139	0.0109	0.0230	0.0097	0.0159	0.0130	0.0251
		D2D-PR	0.0080	0.0135	0.0110	0.0230	0.0098	0.0161	0.0132	0.0249
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0085</u>	<u>0.0140</u>	<u>0.0114</u>	<u>0.0231</u>	<u>0.0101</u>	<u>0.0164</u>	0.0135	0.0255
KuaiSAR	Feat1	Original	0.0118	0.0186	0.0160	0.0318	0.0131	0.0197	0.0175	0.0334
		Retrain	0.0114	0.0184	0.0152	0.0309	0.0128	0.0193	0.0171	0.0327
		Adv-InT	0.0112	0.0175	0.0149	0.0303	0.0124	0.0186	0.0165	0.0317
		D2D-PR	0.0111	0.0177	<u>0.0151</u>	0.0301	0.0125	0.0185	0.0167	0.0318
		D2D-FR	0.0115	0.0183	0.0150	0.0310	<u>0.0127</u>	<u>0.0193</u>	0.0173	0.0328
	Feat2	Original	0.0118	0.0186	0.0160	0.0318	0.0131	0.0197	0.0175	0.0334
		Retrain	0.0115	0.0179	0.0156	0.0316	0.0129	0.0188	0.0168	0.0332
		Adv-InT	0.0109	0.0171	0.0151	0.0304	0.0124	0.0185	0.0164	0.0324
		D2D-PR	0.0113	0.0173	0.0153	0.0306	0.0122	0.0184	0.0165	0.0323
		D2D-FR	<u>0.0116</u>	<u>0.0176</u>	<u>0.0154</u>	0.0316	<u>0.0125</u>	<u>0.0186</u>	0.0168	<u>0.0331</u>

5.2.2 Recommendation Performance (RQ2). Recommendation performance is the other important goal in the PoT-AU problem, since attribute unlearning is usually at the expense of model accuracy. To answer RQ2, we use NDCG and HR to evaluate recommendation performance after unlearning and truncate the ranked list at 5 and 10 for both metrics. As shown in Table 5, unlearning methods also affect recommendation performance. Compared with the original performance, Adv-InT and D2D-PR decrease the NDCG by 6.25% and 4.88%, and decrease the HR by 5.81% and 5.05%, respectively, on average. However, D2D-FR only has an average degradation of 1.91% on NDCG and 2.14% on HR. Retrain has an average degradation of 1.79% on NDCG and 2.05% on HR, which is slightly

Table 6. Running time of unlearning methods.

Time (s)		Retrain	Adv-InT	D2D-PR	D2D-FR
ML-100K	NMF	85.43	159.75	5.46	4.76
	LightGCN	229.77	415.45	13.31	11.57
ML-1M	NMF	943.57	1266.24	78.21	72.66
	LightGCN	1839.73	2414.52	167.85	143.44
LFM-2B	NMF	1148.52	1457.82	95.51	47.92
	LightGCN	2264.55	2617.21	193.64	92.35
KuaiSAR	NMF	971.23	1344.35	97.53	37.92
	LightGCN	1874.53	2506.38	179.24	76.51

better than D2D-FR. Interestingly, D2D-FR, which is devised to make attributes indistinguishable, could accidentally diminish the negative discrimination to enhance recommendation performance. As shown in Fig. 5, the embeddings of users with different attribute categories after unlearning are indistinguishable.

Summary. Compared to Adv-InT and D2D-PR, D2D-FR preserves the recommendation performance to a greater extent while achieving the objective of unlearning, approaching the level of Retrain.

5.2.3 Efficiency (RQ3). To answer RQ3, we use running time to evaluate the efficiency of unlearning methods. Note that Age, Country and Feat1 are chosen as the targets for unlearning in this context. From Table 6, we observe that i) our proposed PoT-AU methods (D2D-PR and D2D-FR) significantly outperform InT-AU methods (Retrain and Adv-InT). This is because PoT-AU methods can be viewed as a fine-tuning process on an existing model, providing them with inherent efficiency compared to InT-AU methods; ii) By incorporating our proposed distinguishability loss to the original recommendation loss and retraining from scratch, Retrain outperforms Adv-InT. As a baseline method, Retrain provides a new path for InT-AU methods to explore; iii) In the scenario of multi-class attribute unlearning, D2D-FR is more efficient than D2D-PR. Compared to D2D-PR, D2D-FR reduces the running time by 51.48% and 58.66% on Lfm-2B and KuaiSAR respectively. By adopting the ℓ_u which introduces an *anchor distribution* to compute distance, D2D-FR can effectively reduce the computational complexity of unlearning.

5.2.4 Parameter Sensitivity (RQ4). To answer RQ4, we investigate the performance fluctuations of our method with varied hyper-parameters, i.e., the trade-off coefficient α and the length of rank list k for ℓ_r . Due to the space limitation, we only showcase the results on ML-1M dataset with age and Feat1 as the target attributes for unlearning, and similar results are also achieved on other three datasets. Specifically, we tune the value of α and k while keeping the other hyper-parameters unchanged, then record the performance of recommendation and attacking model achieved in Fig. 4 and Table 7.

- **Trade-off parameter α .** As shown in Fig. 4, we use BAcc and NDCG@10 to represent unlearning and recommendation performance respectively. We observe that the NDCG@10 of our proposed method, i.e., D2D-FR, is robust with different α . Meanwhile, reducing the value of α results in decrease in BAcc. The above observations indicate that D2D-FR can enhance unlearning performance with insignificant performance degradation for recommendation.
- **Length of rank list k .** The k in ℓ_r represents the length of recommended item list for alignment. As shown in Table 7, D2D-FR with different k can achieve the same unlearning effectiveness. However, larger or smaller k both can reduce the recommendation effectiveness. Specifically, a




Fig. 4. Effect of the hyper-parameter α .




Fig. 5. Distribution of user embedding in the first dimension.

smaller k cannot retain the preference information in top- k recommended item list, as k increases, the top- k ranked items may contain more noise. In our experiments, we set the k to 20 for optimal performance of recommendation.

5.2.5 Analysis of l_r (RQ5). To understand the contribution of our proposed function-space regularization loss l_r , we compare the difference between l_r and l_2 on preserving recommendation performance by conducting unlearning on ML-1M dataset with age as the target attribute. we further record the change of recommendation performance and loss during optimization in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. From these, we have the following observations.

Table 7. Effect of the hyper-parameter k .

Models	k	F1	BAcc	NDCG@10	HR@10
NMF	10	0.5664	0.3333	0.0552	0.1068
	20	0.5665	0.3334	0.0561	0.1087
	30	0.5665	0.3335	0.0553	0.1084
	50	0.5664	0.3333	0.0541	0.1071
LightGCN	10	0.5669	0.3342	0.0535	0.1064
	20	0.5671	0.3341	0.0548	0.1073
	30	0.5673	0.3343	0.0542	0.1069
	50	0.5673	0.3343	0.0537	0.1062




Fig. 6. Change in recommendation performance during unlearning process, where the x-axis and y-axis represent unlearning epochs and values of metric, respectively. (a) Change in HR@10; (b) Change in NDCG@10; The BAcc of attacking model for D2D-FR, D2D-PR and D2D (after running 800 epochs) are 0.3334, 0.3333 and 0.3333.

- As shown in Fig. 6, the recommendation performance dropped significantly during the unlearning process with D2D loss, i.e., ℓ_u . This phenomenon illustrates the necessity of introducing regularization loss to achieve **Goal #2**. Meanwhile, compared to D2D-PR, the proposed D2D-FR is more effective to preserve the recommendation performance during optimization.
- From Fig. 7, we can see that the parameter-space regularization loss ℓ_2 is not always negatively correlated to RBO during unlearning. In contrast, the function-space regularization loss ℓ_r exhibits a relatively higher correlation with RBO. Based on these, D2D-FR can search for optimal model parameters for recommendation performance after ℓ_u is converged.

Summary. With the analysis of the unlearning process with D2D-FR, we find that our proposed D2D-FR outperforms D2D and D2D-PR in maintaining the recommendation performance, which is mainly attributed to the high correlation between ℓ_r and the model function during unlearning process.

5.2.6 Unlearning Performance under different types of attacker (RQ6). In real-life scenarios, there are many available models to choose from to conduct attribute inference attack, so the attacking models are usually unknown and unpredictable. To better understand the robustness of our method and other similar methods, we design several different types of attacking models, namely Decision Tree (DT), Support Vector Machine (SVC), Naive Bayes (NB) and k -Nearest Neighbors (KNN), which are frequently adopted machine learning methods in classification tasks. In this study, we use gender and age as target attributes and conduct unlearning on ML-1M dataset. Based on the F1 score and BAcc of each attacker shown in Table 8, we have these observations: Firstly, it is obvious that our




Fig. 7. Correlation between two types of regularization losses and RBO (similarity in recommendation performance, specified in Section 4.4.3) during optimization with D2D-FR, where the x-axis represents ℓ_2 and ℓ_r respectively and y-axis represents RBO, each point represents a certain epoch. (a) ℓ_2 and RBO; (b) ℓ_r and RBO. There is a notable negative correlation between RBO and ℓ_r , but not between RBO and ℓ_2 . A negative correlation indicates a valid loss measurement, as smaller loss values correspond to greater similarity in recommendation performance.

Table 8. Results of unlearning performance (performance of attribute inference attack) w.r.t. different types of attacker. The top results are highlighted in bold. InT-AU methods are represented in typewriter font.

Attribute	Method	DT		KNN		SVC		NB		MLP	
		F1	BAcc	F1	BAcc	F1	BAcc	F1	BAcc	F1	BAcc
Gender	Original	0.6255	0.6270	0.7408	0.7305	0.7585	0.7580	0.7340	0.7326	0.7602	0.7597
	Retrain	0.5035	0.5056	0.4895	0.5037	0.4978	0.4917	0.5153	0.4895	0.5003	0.5009
	Adv-InT	0.5314	0.5437	0.5663	0.5582	0.5642	0.5573	0.5734	0.5605	0.5774	0.5551
	D2D-PR	0.5043	0.5036	0.5180	0.5121	0.5023	0.4942	0.5337	0.5105	0.4979	0.5118
	D2D-FR	0.5067	0.5061	0.4594	0.4956	0.4748	0.4640	0.5086	0.4810	0.4944	0.5035
Age	Original	0.5539	0.4661	0.6563	0.5055	0.7182	0.6084	0.6614	0.5600	0.7166	0.6061
	Retrain	0.4151	0.3354	0.5025	0.3153	0.5665	0.3333	0.5664	0.3334	0.5667	0.3338
	Adv-InT	0.4355	0.3574	0.5521	0.3475	0.6036	0.3834	0.5863	0.3572	0.6125	0.3707
	D2D-PR	0.4153	0.3350	0.5055	0.3195	0.5664	0.3333	0.5667	0.3350	0.5664	0.3334
	D2D-FR	0.4149	0.3383	0.4975	0.3167	0.5664	0.3333	0.5662	0.3341	0.5665	0.3334

proposed D2D-PR and D2D-FR outperform Adv-Int and achieve the same unlearning performance as retrain in most scenarios, which implies that our methods can more effectively erase attribute information from recommendation model and protect the privacy of users when confronted with unknown attacker models. Specifically, Retrain, Adv-InT, D2D-PR and D2D-FR decrease the BAcc by 34.91%, 28.04%, 34.26% and 35.36% respectively. In most cases, the BAcc after unlearning is similar to that of a random attacker. Secondly, as trained to defend a specific DNN-based inference model, the unlearning performance of Adv-InT deteriorates when the attacker employs a different type of model. As shown in Table 8, the Adv-InT decrease BAcc by 32.89% when attacker is MLP, whereas it decrease BAcc by 26.83% in average when attacker is not MLP. Finally, we notice that DNN-based attacker (i.e., MLP) outperforms other attackers in most scenarios due to its superiority in learning non-linear correlation between user embeddings and the labels of target attribute.

6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we study the Post-Training Attribute Unlearning (PoT-AU) problem in recommender systems, which aims to protect users' attribute information instead of input data. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to study this problem, which is more strict and practical than In-Training Attribute Unlearning (InT-AU) problem. There are two goals in the PoT-AU problem, i.e., making attributes indistinguishable, and maintaining comparable recommendation performance. To achieve the above two goals, we propose a two-component loss function, which consists of distinguishability loss and regularization loss, to optimize model parameters. Compared with our previous work, we further improve the efficiency of distributional distinguishability loss in the multi-class scenarios, and introduce a function-space regularization loss to directly preserve recommendation performance. We conduct extensive experiments on four real-world datasets to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed methods. The results demonstrate that our newly proposed D2D-FR outperforms all compared methods, including our previous work, D2D-PR.

In this work, we focus on the system-wise attribute unlearning, i.e., conducting unlearning for all users in the system. In future research, we plan to investigate user-wise attribute unlearning. In this scenario, only the parameters of users who request attribute unlearning will be updated, while maintaining comparable overall recommendation performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin Abadi, Andy Chu, Ian Goodfellow, H Brendan McMahan, Ilya Mironov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. 2016. Deep learning with differential privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*. 308–318.
- [2] Martial Agueh and Guillaume Carlier. 2011. Barycenters in the Wasserstein space. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 43, 2 (2011), 904–924.
- [3] S Basu, P Pope, and S Feizi. 2021. Influence Functions in Deep Learning Are Fragile. In *ICLR*.
- [4] Ghazaleh Beigi, Ahmadreza Mosallanezhad, Ruocheng Guo, Hamidreza Alvari, Alexander Nou, and Huan Liu. 2020. Privacy-aware recommendation with private-attribute protection using adversarial learning. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 34–42.
- [5] Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, Alex Kulesza, Fernando Pereira, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. 2010. A theory of learning from different domains. *Mach. Learn.* 79, 1-2 (2010), 151–175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-009-5152-4>
- [6] Ari Benjamin, David Rolnick, and Konrad Kording. 2018. Measuring and regularizing networks in function space. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [7] Albrecht Böttcher and David Wenzel. 2008. The Frobenius norm and the commutator. *Linear algebra and its applications* 429, 8-9 (2008), 1864–1885.
- [8] Léon Bottou. 2012. Stochastic gradient descent tricks. In *Neural networks: Tricks of the trade*. Springer, 421–436.
- [9] Lucas Bourtole, Varun Chandrasekaran, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Hengrui Jia, Adelin Travers, Baiwu Zhang, David Lie, and Nicolas Papernot. 2021. Machine unlearning. In *Proceedings in the 42nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*.
- [10] Chris Burges, Tal Shaked, Erin Renshaw, Ari Lazier, Matt Deeds, Nicole Hamilton, and Greg Hullender. 2005. Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*. 89–96.
- [11] Department of Justice California. 2018. California Consumer Privacy Act. <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>.
- [12] Government Canada. 2019. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (S.C. 2000, c. 5). Website. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/ENG/ACTS/P-8.6/index.html>.
- [13] Yinzhi Cao and Junfeng Yang. 2015. Towards making systems forget with machine unlearning. In *Proceedings in the 36th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. 463–480.
- [14] Antoine Chatalic, Nicolas Schreuder, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Alessandro Rudi. 2022. Nyström kernel mean embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 3006–3024.
- [15] Chong Chen, Fei Sun, Min Zhang, and Bolin Ding. 2022. Recommendation unlearning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 2768–2777.
- [16] Chaochao Chen, Huiwen Wu, Jiajie Su, Lingjuan Lyu, Xiaolin Zheng, and Li Wang. 2022. Differential private knowledge transfer for privacy-preserving cross-domain recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 1455–1465.

- [17] Marco Cuturi and Arnaud Doucet. 2014. Fast computation of Wasserstein barycenters. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 685–693.
- [18] Council EU. 2014. Council regulation (eu) on 2012/0011. Website. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52012PC0011>.
- [19] Christian Ganhör, David Penz, Navid Rekabsaz, Oleg Lesota, and Markus Schedl. 2022. Unlearning Protected User Attributes in Recommendations with Adversarial Training (*SIGIR '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2142–2147. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531820>
- [20] Matt W Gardner and SR Dorling. 1998. Artificial neural networks (the multilayer perceptron)—a review of applications in the atmospheric sciences. *Atmospheric environment* 32, 14-15 (1998), 2627–2636.
- [21] Claudio Gentile and Manfred KK Warmuth. 1998. Linear hinge loss and average margin. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 11 (1998).
- [22] Aditya Gohatkar, Alessandro Achille, and Stefano Soatto. 2020. Eternal sunshine of the spotless net: Selective forgetting in deep networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 9304–9312.
- [23] Margherita Grandini, Enrico Bagli, and Giorgio Visani. 2020. Metrics for multi-class classification: an overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05756* (2020).
- [24] Arthur Gretton, Karsten M Borgwardt, Malte J Rasch, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Alexander Smola. 2012. A kernel two-sample test. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13, 1 (2012), 723–773.
- [25] Chuan Guo, Tom Goldstein, Awni Hannun, and Laurens Van Der Maaten. 2020. Certified data removal from machine learning models. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 3832–3842.
- [26] Tao Guo, Song Guo, Jiewei Zhang, Wenchao Xu, and Junxiao Wang. 2022. Efficient Attribute Unlearning: Towards Selective Removal of Input Attributes from Feature Representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.13295* (2022).
- [27] Zhongxuan Han, Xiaolin Zheng, Chaochao Chen, Wenjie Cheng, and Yang Yao. 2023. Intra and Inter Domain HyperGraph Convolutional Network for Cross-Domain Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 449–459.
- [28] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. 2015. The movielens datasets: History and context. *Acm Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems (TIIS)* 5, 4 (2015), 1–19.
- [29] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering. In *proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*. 507–517.
- [30] Xiangnan He, Tao Chen, Min-Yen Kan, and Xiao Chen. 2015. Trirank: Review-aware explainable recommendation by modeling aspects. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*. 1661–1670.
- [31] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 639–648.
- [32] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*. 173–182.
- [33] Xiangnan He, Hanwang Zhang, Min-Yen Kan, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2016. Fast matrix factorization for online recommendation with implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 549–558.
- [34] Yifan Hu, Yehuda Koren, and Chris Volinsky. 2008. Collaborative filtering for implicit feedback datasets. In *2008 Eighth IEEE international conference on data mining*. Ieee, 263–272.
- [35] Jinyuan Jia and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. 2018. Attriguard: A practical defense against attribute inference attacks via adversarial machine learning. In *27th {USENIX} security symposium ({USENIX} security 18)*. 513–529.
- [36] Minsoo Kang, Jaeyoo Park, and Bohyung Han. 2022. Class-incremental learning by knowledge distillation with adaptive feature consolidation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 16071–16080.
- [37] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. 2017. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *International conference on machine learning*. 1885–1894.
- [38] Pang Wei W Koh, Kai-Siang Ang, Hubert Teo, and Percy S Liang. 2019. On the accuracy of influence functions for measuring group effects. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, Vol. 32.
- [39] Walid Krichene and Steffen Rendle. 2020. On sampled metrics for item recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1748–1757.
- [40] Bo Li, Yining Wang, Aarti Singh, and Yevgeniy Vorobeychik. 2016. Data poisoning attacks on factorization-based collaborative filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [41] Yuyuan Li, Chaochao Chen, Yizhao Zhang, Weiming Liu, Lingjuan Lyu, Xiaolin Zheng, Dan Meng, and Jun Wang. 2023. UltraRE: Enhancing RecEraser for Recommendation Unlearning via Error Decomposition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2023).

- [42] Yuyuan Li, Chaochao Chen, Xiaolin Zheng, Yizhao Zhang, Biao Gong, Jun Wang, and Linxun Chen. 2023. Selective and collaborative influence function for efficient recommendation unlearning. *Expert Systems with Applications* (2023), 121025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.121025>
- [43] Yuyuan Li, Chaochao Chen, Xiaolin Zheng, Yizhao Zhang, Zhongxuan Han, Dan Meng, and Jun Wang. 2023. Making Users Indistinguishable: Attribute-wise Unlearning in Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 984–994.
- [44] Yuyuan Li, Xiaolin Zheng, Chaochao Chen, and Junlin Liu. 2022. Making recommender systems forget: Learning and unlearning for erasable recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11491* (2022).
- [45] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. 2017. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 40, 12 (2017), 2935–2947.
- [46] Alessandro B Melchiorre, Navid Rekabsaz, Emilia Parada-Cabaleiro, Stefan Brandl, Oleg Lesota, and Markus Schedl. 2021. Investigating gender fairness of recommendation algorithms in the music domain. *Information Processing & Management* 58, 5 (2021), 102666.
- [47] Andriy Mnih and Russ R Salakhutdinov. 2007. Probabilistic matrix factorization. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 20 (2007).
- [48] Eduardo Fernandes Montesuma and Fred Maurice Ngole Mboula. 2021. Wasserstein barycenter for multi-source domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 16785–16793.
- [49] Saemi Moon, Seunghyuk Cho, and Dongwoo Kim. 2023. Feature unlearning for generative models via implicit feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05699* (2023).
- [50] Thanh Tam Nguyen, Thanh Trung Huynh, Phi Le Nguyen, Alan Wee-Chung Liew, Hongzhi Yin, and Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen. 2022. A survey of machine unlearning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02299* (2022).
- [51] Amal Rannen, Rahaf Aljundi, Matthew B Blaschko, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2017. Encoder based lifelong learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 1320–1328.
- [52] Sashank Reddi, Rama Kumar Pasumarthi, Aditya Menon, Ankit Singh Rawat, Felix Yu, Seungyeon Kim, Andreas Veit, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2021. Rankdistil: Knowledge distillation for ranking. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 2368–2376.
- [53] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. 452–461.
- [54] Ahmed Salem, Yang Zhang, Mathias Humbert, Pascal Berrang, Mario Fritz, and Michael Backes. 2019. ML-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models. In *2019 Network and Distributed Systems Security (NDSS) Symposium*.
- [55] J Ben Schafer, Dan Frankowski, Jon Herlocker, and Shilad Sen. 2007. Collaborative filtering recommender systems. In *The adaptive web*. Springer, 291–324.
- [56] Bernhard Scholkopf, Kah-Kay Sung, Christopher JC Burges, Federico Girosi, Partha Niyogi, Tomaso Poggio, and Vladimir Vapnik. 1997. Comparing support vector machines with Gaussian kernels to radial basis function classifiers. *IEEE transactions on Signal Processing* 45, 11 (1997), 2758–2765.
- [57] Ayush Sekhari, Jayadev Acharya, Gautam Kamath, and Ananda Theertha Suresh. 2021. Remember What You Want to Forget: Algorithms for Machine Unlearning. In *Advances in 34th Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [58] Ilya Shenbin, Anton Alekseev, Elena Tutubalina, Valentin Malykh, and Sergey I Nikolenko. 2020. Recvae: A new variational autoencoder for top-n recommendations with implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*. 528–536.
- [59] Yue Shi, Martha Larson, and Alan Hanjalic. 2014. Collaborative filtering beyond the user-item matrix: A survey of the state of the art and future challenges. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 47, 1 (2014), 1–45.
- [60] Chiappa Silvia, Jiang Ray, Stepleton Tom, Pacchiano Aldo, Jiang Heinrich, and Aslanides John. 2020. A general approach to fairness with optimal transport. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 3633–3640.
- [61] Bharath K Sriperumbudur, Arthur Gretton, Kenji Fukumizu, Bernhard Schölkopf, and Gert RG Lanckriet. 2010. Hilbert space embeddings and metrics on probability measures. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11 (2010), 1517–1561.
- [62] Jiaxi Tang and Ke Wang. 2018. Ranking distillation: Learning compact ranking models with high performance for recommender system. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 2289–2298.
- [63] Ilya O Tolstikhin, Bharath K Sriperumbudur, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2016. Minimax estimation of maximum mean discrepancy with radial kernels. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 29 (2016).
- [64] Alexander Warnecke, Lukas Pirch, Christian Wressnegger, and Konrad Rieck. 2023. Machine Unlearning of Features and Labels. In *Network and Distributed System Security (NDSS) Symposium 2023*.
- [65] William Webber, Alistair Moffat, and Justin Zobel. 2010. A similarity measure for indefinite rankings. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 28, 4 (2010), 1–38.

- [66] Hong-Jian Xue, Xinyu Dai, Jianbing Zhang, Shujian Huang, and Jiajun Chen. 2017. Deep Matrix Factorization Models for Recommender Systems.. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, Vol. 17. 3203–3209.
- [67] Haonan Yan, Xiaoguang Li, Ziyao Guo, Hui Li, Fenghua Li, and Xiaodong Lin. 2022. Arcane: An efficient architecture for exact machine unlearning. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*. 4006–4013.
- [68] Muhammad Bilal Zafar, Isabel Valera, Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez, and Krishna P Gummadi. 2019. Fairness constraints: A flexible approach for fair classification. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20, 1 (2019), 2737–2778.
- [69] Shijie Zhang, Hongzhi Yin, Tong Chen, Zi Huang, Lizhen Cui, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2021. Graph embedding for recommendation against attribute inference attacks. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 3002–3014.
- [70] Shijie Zhang, Wei Yuan, and Hongzhi Yin. 2023. Comprehensive privacy analysis on federated recommender system against attribute inference attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [71] Yang Zhang, Zhiyu Hu, Yimeng Bai, Fuli Feng, Jiancan Wu, Qifan Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Recommendation unlearning via influence function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02147* (2023).
- [72] Zhihao Zhu, Chenwang Wu, Rui Fan, Defu Lian, and Enhong Chen. 2023. Membership Inference Attacks Against Sequential Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 1208–1219.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009