

FourierKAN-GCF: Fourier Kolmogorov-Arnold Network - An Effective and Efficient Feature Transformation for Graph Collaborative Filtering

Jinfeng Xu

The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China
jinfeng@connect.hku.hk

Zheyu Chen

The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong, China
zheyu.chen@connect.polyu.hk

Jinze Li

The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China
lijinze-hku@connect.hku.hk

Shuo Yang

The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China
shuoyang.ee@gmail.com

Wei Wang

Shenzhen MSU-BIT University
Shenzhen, China
ehomewang@ieee.org

Xiping Hu

Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
huxp@bit.edu.cn

Edith C.-H. Ngai*

The University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China
chngai@eee.hku.hk

ABSTRACT

Graph Collaborative Filtering (GCF) has achieved state-of-the-art performance for recommendation tasks. However, most GCF structures simplify the feature transformation and nonlinear operation during message passing in the graph convolution network (GCN). We revisit these two components and discover that a part of feature transformation and nonlinear operation during message passing in GCN can improve the representation of GCF, but increase the difficulty of training.

In this work, we propose a simple and effective graph-based recommendation model called FourierKAN-GCF. Specifically, it utilizes a novel Fourier Kolmogorov-Arnold Network (KAN) to replace the multilayer perceptron (MLP) as a part of the feature transformation during message passing in GCN, which improves the representation power of GCF and is easy to train. We further employ message dropout and node dropout strategies to improve the representation power and robustness of the model. Extensive experiments on two public datasets demonstrate the superiority of FourierKAN-GCF over most state-of-the-art methods. The implementation code is available at <https://github.com/Jinfeng-Xu/FKAN-GCF>.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Recommender systems**;

*Corresponding authors

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](https://permissions.acm.org).

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

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

KEYWORDS

Recommendation, Collaborative Filtering, Graph Neural Network, Kolmogorov-Arnold Network, Fourier Coefficients

ACM Reference Format:

Jinfeng Xu, Zheyu Chen, Jinze Li, Shuo Yang, Wei Wang, Xiping Hu, and Edith C.-H. Ngai. 2024. FourierKAN-GCF: Fourier Kolmogorov-Arnold Network - An Effective and Efficient Feature Transformation for Graph Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 5 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender system has been widely used to alleviate information overload on the web [16]. The aim of recommender system is to predict whether a user will interact with an unobserved item. To this end, collaborative filtering (CF) addresses it by learning user preferences from similar users. Many works [4, 5, 14] harnessing graph-based recommendation to capture latent user preferences from user-item interactions have gained notable successes. The main reason is that the interactive data between users and items are naturally graph-structured. For example, NGCF [14] utilizes whole standard GCN in recommender systems, which retains the feature transformation and nonlinear operation. However, LightGCN [4] states that both feature transformation and nonlinear operation are unnecessary for feature extraction in recommendation field and further proposes a light GCN. Most of the subsequent graph-based models [15, 17, 18] are based on LightGCN for further exploration.

However, there are many unfair analyses of NGCF in LightGCN: a) There are two different feature transformations in NGCF, but LightGCN removed them without performing separate fine-grained ablation experiments. b) LightGCN also removed the interaction information representation part of NGCF without giving reasons.

Therefore, we question: **‘Is feature transformation during message passing in GCN really unnecessary in recommendation?’**

We provide an empirical analysis for NGCF and LightGCN in Section 2. Then, we state that feature transformation in NGCF can enhance the interaction representation and boost the performance of GCN, but the training process becomes more complex. In this work, we introduce a simple yet powerful graph-based recommendation model called FourierKAN-GCF. Particularly, FourierKAN-GCF incorporates a unique Fourier Kolmogorov-Arnold Network (KAN) in place of the traditional multilayer perceptron (MLP) within the feature transformation during message passing in GCNs. This substitution enhances the representational capabilities and training ease of the GCF. Additionally, we implement various dropout techniques to further boost the model’s representational strength and robustness. Extensive experiments on public datasets demonstrate the superiority of our FourierKAN-GCF over state-of-the-art methods.

2 PRELIMINARY

2.1 NGCF Brief

NGCF retains feature transformation and nonlinear operation during the message passing in GCN, formally:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_u^{(l+1)} &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \frac{\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} + \mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}), \\ \mathbf{e}_i^{(l+1)} &= \sigma(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} + \mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ represent the embedding of user u and item i after l layers message propagation, respectively. \mathcal{N}_u and \mathcal{N}_i denote the interacted item set with u and interacted user set with i , respectively. \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 are two trainable weight matrices to perform feature transformation in each layer. σ is the nonlinear activation function. It is worth noting that $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ can be regarded as the aggregated representation from neighbors, while $\mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})$ and $\mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)})$ can be regarded as the aggregated representation from interaction information. The final embeddings are calculated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u = \mathbf{e}_u^{(1)} \parallel \mathbf{e}_u^{(2)} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{e}_u^{(L)}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^{(1)} \parallel \mathbf{e}_i^{(2)} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{e}_i^{(L)}, \quad (2)$$

where \parallel is the concatenation operation. NGCF only concatenates layer-1 to layer- L and ignores ego layer-0, since ego layer-0 has already been considered in the first term $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ of message passing and propagation.

2.2 LightGCN Brief

LightGCN provides an analysis of the feature transformation and nonlinear operation in NGCF. It mainly provides four observations:

1. Removing the entire feature transformation including both \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 leads to consistent improvements over NGCF.
2. Removing only nonlinear operation σ will lead to a small deterioration of performance.
3. Removing both entire feature transformation and nonlinear operation can improve performance significantly.
4. The deterioration of NGCF stems from the training difficulty rather than over-fitting.

To this end, LightGCN removes feature transformation and nonlinear

operation during the message passing in GCN. Formally, LightGCN leverages the user-item graph to propagate embeddings as:

$$\mathbf{e}_u^{(l+1)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \frac{\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}, \quad \mathbf{e}_i^{(l+1)} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ represent the embedding of user u and item i after l layers message propagation, respectively. \mathcal{N}_u and \mathcal{N}_i denote the interacted item set with u and interacted user set with i , respectively. LightGCN only retains the aggregation of neighbors’ representation but removes the aggregation of interaction information representation. The final embeddings are calculated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}}{L+1}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i = \sum_{l=0}^L \frac{\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}}{L+1}, \quad (4)$$

where L is the total layer number. LightGCN considers the ego layer-0 cause it removes the first term $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ in NGCF.

We argue that observation 4 is the main reason why LightGCN performs better than NGCF in most cases. Observations 1-3 were not sufficient to verify that the entire feature transformation and nonlinear operation do not contribute to feature extraction. Besides, we argue that LightGCN verified the feature transformation not contributing to learning better features by comparing NGCF with removed both \mathbf{W}_1 and the whole interaction representation aggregation part $\mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})$, which is not a fair comparison. We point out that $\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ naturally contain information about user preferences and item properties that can be adequately described through multiple feature dimensions. Therefore, \mathbf{W}_1 is an unnecessary feature transformation part. However, we point out that the interaction representation aggregation part $\mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})$ contains valuable interaction information, which can not be easily extracted by the heuristic rule. In this case, \mathbf{W}_2 is a necessary feature transformation part that contributes to feature extraction. In the next subsection, we provide empirical evidence for these arguments.

Table 1: Performance comparison of LightGCN, NGCF, and four variants of NGCF in terms of Recall@20 and NDCG@20.

Dataset	Metrics	LightGCN	NGCF	NGCF-f1	NGCF-f2	NGCF-i	NGCF-n
MOOC	Recall@20	0.3307	0.3361	0.3377↑	0.3357↓	0.3301↓	0.3343↓
	NDCG@20	0.1811	0.1894	0.1926↑	0.1897↑	0.1824↓	0.1878↓
Games	Recall@20	0.0447	0.0379	0.0414↑	0.0388↑	0.0362↓	0.0373↓
	NDCG@20	0.0227	0.0196	0.0209↑	0.0192↓	0.0181↓	0.0196--

2.3 Re-Analysis for NGCF

We implement four simplified variants of NGCF:

- NGCF-f1, which removes feature transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_1 .
- NGCF-f2, which removes feature transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_2 .
- NGCF-i, which removes the whole interaction representation aggregation part $\mathbf{W}_2(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})$.
- NGCF-n, which removes the nonlinear operation σ .

We keep all hyper-parameter settings the same as the optimal settings of NGCF. As Table 1 shows, we conclude the findings that:

1. For both MOOC and Games datasets, removing the feature transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_1 will lead to observed improvements. Therefore, the feature transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_1 is unnecessary.
2. For MOOC dataset, removing the feature transformation matrix \mathbf{W}_2 leads to a slight deterioration. However, for Games dataset, it




Figure 1: Overview of FourierKAN-GCF, NGCF, and LightGCN

will lead to a small improvement. We own this to that user-item interaction in MOOC dataset has higher density than in Games dataset.

3. Removing the whole interaction representation aggregation part $W_2(e_i^{(l)} \odot e_u^{(l)})$ will lead to a performance degradation on all datasets. It shows that this part can bring valuable interaction information.

4. Nonlinear operation only brings a small positive effect.

5. NGCF outperforms LightGCN on the MOOC dataset verifying that NGCF has better representation power than LightGCN, but the training is more difficult.

Then, we can draw some conclusions. First, the feature transformation matrix W_1 is unnecessary for NGCF. Besides, the feature transformation matrix W_2 and the whole interaction representation aggregation part $W_2(e_i^{(l)} \odot e_u^{(l)})$ is beneficial for feature extraction. Last, nonlinear operation occupies only a minor influence.

3 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we detail the overall architecture of our FourierKAN-GCF, NGCF, and LightGCN in Figure 1. Our Fourier Kolmogorov-Arnold Network provides a powerful interaction representation aggregation part in NGCF to achieve a significant performance improvement and make it easy to train.

3.1 Kolmogorov-Arnold Network (KAN)

Kolmogorov-Arnold Network [10] is a promising alternative to Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). MLP is inspired by the universal approximation theorem [2]. KAN focuses on the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theorem [7]. KAN can be formed as:

$$\text{KAN} = f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi_q \left(\sum_{p=1}^n \phi_{q,p}(\mathbf{x}_p) \right), \quad (5)$$

where $\phi_{q,p}$ are univariate functions that map each input variable \mathbf{x}_p such $\phi_{q,p} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. $\phi_{q,p}(\mathbf{x}_p)$ is trainable activation function. In the Kolmogorov-Arnold theorem, the inner functions form a KAN layer with $n_{in} = n$ and $n_{out} = 2n + 1$, and the outer functions form a KAN layer with $n_{in} = 2n + 1$ and $n_{out} = n$. So the Kolmogorov-Arnold representations in this formula are simply compositions of two KAN layers. A useful trick is that it includes a

basis function $b(\mathbf{x})$ such that the activation function $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is the sum of the basis function $b(\mathbf{x})$ and the spline function:

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{w}(b(\mathbf{x}) + \text{spline}(\mathbf{x})). \quad (6)$$

spline(\mathbf{x}) is parameterized as a linear combination of B-splines:

$$b(\mathbf{x}) = \text{silu}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\mathbf{x}}{1 + e^{-\mathbf{x}}}, \quad \text{spline}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i c_i B_i(\mathbf{x}), \quad (7)$$

where c_i is trainable.

3.2 Fourier KAN

However, KAN is more difficult to train than MLP due to the spline function, which does not satisfy our motivation to provide a more effective and efficient method to replace $W_2(e_i^{(l)} \odot e_u^{(l)})$ part. The essence of KAN is to form an arbitrary function by superposition of multiple nonlinear functions. Our goal can be converted into finding the split from a complex function into multiple relatively simple nonlinear functions. Naturally, the Fourier Coefficients [12] is an interesting choice. Therefore, we propose the following equation:

$$\phi_F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^g (\cos(kx_i) \cdot a_{ik} + \sin(kx_i) \cdot b_{ik}), \quad (8)$$

where d is the dimension number of features. Fourier coefficients a_{ik} and b_{ik} are trainable. Hyper-parameter g is the gridsize, which plays a critical role in controlling the number of terms (frequencies) used in the Fourier series expansion. Specifically, g determines how many different sine and cosine terms are included in the Fourier Coefficients corresponding to each input dimension. The Fourier Coefficients has a significant advantage in computational efficiency and solves the training difficulty caused by the spline function.

3.3 FourierKAN-GCF

The message passing in our FourierKAN-GCF is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_u^{(l+1)} &= \sigma(\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \frac{\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} + \phi_F(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_u^{(l)})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}), \\ \mathbf{e}_i^{(l+1)} &= \sigma(\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} + \phi_F(\mathbf{e}_u^{(l)} \odot \mathbf{e}_i^{(l)})}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u||\mathcal{N}_i|}}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\phi_F(\cdot)$ is simplified single layer Fourier KAN function. We remove the unnecessary transform matrix W_1 in NGCF and utilize our Fourier KAN function to replace the transform matrix W_2 . The final user embedding and item embedding are calculated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u = \mathbf{e}_u^{(1)} || \mathbf{e}_u^{(2)} || \dots || \mathbf{e}_u^{(L)}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{e}}_i = \mathbf{e}_i^{(1)} || \mathbf{e}_i^{(2)} || \dots || \mathbf{e}_i^{(L)}, \quad (10)$$

where $||$ is the concatenation operation.

3.4 Dropout Strategies

To further prevent the over-fitting problem for FourierKAN-GCF, we adopt message dropout and node dropout strategies. For the message dropout, we randomly change some message passing being propagated in Eq 9 by zero, with a probability $1 - p_m$, where p_m is the message dropout ratio. For the node dropout, we randomly drop $1 - p_n$ nodes of the matrix, where p_n is the node dropout ratio.

Table 2: Performance comparison of baselines and FourierKAN-GCF in terms of R@K and N@K. The superscript * indicates the improvement is statistically significant where the p-value is less than 0.05.

Datasets	¹ MOOC						² Games					
	R@10	R@20	R@50	N@10	N@20	N@50	R@10	R@20	R@50	N@10	N@20	N@50
BPR-MF	0.2401	0.3353	0.4813	0.1571	0.1898	0.2261	0.0210	0.0369	0.0699	0.0135	0.0183	0.0265
BUIR	0.2354	0.3196	0.4801	0.1589	0.1835	0.2224	0.0227	0.0384	0.0749	0.0143	0.0192	0.0282
NGCF	0.2453	0.3361	0.4799	0.1722	0.1894	0.2349	0.0231	0.0379	0.0782	0.0142	0.0196	0.0274
LR-GCCF	0.2466	0.3336	0.4809	0.1678	0.1938	0.2294	0.0253	0.0440	0.0815	0.0171	0.0224	0.0317
LightGCN	0.2402	0.3307	0.4773	0.1581	0.1811	0.2217	0.0271	0.0447	0.0844	0.0174	0.0227	0.0326
UltraGCN	0.2372	0.3194	0.4701	0.1737	0.1962	0.2307	0.0277	0.0459	0.0844	0.0173	0.0230	0.0331
IMP-GCN	0.2170	0.2788	0.4183	0.1531	0.1717	0.2057	0.0273	0.0461	0.0839	0.0171	0.0232	0.0323
w/o MD	0.2518	0.3523	0.4912	0.1814	0.2116	0.2449	0.0267	0.0452	0.0825	0.0165	0.0221	0.0314
w/o ND	0.2603	0.3527	0.4839	0.1800	0.2071	0.2439	0.0257	0.0452	0.0809	0.0161	0.0219	0.0309
KAN-GCF	0.2536	0.3417	0.4984	0.1758	0.2024	0.2396	0.0272	0.0451	0.0837	0.0172	0.0229	0.0325
FourierKAN-GCF	0.2595	0.3564	0.5065	0.1866	0.2147	0.2462	0.0287	0.0473	0.0856	0.0176	0.0252	0.0342

¹Dataset can be accessed at <http://moocdata.cn>. ²Dataset can be accessed at <http://jmcauley.ucsd.edu/data/amazon/links.html>.

3.5 Model Training

To learn model parameters, we adopt the Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [13] loss function as our optimization criterion. The core objective of BPR is to enhance the divergence in the predictive preference between positive and negative items within each user-item triplet $(u, i_p, i_n) \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} signifies the collection of training data, the term positive item p pertains to an item with which the user u has interacted, whereas the negative item n is selected randomly from the pool of items without interaction with user u .

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{(u, i_p, i_n) \in \mathcal{D}} -\ln \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{e}}_u^T \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{i_p} - \hat{\mathbf{e}}_u^T \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{i_n}) + \lambda \|\Theta\|^2, \quad (11)$$

where λ controls the L_2 regularization strength, σ is the Sigmoid function, and Θ denotes model parameters.

Table 3: Statistics of experimental datasets.

Dataset	# Users	# Items	# Interaction	Sparsity
MOOC	82535	1302	458453	99.57%
Games	50677	16897	454529	99.95%

4 EXPERIMENT

4.1 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

We conduct our experiments on two real-world datasets: MOOC and Anazon Video Games (Games for short). Details can be found in Table 3. For a fair comparison, we follow previous work [19] to sort all the observed user-item interactions of each dataset in chronological order based on the interaction timestamps. Then, we split each dataset with a ratio of 7:1:2 for training, validation, and testing. Regarding evaluation metrics, we adopt two well-established metrics: Recall@K (R@K) and NDCG@K (N@K). We report the average metrics of all users in the test dataset among $K = 10$, $K = 20$, and $K = 50$.

4.2 Baselines and Experimental Settings

To verify the effectiveness of FourierKAN-GCF, we select two traditional matrix factorization models (BPR-MF [13] and BUIR [8]) and five state-of-the-art GCN-based models (NGCF [14], LR-GCCF [1], LightGCN [4], UltraGCN [11], and IMP-GCN [9]) for comparison. For a fair comparison, we implement all baselines under a unified


framework [19], fix the embedding size of both users and items to 64 for all models, initialize the embedding parameters with the Xavier initialization [3], and use Adam [6] as the optimizer. Besides, we carefully tune the hyper-parameters of each baseline following their published papers to find optimal settings. For our FourierKAN-GCF, we tune the λ of L_2 regularization term in $\{0, 1e-2, 1e-1, 1, 10\}$, and tune the layer number L from 1 to 4. The gridsize g of Fourier KAN is searched from $\{1, 2, 4, 8\}$. We further grid search the message dropout ratio p_m and node dropout ratio p_n in $\{0.0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3\}$.


4.3 Performance Comparison

The results of our experiments are listed in Table 2. We can identify that the majority of GCN-based methods outperform traditional matrix factorization methods, which is a common trend. Our FourierKAN-GCF outperforms all baselines in two datasets across various metrics. We owe our superiority to FourierKAN, which is easier to train and has greater representation power than MLP. It is worth noting that FourierKAN-GCF can adjust the training difficulty by adjusting the grid size g .

4.4 Ablation Study

Table 2 also demonstrates the significance of dropout strategies. We use w/o MD and w/o ND to denote without message dropout and without node dropout, respectively. This ablation study shows that both message dropout and node dropout play a distinct role in improving model representation power and model robustness. We use KAN-GCF to denote a variant that utilizes our standard KAN function to replace transform matrix W_2 in NGCF. It shows that standard KAN is better than MLP but worse than our Fourier KAN.

(a) Layer number L (Recall@20)(b) Grid size g (Recall@20)**Figure 2: Effective of layer number L and grid size g .**



(a) MOOC (Recall@20)

(b) Games (Recall@20)

Figure 3: Effective of drop out ratio p_m and p_n .

4.5 Sensitivity Analysis

To analyze the hyper-parameter sensitivity of FourierKAN-GCF, we test the performance of FourierKAN-GCF on two datasets with different hyper-parameters. The optimal layer number L is 3 on all datasets, shown in Figure 2(a). Besides, Figure 2(b) demonstrates that for MOOC and Games datasets, optimal (p_m, p_n) pairs are (0.2, 0.2) and (0.1, 0.1), respectively. As Figure 3 illustrated, for the relatively dense dataset MOOC, $g = 4$ is the best grid size. For the relatively sparse dataset Games, $g = 2$ is the best grid size. This further demonstrates that FourierKAN can be easily adapted to various datasets.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we revisit the processes of feature transformation and nonlinear operations during message passing in the NGCF. We assert that feature transformation in NGCF can enhance the interaction representation and boost the performance of GCN but add complexity in training. To reduce the training difficulty while benefiting from these representational enhancements, we introduce a novel feature transformation method called FourierKAN. Inspired by KAN, FourierKAN employs a Fourier Coefficients instead of the Spline function in standard KAN, which further reduces the difficulty of training while increasing the representation power. Furthermore, based on FourierKAN, we introduce a simple and effective graph-based recommendation model (FourierKAN-GCF) with extra dropout strategies. Extensive experiments on public datasets demonstrate the superiority of our model over the state-of-the-art methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lei Chen, Le Wu, Richang Hong, Kun Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Revisiting graph based collaborative filtering: A linear residual graph convolutional network approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 27–34.
- [2] George Cybenko. 1989. Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function. *Mathematics of control, signals and systems* 2, 4 (1989), 303–314.
- [3] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 249–256.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Yangqin Jiang, Chao Huang, and Lianhao Huang. 2023. Adaptive graph contrastive learning for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 4252–4261.
- [6] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [7] Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. 1961. *On the representation of continuous functions of several variables by superpositions of continuous functions of a smaller number of variables*. American Mathematical Society.
- [8] Dongha Lee, SeongKu Kang, Hyunjun Ju, Chanyoung Park, and Hwanjo Yu. 2021. Bootstrapping user and item representations for one-class collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in information retrieval*. 317–326.

- [9] Fan Liu, Zhiyong Cheng, Lei Zhu, Zan Gao, and Liqiang Nie. 2021. Interest-aware message-passing GCN for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2021*. 1296–1305.
- [10] Ziming Liu, Yixuan Wang, Sachin Vaidya, Fabian Ruehle, James Halverson, Marin Soljačić, Thomas Y Hou, and Max Tegmark. 2024. Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756* (2024).
- [11] Kelong Mao, Jieming Zhu, Xi Xiao, Biao Lu, Zhaowei Wang, and Xiuqiang He. 2021. UltraGCN: ultra simplification of graph convolutional networks for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 1253–1262.
- [12] Henri J Nussbaumer and Henri J Nussbaumer. 1982. *The fast Fourier transform*. Springer.
- [13] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2012. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.2618* (2012).
- [14] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval*. 165–174.
- [15] Yinwei Wei, Xiang Wang, Liqiang Nie, Xiangnan He, Richang Hong, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. MMGCN: Multi-modal graph convolution network for personalized recommendation of micro-video. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 1437–1445.
- [16] Jinfeng Xu, Zheyu Chen, Shuo Yang, Jinze Li, Hewei Wang, and Edith C-H Ngai. 2024. MENTOR: Multi-level Self-supervised Learning for Multimodal Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19407* (2024).
- [17] Junliang Yu, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Lizhen Cui, Nguyen Quoc Viet Hung, and Hongzhi Yin. 2023. XSimGCL: Towards extremely simple graph contrastive learning for recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [18] Xin Zhou, Donghui Lin, Yong Liu, and Chunyan Miao. 2023. Layer-refined graph convolutional networks for recommendation. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1247–1259.
- [19] Xin Zhou, Aixin Sun, Yong Liu, Jie Zhang, and Chunyan Miao. 2023. SelfCF: A Simple Framework for Self-Supervised Collaborative Filtering. *ACM Trans. Recomm. Syst.* (2023).