

Auto-Encoding or Auto-Regression? A Reality Check on Causality of Self-Attention-Based Sequential Recommenders

Yueqi Wang*
yueqi@berkeley.edu
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, USA

Zhankui He*
zh004@ucsd.edu
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, USA

Zhenrui Yue
zhenrui3@illinois.edu
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, USA

Julian McAuley†
jmcauley@ucsd.edu
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, USA

Dong Wang
dwang24@illinois.edu
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, USA

ABSTRACT

The comparison between Auto-Encoding (AE) and Auto-Regression (AR) has become an increasingly important topic with recent advances in sequential recommendation. At the heart of this discussion lies the comparison of BERT4Rec and SASRec, which serve as representative AE and AR models for self-attentive sequential recommenders. Yet the conclusion of this debate remains uncertain due to: (1) the lack of fair and controlled environments for experiments and evaluations; and (2) the presence of numerous confounding factors w.r.t. feature selection, modeling choices and optimization algorithms. In this work, we aim to answer this question by conducting a series of controlled experiments. We start by tracing the AE / AR debate back to its origin through a systematic re-evaluation of SASRec and BERT4Rec, discovering that AR models generally surpass AE models in sequential recommendation. In addition, we find that AR models further outperforms AE models when using a customized design space that includes additional features, modeling approaches and optimization techniques. Furthermore, the performance advantage of AR models persists in the broader HuggingFace transformer ecosystems. Lastly, we provide potential explanations and insights into AE/AR performance from two key perspectives: low-rank approximation and inductive bias. We make our code and data available at <https://github.com/yueqirex/ModSAR>

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Recommender systems**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language processing**.

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

†Correspondence to Julian McAuley (jmcauley@ucsd.edu).

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://www.acm.org).
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

KEYWORDS

Self-attention, Sequential Recommendation, SASRec, BERT4Rec, Auto-regression, Auto-encoding

ACM Reference Format:

Yueqi Wang, Zhankui He, Zhenrui Yue, Julian McAuley, and Dong Wang. 2018. Auto-Encoding or Auto-Regression? A Reality Check on Causality of Self-Attention-Based Sequential Recommenders. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

“Auto-Encoding (AE) or Auto-Regression (AR)?”: The debate over model architecture has existed in the context of sequence modeling tasks since the introduction of transformer models [5, 32]. For language tasks, this discourse has driven the prosperity of BERT-like and GPT-like models, and the recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) show a milestone for AR models [1, 5, 25, 31]. Nevertheless, in the context of sequential recommendations, the “AE or AR” question still remains unanswered.

AR-based and AE-based self-attentive models are widely used in sequential recommendation tasks [7, 18, 23], to predict users’ next action based on their historical action sequences. AR-based recommenders, represented by SASRec [12], SSE-PT [34], are commonly compared with the AE-based recommenders, represented by BERT4REC [27], LOCKER [11] in a wide range of recommendation datasets. However, those comparisons between AR-based and AE-based recommenders always lead to discrepancies in conclusions from a number of papers [22]. Specifically, while AE models claim superiority of bi-directional attention over AR models in [2, 16, 19, 20, 28, 30, 35–37, 39], AR models show better performance in [17, 24, 38, 40]. Approaching this issue, [22] focuses on replicating the original results of the AE-based recommender BERT4REC, rectifying several implementation details to obtain closer results to the reported. Afterwards, [13] shows that the AR-based recommender, SASRec, outperforms the AE-based BERT4REC when using the same loss function of the latter. Different from




Figure 1: Scope and hierarchy of AE / AR comparison for sequential recommendation in this work.

BERT4REC-SASRec reproducibility check [13, 22], we aim to hierarchically address the more general "AE or AR" model architectural comparison shown in figure 1.

To address this issue, below we formulate four specific research questions and share a summary of our findings and insights:

Q1: What are the Origins of the AE/AR Performance Debate for Sequential Recommendation? To answer this question, we start from the representative AE/AR models BERT4REC [27] and SASRec [12]. Unlike direct re-implementation in related works [13, 22], we carefully inspect the implementation details, revealing that discrepancies in AE/AR performance can be attributed to (1) evaluation metric choices and (2) loss function choices. The original BERT4REC outperforms SASRec with popularity-based sampled ranking metrics and Cross-Entropy loss, while SASRec performs better in other settings. Considering diverse evaluation settings in literature, AE/AR performance varies accordingly.

Q2: What is the AE/AR Performance Difference within the Common Sequential Recommender Design Space? To address this question, we eliminate confounding factors from the original implementations of BERT4REC and SASRec, and change the evaluation protocol to the most commonly used setup to date. Additionally, to draw more generalizable conclusions, we incorporate features from LOCKER [11] (local attentions) and SSE-PT [34] (personalized embeddings) together with various loss designs to construct a common sequential recommender design space. We systematically validate AE/AR performance differences within this design space and share our insights.

Q3: What is the AE/AR Recommendation Performance Difference within the Broader Self-Attentive Model Variants? To answer this question, we extend our evaluation beyond typical transformer variants in sequential recommendation tasks, controlling for AE/AR. We assess the performance difference in a broader ecosystem powered by HuggingFace [33], using various transformer variants originally designed for language tasks [3, 9, 15, 31]. We report the performance results, in which AE/AR is controlled.

Q4: How to Explain the AE/AR Performance Difference for Sequential Recommendation? To answer this question, we explore potential explanations from both *low-rank* and *inductive-bias* perspectives, to deepen the understanding of AE/AR difference in the context of sequential recommendations.

Table 1: Dataset statistics after preprocessing.

Datasets	Users	Items	Interact.	Length	Density
Beauty	52,204	57,289	395K	7.6	1e-4
Sports	83,970	83,728	589K	7.0	8e-5
Video	31,013	23,715	287K	9.3	4e-4
Yelp	31,371	36,616	300k	9.6	3e-4
ML-1M	6,040	3,416	1M	165.5	5e-2

In addition to those empirical results and theoretical analyses, we make our code and experimental scripts publicly available, along with unified evaluation environments, namely ModSAR, to support future research (a link attached to the end of abstract).

2 OVERALL EXPERIMENTAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Task formulation

The sequential recommendation task is formulated as follows. Consider a user set $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|U|}\}$, an item set $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|V|}\}$ and a user u_i 's interacted item sequence in chronological order $S_u = [v_1^{(u)}, v_2^{(u)}, \dots, v_n^{(u)}]$ with n being the sequence length, the sequential recommendation task is to predict the next item $v_{n+1}^{(u)}$ that u will interact with. Formally, it could be written as the probability of each item $v \in V$ being the next interacted item given S_u :

$$p(v_{n+1}^{(u)} = v | S_u)$$

We save the detailed math formulation of the reproduced models and refer readers to their original papers when encountered.

2.2 Datasets

We select datasets based on a survey of 48 most-cited papers of sequential recommendation and use ones with most frequent appearances [12, 27, 34, 41]. Specifically, Beauty, ML-1M, Yelp, Sports, Video Appears 20 (41.67%), 18 (37.50%), 10 (20.83%), 9 (18.75%), 9 (18.75%) times of the 48 surveyed papers:

- **Beauty:** A dataset of beauty sector from the Amazon review data crawled from Amazon [21], which includes a variety of products such as cosmetics, haircare, skincare, and other beauty-related products. This sparse dataset contains valuable real-world purchase behavior and rating information for the beauty sector on Amazon.
- **Sports:** A dataset of sports sector from the Amazon review data [21], including sports equipment, outdoor gears, fitness accessories, etc. Sports-ware purchasing dynamics included.
- **Video:** Video games sector of the Amazon review dataset [21], containing games for various platforms, gaming consoles, and gaming peripherals. Gaming-related purchase information and item metadata included.
- **Yelp**¹: A massive dataset for business review and recommendation, including user preference information for restaurants, cafes, shops, etc.
- **MovieLens:** A popular benchmark for movie recommendation [8], common for evaluating collaborative filtering algorithms. Here we utilize the widely used ML-1M.

For preprocessing, we follow common practice in [10–12, 26, 29] remove users and items with fewer than 5 interactions. We do not

¹<https://www.yelp.com/dataset>




Figure 2: The overall architecture for ModSAR. The middle section introduces the self-attention-based backbone accompanied by our modularized design space of {feature, modeling, loss}. User can also choose between the {self-attention + design space, Hugging Face models}. The far left section illustrates ASHA-adaptive architecture search managed by ray tune. The far right section shows comprehensive train/validation/test results logging.

use k-core filtering to keep the natural sparsity of datasets [11, 12]. we adopt max sequence length of 200 for ML-1M and 50 for Beauty, Sports, Video and Yelp datasets. We use the last item in the sequence as the test set, the second to last item for validation, and the rest items for training. Data statistics after preprocessing are in Table 1.

2.3 Training and Evaluation Framework

For experiments in Section 3, we re-implemented BERT4Rec using PyTorch-Lightning for AE/AR task control and easy tuning of its complex environment discussed in table 2. To ensure the correctness of our implementation, we keep Recall@{10, 20} and NDCG@{10, 20} between the original implementation and ours less and equal to 0.001. Detailed usage of the re-implementation will be discussed in Section 3.

For experiments in Section 4 and 5, we have a series of flexible experimental requirements:

- (1) Study AE/AR in various feature/model/loss design options.
- (2) Apply adaptive tuning heuristics for hyper-parameters and design choices. This way it yields more accurate results with limited memory and running time (Section 4, Section 5).
- (3) Allow Huggingface models to be easily trained and evaluated on recommendation datasets (Section 5).
- (4) Fulfill above flexible experimental requirements and meanwhile maintaining fair comparison between models by keeping the same data processing (subsection 2.2), training and evaluation conditions (subsection 2.4).

To ensure the above requirements, we design a customized training and evaluation framework named Modularized Design Space for Self-Attentive Recommender (ModSAR) shown in figure 2. We briefly introduce the structure of ModSAR as follows. Specific usage is discussed in later sections with detailed experimental setups.

- (1) The middle part in figure 2: Modeling part that supports both of {Design space + SAR backbone, Huggingface Plug-in}. Elements in the design space are added to the Self-Attentive Recommender (SAR) backbone to study AE/AR under the extensive choice of designs (Section 4). Huggingface plug-in acts as a counterpart to easily train and evaluate huggingface models on recommendation datasets (Section 5).
- (2) The left part in figure 2: Management of hyper-parameters and design space tuning. Huggingface model-tuning is also included. Asynchronous Successive Halving (ASHA) (discussed later) is used as the tuning algorithm implemented using Ray-tune.
- (3) The right part in figure 2: Logging of evaluation metrics, model weights, and configurations/hyper-parameters.

Specific usage of ModSAR will be discussed in later sections with corresponding experimental setups.

2.4 Implementation details

2.4.1 Training and evaluation. The evaluations metrics for all experiments are Recall@ k and NDCG@ k ($k \in [5, 10, 20]$), which are the most commonly used metrics in related works. For training in section 3, we adopt Cross-Entropy (CE) loss and set max epochs to 1000 and early stop when Recall@10 does not improve for 20 epochs. Each one of all models is trained on a single NVIDIA-3090 GPU (24G). The training time of each model ranges between 40min to 3 hours depending on the dataset. For training in section 4 and 5, we keep the same settings as above except that (1) loss is changeable (2) models are most likely stopped by ray-tune adaptive tuning rather than early stopping. We re-train and test the model with the best hyper-parameters tuned to derive final results.

2.4.2 Hyper-parameter tuning. For hyper-parameter tuning, we apply grid-search for models in section 3 and ray-tune managed adaptive search for ones in section 4 and 5. we search the hidden size of BERT4Rec in [32, 64, 128, 256, 512]. We search the hidden activation dropout rate and attention dropout rate from 0.1 to 0.9 on a 0.1 stride. We also search the number of attention layers and number attention heads of [1,2,4]. Lastly, we search masking probability of bidirectional attention models among [0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8]. Due to page constraint we do not enumerate through the tuning of all hyperparameters but rather above important ones. Refer to our shared code base for more details.

2.4.3 Reproducibility standard. For reproducibility standard, we set a reproducibility tolerance of 0.001 for relevant error between original and our implementation. This includes BERT4Rec used in Section 3 and all design space modules such as SSE-PT, Local attention and loss functions used in Section 4. The way we examine reproducibility of an design space module is that we compare the performance between original and our implementation of the model from which it is extracted. For example, we have local attention as a module in our design space. We first examine the correctness of our re-implementation of LOCKER [11] that proposes local attention and then extract local attention module to insert to our design space.

3 ORIGINS OF THE AE/AR PERFORMANCE DEBATE (Q1)

Findings. In this section, we address the origins of AE / AR performance debate. Petrov and Macdonald [22] finds that different training time and different versions of BERT4Rec implementations show inconsistent performance, here we sort out these confounding factors in table 2 and find the factors that can flip the AE / AR performance rank:

- (1) Both of AE / AR perform the best with Cross-Entropy (CE loss. Thus, we report results of CE loss here.
- (2) AR attention performs better than AE under all ranking evaluation (explained in table 2).
- (3) AE only performs better in popularity-based-sampling evaluation (explained in table 2), which causes inconsistencies of model performance and is not recommended when computational power is sufficient [14].

Details are discussed as follows.

3.1 Experimental setup

Our motivation in this section is to clarify the related confounding factors and fairly compare AE / AR for BERT4Rec and SASRec. However as summarized in table 2, BERT4Rec’s original implementation adopts a complex training environment with extra sequence augmentation, advanced learning rate scheduling, etc., while SASRec employs a canonical environment without add-ons. This makes it unfair to directly compare SASRec and BERT4Rec.

Thus, we design a series of fair and systematic environments for comparing AE and AR concepts. As BERT4Rec employs a series of add-ons than SASRec, we experiment BERT4Rec on (1) its original environment with add-ons and (2) a canonical environment that SASRec employs without add-ons. To fairly compare AE and

AR in these environments, we call the bidirectional BERT4Rec as BERT4Rec-AE, and build a uni-directional version of BERT4Rec named BERT4Rec-AR by:

- (1) Adding a causal mask/look-ahead-mask to the original BERT4Rec, allowing it to only attend to the history direction.
- (2) Change the optimization goal to predicting the next item like SASRec does.

For evaluation, table 2 shows the original BERT4Rec adopts popularity-based-sampling evaluation that ranks the ground-truth item with here $k=100$ sampled items according to their frequency of appearance in the dataset. However, this type of sampling-based evaluation is no longer recommended as it does not rank with all items in the pool and suffers from inconsistent @k-based metric values as k varies [14]. Instead, all-ranking-based evaluation better reflects the models’ true performance by ranking the ground-truth item with all items in the pool. Here, we evaluate models on both methods as we find during our experiments that this might be an important factor influencing the AE / AR comparison.

3.2 Experimental results

In this section, we discuss the results of encoding (AE) and auto-regression (AR) for BERT4Rec. We report its evaluation results in table 3. In table 3, *Eval.* means evaluation methods of popularity-based as in original BERT4Rec implementation or all-ranking based (explained in table 2). *Environment* means training environment, where *reprod.* is the BERT4Rec’s original environment with additional data augmentation and advanced learning rate scheduling etc. and *std.* means the standard environment like the original SASRec employed. Specific differences between the two environments are discussed in table 2. In addition to metrics of Recall@k and NDCG@k, we also report relative improvement of the best AR model than the best AE model as percentages, as long as they bear the same evaluation method; The best model under the same evaluation method is in bold.

From table 3, we find that the *flipping point* of AE vs. AR in performance is the evaluation method. Under popularity-based sampling evaluation, AE significantly leads AR by 10.32%, 8.30%, 8.04% for Beauty and Yelp and Sports with an average of 8.89%; AE leads AR modestly by -3.81%, -4.60% for Video and ML-1M with an average of -4.20%. The average lead of AE than AR across all metrics and dataset is 3.65%. In summary, AE shows superior performance than AR under popularity-based sampling evaluation by leading significantly in 3/5 datasets. This is consistent with the conclusion of the original BERT4Rec paper [27] despite BERT4Rec here showing less performance gain than originally reported.

However, when switched to all-ranking-based evaluation (explained in table 2), we find that AR significantly leads AE by 58.28%, 48.48%, 19.26%, 16.30% for Sports, Beauty, ML-1M and Video, and losses to AE by -31.34% for Yelp. The average performance gain of AR over AE is 22.20%. In summary, AR shows superior performance than AE under all-ranking evaluation by leading significantly in 4/5 datasets. All-ranking-based evaluation is now more widely adopted as it resembles better the real-world scenario where data sparsity prevails. AR’s superior performance might be better reflected under a more reasonable all-ranking evaluation due to its auto-regressive nature cohesion with next item prediction.

Table 2: Environmental differences between original SASRec and BERT4Rec implementation.

Aspect	Term	Explanation	SASRec	BERT4Rec
Data augmentation	Sequence Duplication	Duplicate a sequence by k times, and do random MLM masking for each duplicate independently.	✗	✓
	Sliding window	For sequence length greater than the pre-defined max length, sliding a window of size max length with stride k over the original sequence, yielding multiple subsequences.	✗	✓
	BCE loss function	-	✓	✗
Training Configuration	CE loss function	-	✗	✓
	Learning rate warm-up	Learning rate warm-up from zero to maximum learning rate. Strength is the current steps number divided by the number of pre-defined warm-up steps.	✗	✓
	Learning rate decay	After warm-up phase, apply a linear decay of the learning rate from maximum learning rate to zero. Strength is current step number divided by the number of pre-defined maximum number of training steps.	✗	✓
	Weight decay	Weight decay of the entire network.	✗	✓
	Uniform-based sampling	Ranking the label item with k uniformly sampled items instead of all items in the pool.	✓	✗
Evaluation method	Popularity-based sampling	Ranking the ground-truth item with k items sampled from a weighted random distribution corresponding to frequency of each item appearing in the entire dataset.	✗	✓
	All ranking	Ranking the ground-truth item with all items in the item pool.	✗	✗

We also notice that evaluation method flips the fact that which model performs better on sparse datasets. For popularity-based sampling, AE performs better than AR by leading 8.04%, and 10.32% on Sports and Beauty which are top-2 sparsest datasets. While AE performs worse than AR by leading -3.81% and -4.60% for Video and ML-1M, which are the bottom-2 sparsest; For all-ranking based sampling, AR has higher performance gain over AE by leading 58.28%, 48.48% for Sports and Video which are the top-2 sparsest datasets, while by leading 16.30% and 19.26% for Video and ML-1M which are the bottom-2 sparsest datasets. This also suggests when reducing the item pool size and using popularity-based sampling, one could break or even reverse models' performance on sparse datasets compared with all ranking.

In summary, while AE outperforms AR under popularity-based sampling evaluation, AR outperforms AE under all-ranking evaluation which resembles well the real-world data sparsity; The Evaluation method of popularity-sampling or all-ranking as the *flipping point* also controls models performance on sparse datasets.

4 AE/AR COMPARISON IN COMMON DESIGN SPACE (Q2)

Findings. We show in the previous section that AR outperforms AE in the level of representative models' comparison. In this section, we are curious if this conclusion changes in a broader settings of more variant feature/model/loss designs and find:

- (1) In the modularized, common design space for sequential recommendation, AR attention performs better than AE with variant attention types and loss types.

Details are explained as follows.

4.1 Experimental setup

4.1.1 Modularized design space with adaptive architecture search. In section 3, we compared auto-encoding (AE) and auto-regression (AR) for SASRec and BERT4REC under a series of comparable environments. In this section, we compare more systematically the idea of AE and AR. To achieve this purpose, we introduce a framework named **Modularized design space for Self-Attention-based**

Recommenders (ModSAR). As shown in figure 2, ModSAR modularizes past and potentially future modeling designs into a design space with easy adaptive neural architecture search (NAS) for the best performing design-combinations (Far left section in figure 2). Here, we leverage the flexibility of ModSAR to extensively compare AE and AR with more configurations. Specifically, we study AE vs AR under three aspect of the design space from past works:

- (1) Feature: User Embeddings via SSE-PT
- (2) Modeling: Local-attn
- (3) Optimization: Loss in {Loss-CE, Loss-BPR}

where *SSE-PT* [34] is an optimization-friendly way to introduce user embeddings; *Local-attn* [11] apply a window-based local attention mechanism in additional to vanilla self-attention. *{Loss-CE, Loss-BPR}* serves as two mostly used loss functions for sequential recommendation; Due to computational resource limitations, we can not study every combination of designs but rather set one representative configuration for each aspect in {Feature, Modeling, Optimization}. For each of above three designs, we search the best hyper-parameters for AE and AR respectively and compare the performance of the two. To tune as many combinations of hyper-parameters with limited machines, we adopt Asynchronous Successive Halving (ASHA)² heuristics for hyper-parameter tuning implemented by Ray-tune. ASHA stores the evaluation of each hyper-parameter combination per-epoch, compares each combination and gives up bad-performing combinations at an early epoch to save resources for tuning more promising hyper-parameters. This way we derive more optimal hyper-parameters for each model given limited machines. Evaluation results for different design options are discussed in section 4.2.

4.2 Experimental results

Table 4 shows AE/AR comparison based on our modularized design space with adaptive architecture search (ModSAR). We report the evaluation metrics and relative improvements as percentages of the best AR models than the best AE model which are in bold. The better

²<https://blog.ml.cmu.edu/2018/12/12/massively-parallel-hyperparameter-optimization/>

Table 3: Experimental results for different configurations for BERT4Rec. The best model under the same evaluation method is in bold. As shown in *Improv.* column, the best AE performs better than the best AR for 3/5 datasets under popularity-based-sample evaluation while AR outperforms AE for 4/5 datasets under all-ranking evaluation. *Environment* means training environment, where *reprod.* means BERT4Rec original environment with sequence augmentation, advanced learning rate scheduling etc., while *std.* means SASRec-like standard environment. See table 2 for a detailed comparison between environments.

BERT4Rec Eval. Environment		pop reprod.	pop reprod.	pop std.	pop std.	all-rank reprod.	all-rank reprod.	all-rank std.	all-rank std.	pop Improv.	all-rank Improv.
Dataset	Metric/Task	AE	AR	AE	AR	AE	AR	AE	AR	$\frac{AR-AE}{AE}$	$\frac{AR-AE}{AE}$
Beauty	Recall@5	0.1746	0.1743	0.1998	0.1791	0.0169	0.0289	0.0190	0.0295	-10.36%	55.26%
	Recall@10	0.2573	0.2427	0.2838	0.2463	0.0265	0.0395	0.0302	0.0391	-13.21%	30.79%
	Recall@20	0.3712	0.3484	0.3920	0.3473	0.0409	0.0518	0.0443	0.0525	-11.12%	18.51%
	NDCG@5	0.1182	0.1281	0.1394	0.1318	0.0106	0.0214	0.0122	0.0220	-5.45%	80.33%
	NDCG@10	0.1448	0.1500	0.1665	0.1534	0.0137	0.0248	0.0158	0.0251	-7.87%	58.86%
	NDCG@20	0.1735	0.1765	0.1936	0.1787	0.0173	0.0279	0.0193	0.0284	-7.70%	47.15%
Sports	Recall@5	0.1655	0.1594	0.1811	0.1638	0.0101	0.0150	0.0102	0.0175	-9.55%	71.57%
	Recall@10	0.2665	0.2493	0.2763	0.2543	0.0161	0.0209	0.0172	0.0242	-7.96%	40.70%
	Recall@20	0.4090	0.3840	0.4054	0.3872	0.0257	0.0289	0.0279	0.0334	-5.33%	19.71%
	NDCG@5	0.1067	0.1085	0.1202	0.1103	0.0065	0.0105	0.0064	0.0127	-8.24%	95.38%
	NDCG@10	0.1391	0.1373	0.1508	0.1393	0.0084	0.0124	0.0087	0.0148	-7.63%	70.11%
	NDCG@20	0.1750	0.1711	0.1833	0.1727	0.0108	0.0144	0.0113	0.0172	-5.78%	52.21%
Video	Recall@5	0.3374	0.3695	0.3713	0.3878	0.0446	0.0538	0.0524	0.0629	4.44%	20.04%
	Recall@10	0.4838	0.5034	0.5067	0.5186	0.0740	0.0823	0.0837	0.0941	2.35%	12.43%
	Recall@20	0.6437	0.6573	0.6500	0.6550	0.1155	0.1204	0.1292	0.1374	1.12%	6.35%
	NDCG@5	0.2279	0.2587	0.2552	0.2724	0.0287	0.0355	0.0337	0.0422	6.74%	25.22%
	NDCG@10	0.2751	0.3019	0.2991	0.3146	0.0381	0.0447	0.0437	0.0522	5.18%	19.45%
	NDCG@20	0.3156	0.3408	0.3353	0.3491	0.0485	0.0543	0.0552	0.0631	4.12%	14.31%
Yelp	Recall@5	0.5231	0.4906	0.5489	0.4990	0.0309	0.0185	0.0397	0.0254	-9.09%	-36.02%
	Recall@10	0.7377	0.7002	0.7432	0.7124	0.0479	0.0314	0.0575	0.0426	-4.14%	-25.91%
	Recall@20	0.8671	0.8382	0.8615	0.8489	0.0745	0.0533	0.0861	0.0694	-2.10%	-19.40%
	NDCG@5	0.3411	0.3196	0.3675	0.3209	0.0209	0.0116	0.0276	0.0161	-12.68%	-41.67%
	NDCG@10	0.4108	0.3877	0.4308	0.3903	0.0263	0.0158	0.0333	0.0216	-9.40%	-35.14%
	NDCG@20	0.4440	0.4230	0.4612	0.4253	0.0330	0.0213	0.0405	0.0284	-7.78%	-29.88%
ML-1M	Recall@5	0.5656	0.5929	0.5589	0.5712	0.1892	0.2329	0.1490	0.2086	4.83%	23.10%
	Recall@10	0.6846	0.6977	0.6732	0.6833	0.2796	0.3250	0.2344	0.3008	1.91%	16.24%
	Recall@20	0.7800	0.7937	0.7715	0.7813	0.3985	0.4356	0.3425	0.4116	1.76%	9.31%
	NDCG@5	0.4215	0.4562	0.4222	0.4379	0.1273	0.1615	0.0974	0.1440	8.05%	26.87%
	NDCG@10	0.4603	0.4901	0.4594	0.4743	0.1564	0.1914	0.1248	0.1738	6.47%	22.38%
	NDCG@20	0.4844	0.5144	0.4843	0.4991	0.1864	0.2193	0.1520	0.2018	6.19%	17.65%

model in {AE, AR} of each configuration in {Local-attn, SSE-PT, Loss-CE, Loss-BPR} is underlined; AR on average outperforms AE by a large margin of 19.64%, 24.01%, 28.04%, 35.77% for Local-attn, SSE-PT, Loss-CE, and Loss-BPR. The best AR model of all configurations on average leads the best AE model by 21.60%. This shows that (1) the concept of auto-regression (AR) continue to perform better than AE under extensive experimentation of modularized design space with adaptive search. (2) AR's performance gain also varies on different data distributions. AE leads AE by 39.73%, 26.01%, 32.46%, 8.28%, 27.84% for Beauty, Sports, Video, Yelp and ML-1M datasets, showing that AR's robustness for both sparse and dense datasets besides Yelp due to its data distribution. (3) AR models continue to show better ranking performance than AE, as AR's average NDCG gains over AE is 29.69% across all datasets, models and metrics and for Recall its around 5% lower as 24.04%. (4) We also observe that AR's performance gain for Local-attn design is the lowest for all, and we will show analysis on this based on model designing

in section 6. (5) Compared with results from section 3, We found that AR's Superior performance is retained here in the extensive study on ModSAR (performance gain of AR 22.20% in section 3, and 21.60% here);

In summary, AR continues to outperform AE across various design choices; AR outperforms AE as good on sparse datasets as on dense datasets in our modularized design space, an improvement from results in section 3 where AR's lead is more significant on sparse datasets; AR continues to show better ranking ability than AE as we showed in point (3).

5 AE/AR COMPARISON IN BROADER TRANSFORMER ECOSYSTEM (Q3)

Findings. In this section, we are curious that whether AE or AR performs better when expanding our research objective to a broader group of self-attention variants. Thus we design a HuggingFace

Table 4: Adaptive tuning results of our modularized design space, ModSAR. The better model in {AE, AR} are underlined for each design choice. AR outperforms AE at least on 4/5 datasets for all design choices; Improvements are computed based on the best AE model and the best AR model that are in bold; The best AR model sometimes significantly outperforms the best AE one (often over 20%).

Design Choice	Local attn	Local attn	SSE PT	SSE PT	Loss CE	Loss CE	Loss BPR	Loss BPR	Best Improv.	
Data	-	AE	AR	AE	AR	AE	AR	AE	AR	$\frac{AR-AE}{AE}$
Bea.	R@5	.0234	.0324	.0172	<u>.0239</u>	.0203	<u>.0313</u>	.0095	<u>.0133</u>	38.46%
	R@10	.0371	.0477	.0280	<u>.0358</u>	.0330	<u>.0468</u>	.0168	<u>.0237</u>	28.57%
	R@20	.0544	.0662	.0430	<u>.0512</u>	.0496	.0673	.0279	<u>.0384</u>	23.71%
	N@5	.0136	.0206	.0105	<u>.0152</u>	.0116	<u>.0192</u>	.0054	<u>.0076</u>	51.47%
	N@10	.0180	.0255	.0140	<u>.0190</u>	.0157	<u>.0242</u>	.0077	<u>.0110</u>	41.67%
N@20	.0223	.0302	.0177	<u>.0229</u>	.0199	<u>.0294</u>	.0105	<u>.0146</u>	35.43%	
Spo.	R@5	.0141	.0184	.0124	<u>.0151</u>	.0132	.0188	.0071	<u>.0088</u>	33.33%
	R@10	.0238	.0286	.0192	<u>.0228</u>	.0216	.0288	.0122	<u>.0150</u>	21.01%
	R@20	.0374	.0414	.0288	<u>.0335</u>	.0349	.0429	.0199	<u>.0243</u>	14.71%
	N@5	.0082	.0111	.0075	<u>.0096</u>	.0078	.0114	.0042	<u>.0051</u>	39.02%
	N@10	.0113	.0144	.0097	<u>.0121</u>	.0105	.0146	.0058	<u>.0071</u>	29.20%
N@20	.0147	.0176	.0121	<u>.0148</u>	.0138	.0181	.0078	<u>.0094</u>	23.13%	
Vid.	R@5	.0534	.0681	.0444	<u>.0551</u>	.0500	.0692	.0293	<u>.0470</u>	29.59%
	R@10	.0872	.1076	.0744	<u>.0890</u>	.0844	.1125	.0548	<u>.0777</u>	29.01%
	R@20	.1350	.1571	.1157	<u>.1355</u>	.1304	.1664	.0892	<u>.1235</u>	23.26%
	N@5	.0321	.0413	.0266	<u>.0332</u>	.0296	.0421	.0173	<u>.0280</u>	31.15%
	N@10	.0430	.0540	.0362	<u>.0441</u>	.0406	.0560	.0255	<u>.0379</u>	30.23%
N@20	.0550	.0665	.0465	<u>.0559</u>	.0522	.0696	.0341	<u>.0494</u>	26.55%	
Yel.	R@5	<u>.0422</u>	.0386	.0298	<u>.0337</u>	.0504	.0477	.0244	<u>.0324</u>	-5.36%
	R@10	<u>.0649</u>	.0592	.0490	<u>.0527</u>	.0728	.0724	.0423	<u>.0524</u>	-0.55%
	R@20	<u>.0992</u>	.0922	.0762	<u>.0807</u>	.1057	.1057	.0695	<u>.0825</u>	0.00%
	N@5	<u>.0272</u>	.0263	.0190	<u>.0220</u>	.0353	.0323	.0140	<u>.0210</u>	-8.50%
	N@10	<u>.0345</u>	.0329	.0252	<u>.0281</u>	.0424	.0402	.0197	<u>.0274</u>	-5.19%
N@20	<u>.0431</u>	.0412	.0321	<u>.0351</u>	.0507	.0486	.0266	<u>.0350</u>	-4.14%	
ML-.	R@5	.1715	.2161	.1232	<u>.1745</u>	.1641	<u>.2096</u>	.1116	<u>.1591</u>	26.01%
	R@10	.2666	.3118	.2040	<u>.2523</u>	.2606	<u>.3089</u>	.1868	<u>.2449</u>	16.95%
	R@20	.3892	.4290	.2942	<u>.3487</u>	.3724	<u>.4174</u>	.2960	<u>.3629</u>	10.23%
	N@5	.1057	.1362	.0749	<u>.1127</u>	.0991	<u>.1316</u>	.0671	<u>.0966</u>	28.86%
	N@10	.1363	.1671	.1009	<u>.1377</u>	.1301	<u>.1638</u>	.0912	<u>.1243</u>	22.60%
N@20	.1671	.1966	.1237	<u>.1619</u>	.1582	<u>.1912</u>	.1186	<u>.1540</u>	17.65%	

plugs-in that directly applies to recommendation datasets (An item ID sequence as a "sentence"). We find that:

- (1) AR attention performs better than AE when directly applying and tuning huggingface models including ALBERT, LLaMA and Trm-XL on recommendation datasets.

Details are explained as follows.

5.1 Experimental setup

Bridging the gap between the field of Sequential Recommendations and Natural language Processing has been long talked about [4]. In this section, we introduce HuggingFace plugs-ins to our ModSAR pipeline discussed in section 4. The far right section of figure 2 shows the position of HuggingFace plug-ins in ModSAR as optional modeling backbones. With HuggingFace-enabled ModSAR, the latest NLP models could be efficiently tuned on recommendation benchmarks utilizing our adaptive hyper-parameter/architecture search. One solely needs to change the modeling part as data-loading, training, and evaluation are managed by ModSAR. We summarize the steps needed for training/re-developing a HuggingFace-supported NLP model on recommendation benchmarks as follows:

- (1) Copy the desired modeling file directly from HuggingFace.

Table 5: Adaptive tuning results of sometimes latest Hugging Face NLP models on sequential recommendation datasets of ours. The better model in {AE, AR} are underlined; AR outperforms AE on at least 4/5 datasets. Improvements are computed between the best AE model and the best AR model which are in bold; The best AR model sometimes significantly outperforms the best AE model (often over 20% for *Beauty* and *Sports*, over around 10% for *Yelp* and *ML-1M*).

HF Model	AL-BERT	AL-BERT	LLa-MA	LLa-MA	Trm.-XL	Trm.-XL	Best Improv.	
Data	-	AE	AR	AE	AR	AE	AR	$\frac{AR-AE}{AE}$
Bea.	R@5	.0189	<u>.0284</u>	.0192	<u>.0277</u>	.0247	.0343	38.87%
	R@10	.0312	<u>.0386</u>	.0319	<u>.0394</u>	.0389	.0485	24.68%
	R@20	.0481	<u>.0527</u>	.0470	<u>.0540</u>	.0553	.0666	20.43%
	N@5	.0113	<u>.0192</u>	.0118	<u>.0180</u>	.0150	.0226	50.67%
	N@10	.0152	<u>.0224</u>	.0159	<u>.0218</u>	.0195	.0272	39.49%
N@20	.0195	<u>.0260</u>	.0197	<u>.0255</u>	.0236	.0317	34.32%	
Spo.	R@5	.0135	<u>.0160</u>	.0124	<u>.0154</u>	.0146	.0187	28.08%
	R@10	.0216	<u>.0238</u>	.0199	<u>.0233</u>	.0230	.0294	27.83%
	R@20	.0347	<u>.0351</u>	.0309	<u>.0338</u>	.0359	.0432	20.33%
	N@5	.0079	<u>.0101</u>	.0073	<u>.0098</u>	.0088	.0119	35.23%
	N@10	.0106	<u>.0125</u>	.0098	<u>.0124</u>	.0115	.0153	33.04%
N@20	.0139	<u>.0154</u>	.0125	<u>.0150</u>	.0148	.0188	27.03%	
Vid.	R@5	.0471	<u>.0625</u>	.0556	<u>.0625</u>	.0644	.0709	10.09%
	R@10	.0798	<u>.0955</u>	.0914	<u>.0980</u>	.1032	.1106	7.17%
	R@20	.1238	<u>.1420</u>	.1407	<u>.1436</u>	.1543	.1620	4.99%
	N@5	.0284	<u>.0388</u>	.0339	<u>.0387</u>	.0391	.0441	12.79%
	N@10	.0389	<u>.0494</u>	.0454	<u>.0501</u>	.0516	.0569	10.27%
N@20	.0500	<u>.0611</u>	.0577	<u>.0616</u>	.0645	.0699	8.37%	
Yel.	R@5	<u>.0329</u>	.0219	<u>.0364</u>	.0347	<u>.0377</u>	.0343	-7.96%
	R@10	<u>.0514</u>	.0392	<u>.0557</u>	.0529	.0563	.0567	0.71%
	R@20	<u>.0798</u>	.0632	.0865	.0791	.0845	.0903	4.39%
	N@5	<u>.0217</u>	.0128	<u>.0237</u>	.0246	<u>.0259</u>	.0210	-5.02%
	N@10	<u>.0276</u>	.0184	.0299	.0305	<u>.0319</u>	.0282	-4.39%
N@20	<u>.0348</u>	.0244	<u>.0377</u>	.0370	<u>.0390</u>	.0365	-5.13%	
ML-.	R@5	.1508	<u>.2108</u>	.1733	<u>.2013</u>	.1988	.2238	12.58%
	R@10	.2371	<u>.3018</u>	.2714	<u>.2894</u>	.2935	.3219	9.68%
	R@20	.3475	<u>.4081</u>	.3894	<u>.4017</u>	.4000	.4311	7.77%
	N@5	.0908	<u>.1322</u>	.1106	<u>.1282</u>	.1250	.1412	12.96%
	N@10	.1185	<u>.1615</u>	.1422	<u>.1565</u>	.1556	.1728	11.05%
N@20	.1464	<u>.1883</u>	.1722	<u>.1849</u>	.1827	.2003	9.63%	

- (2) Define one's preferred training configurations following HuggingFace's format (e.g. number of layers and dimensions).
- (3) Run a one-line command to tune the model on various recommendation datasets with ray tune.

Here, we focus on further extensive study of AE and AR comparison on the latest NLP models from HuggingFace. Specifically, we select three popular models that are originally uni-directional (Llama, Transformer-XL) or bi-directional (ALBERT). Similar to the approach discussed in section 3, we change the original model to their AE/AR counterparts by (1) adding/removing the causal mask and (2) changing their optimization task to the next item prediction/Mask Language Model (MLM). Evaluation results for HuggingFace models are discussed in section 5.2

5.2 Experimental results

Table 5 shows the evaluation results of the above models and the relative improvement of the best AR models to the best AE model which are in bold. The better of {AE, AR} for each model choice is underlined; According to table 5, (1) AR continues to outperform AE on average by 16.21%, 14.37%, 15.30% for ALBERT Llama




Figure 3: Average relative improvement of AR over AE for common model design space and for Hugging Face. Local-attn in 3a and Transformer-XL in 3b show lowest improvements due to inductive bias in their AR versions.

and Transformer-XL; The best AR model outperforms the best AE model by 16.00%. (2) AR performs extra well on sparse datasets. For instance, AR on average leads AE by 35.80%, 21.63% for Beauty and Sports which are top-2 sparsest datasets, and by 14.42%, 17.67% for Video and ML-1M which are bottom-2 sparsest. AR only loses to AE on Yelp due to its specific data distribution. (3) AR continues to show superior ranking ability than AE. This is because AR outperforms AE by 12.46% for Recall and by 18.12% for NDCG.

In summary, AR continues to show superior performance than AE on HuggingFace NLP models, this is consistent with our conclusions from section 3 and section 4; AR’s performance gain is more significant on sparse datasets and it shows better ranking ability than AE by having more improved NDCG than Recall.

6 EXPLAINING AE/AR PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCE (Q4)

6.1 Local inductive bias for AR as performance contributor

AR models introduce natural inductive biases [11] for next item prediction. This visualized in the first row of figure 5, where current item tends to attend to local items in the past. Local attention [11] introduces such local inductive bias by forcing models to focus on recent items. The fact that such restriction improves performance of BERT4REC-AE that suggests inductive bias contributes positively to the performance of self-attention models. This thus justifies AR’s superior performance over AE due to its natural inductive bias. Besides, we found AR’s performance gain over AE is the lowest for local-attn model in section 4 as 19.64%, but the gain is 24.01%, 28.04%, 35.77% for SSE-PT, Loss-BCE, Loss-BPR. See figure 3a for visualization. This is because while AE is improved by learning the inductive bias from local-attention, AR models already bear such bias due to its auto-regressive nature; Thus, adding local attention to AR shows less performance gain over local-attention enabled AE than other configurations. This phenomenon suggests positive contribution of natural local inductive bias contained in AR models. Figure 3b shows worst ranking ability improvement of AR over AE of Transformer-XL by having the lowest NDCG improvement. This is because AE version of transformer-XL does not remove the segment level inductive bias due to its recurrent memory, but




Figure 4: Singular values distribution for random user X in descending order for BERT4Rec-{AE, AR}, AE’s singular values drops to near zero in a faster rate than AR, suggesting a lower rank approximation.




Figure 5: Attention visualizations. First row is original matrix; Second row is corresponding low-rank approximations using top-5 largest singular values. Pure BERT4Rec-AE attention has a clear-pattern rank-5 approximation while local-attn and AR losses their patterns and need a higher-rank approximation.

rather only allowing bi-directional item-item attention. This also justifies the positive role of local inductive bias towards AR model’s performance.

6.2 Lower-rank approximation of AE

In previous sections, we have shown that AR constantly outperforms AE on various settings of classic/extensive model designs across datasets/metrics. We explore the reason by applying singular value decomposition to the attention matrices of BERT4REC-AE, BERT4REC-AR, in figure 4. The singular values are sorted in descending order along y-axis while x-axis shows their index. Both models show non-trivial decomposition patterns but AE’s singular values drop to near zero in a faster rate than AR. This suggests that AE’s attention matrix could be approximated by a lower rank matrix. Dong et al. [6] argues AE’s attention matrices suffer from attention degeneration problem due to low rank convergence but AR matrices are guaranteed full-rank due to its positive triangular values (positive determinant thus full-rank). This is consistent with our analysis here as AE could be approximated by a lower-rank

matrix, thus making some positions in the sequence corresponding to small singular values trivial to contribute to a performant attention matrix. This is further proved by figure 5 where the first row shows the original attention matrix and the second row shows their approximation using top-5 largest singular values. Attention matrix the pure bi-directional BERT4REC-AE is approximated well by resembling well as the original matrix. However, Attention matrix of Local-attn and BERT4REC-AR already loss their pattern of local inductive bias, and they need a higher-rank approximation to reconstruct performant attention as the original. As a conclusion, higher-rank singular value approximation of AR and local-attn model implies more useful positions in the original sequence to contribute to the overall attention pattern, which is here the local inductive bias discussed in section 6.1. And this justifies the superior performance of AR models over AE.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we systematically evaluate the performance of AE and AR models in the sequential recommendation task. Through extensive experiments and evaluations in a controlled setting, we find that AR models consistently exhibit advantages over AE models in recommendation performance. This may be attributed to the superior capabilities of causal attention in capturing local inductive bias for user preference understanding. In contrast, AE models perform better in popularity-based sampling evaluation, which may not accurately reflect the models' true performance [14]. For future research, we recommend that models should be evaluated in fair and controlled environments, using consistent and reasonable data processing and evaluation methods. Combined with detailed design explanations, better modeling practices could accelerate the development of high-performance architectures.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [2] Sung Min Cho, Eunhyeok Park, and Sungjoo Yoo. 2020. MEANTIME: Mixture of attention mechanisms with multi-temporal embeddings for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on recommender systems*. 515–520.
- [3] Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc V Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Transformer-xl: Attentive language models beyond a fixed-length context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.02860* (2019).
- [4] Gabriel de Souza Pereira Moreira, Sara Rabhi, Jeong Min Lee, Ronay Ak, and Even Oldridge. 2021. Transformers4rec: Bridging the gap between nlp and sequential/session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 143–153.
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [6] Yihe Dong, Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, and Andreas Loukas. 2021. Attention is not all you need: Pure attention loses rank doubly exponentially with depth. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2793–2803.
- [7] Xinyan Fan, Zheng Liu, Jianxun Lian, Wayne Xin Zhao, Xing Xie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. Lighter and better: low-rank decomposed self-attention networks for next-item recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 1733–1737.
- [8] 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.
- [9] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654* (2020).
- [10] 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*. 173–182.
- [11] Zhankui He, Handong Zhao, Zhe Lin, Zhaowen Wang, Ajinkya Kale, and Julian McAuley. 2021. Locker: Locally constrained self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 3088–3092.
- [12] Wang-Cheng Kang and Julian McAuley. 2018. Self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 197–206.
- [13] Anton Klenitskiy and Alexey Vasilev. 2023. Turning Dross Into Gold Loss: is BERT4Rec really better than SASRec?. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 1120–1125.
- [14] 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.
- [15] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2019. Albert: A lite bert for self-supervised learning of language representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.11942* (2019).
- [16] Haoyang Li, Xin Wang, Ziwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Peng Cui, and Wenwu Zhu. 2021. Intention-aware sequential recommendation with structured transition. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34, 11 (2021), 5403–5414.
- [17] Yang Li, Tong Chen, Peng-Fei Zhang, and Hongzhi Yin. 2021. Lightweight self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 967–977.
- [18] Chang Liu, Xiaoguang Li, Guohao Cai, Zhenhua Dong, Hong Zhu, and Lifeng Shang. 2021. Noninvasive self-attention for side information fusion in sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4249–4256.
- [19] Zhiwei Liu, Ziwei Fan, Yu Wang, and Philip S Yu. 2021. Augmenting sequential recommendation with pseudo-prior items via reversely pre-training transformer. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 1608–1612.
- [20] Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Hongxia Yang, Peng Cui, Xin Wang, and Wenwu Zhu. 2020. Disentangled self-supervision in sequential recommenders. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 483–491.
- [21] Julian McAuley, Christopher Targett, Qinfeng Shi, and Anton Van Den Hengel. 2015. Image-based recommendations on styles and substitutes. In *Proceedings of the 38th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 43–52.
- [22] Aleksandr Petrov and Craig Macdonald. 2022. A systematic review and replicability study of bert4rec for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 436–447.
- [23] Aleksandr Petrov and Yurii Makarov. 2021. Attention-based neural re-ranking approach for next city in trip recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12475* (2021).
- [24] Ruihong Qiu, Zi Huang, Hongzhi Yin, and Zijian Wang. 2022. Contrastive learning for representation degeneration problem in sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 813–823.
- [25] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. (2018).
- [26] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2010. Factorizing personalized markov chains for next-basket recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*. 811–820.
- [27] Fei Sun, Jun Liu, Jian Wu, Changhua Pei, Xiao Lin, Wenwu Ou, and Peng Jiang. 2019. BERT4Rec: Sequential recommendation with bidirectional encoder representations from transformer. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 1441–1450.
- [28] Zhongchuan Sun, Bin Wu, Youwei Wang, and Yangdong Ye. 2022. Sequential graph collaborative filtering. *Information Sciences* 592 (2022), 244–260.
- [29] Jiayi Tang and Ke Wang. 2018. Personalized top-n sequential recommendation via convolutional sequence embedding. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 565–573.
- [30] Xiaohai Tong, Pengfei Wang, Chenliang Li, Long Xia, and Shaozhang Niu. 2021. Pattern-enhanced Contrastive Policy Learning Network for Sequential Recommendation. In *IJCAI*. 1593–1599.
- [31] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. *arXiv:2302.13971* [cs.CL]
- [32] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [33] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Mui, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al.

2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771* (2019).
- [34] Liwei Wu, Shuqing Li, Cho-Jui Hsieh, and James Sharpnack. 2020. SSE-PT: Sequential recommendation via personalized transformer. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 328–337.
- [35] Qitian Wu, Chenxiao Yang, Shuodian Yu, Xiaofeng Gao, and Guihai Chen. 2021. Seq2bubbles: Region-based embedding learning for user behaviors in sequential recommenders. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2160–2169.
- [36] Zhenrui Yue, Zhankui He, Huimin Zeng, and Julian McAuley. 2021. Black-box attacks on sequential recommenders via data-free model extraction. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 44–54.
- [37] Lingxiao Zhang, Jiangpeng Yan, Yujiu Yang, and Li Xiu. 2020. Match4rec: A novel recommendation algorithm based on bidirectional encoder representation with the matching task. In *Neural Information Processing: 27th International Conference, ICONIP 2020, Bangkok, Thailand, November 23–27, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 27. Springer, 491–503.
- [38] Yixin Zhang, Lizhen Cui, Wei He, Xudong Lu, and Shipeng Wang. 2021. Behavioral data assists decisions: exploring the mental representation of digital-self. *International Journal of Crowd Science* 5, 2 (2021), 185–203.
- [39] Chang Zhou, Jianxin Ma, Jianwei Zhang, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. 2021. Contrastive learning for debiased candidate generation in large-scale recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 3985–3995.
- [40] Kun Zhou, Hui Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yutao Zhu, Sirui Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Zhongyuan Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2020. S3-rec: Self-supervised learning for sequential recommendation with mutual information maximization. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 1893–1902.
- [41] Kun Zhou, Hui Yu, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Filter-enhanced MLP is all you need for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM web conference 2022*. 2388–2399.

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