
Large Language Models Make Sample-Efficient Recommender Systems

Jianghao Lin

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China
chiangel@sjtu.edu.cn

Xinyi Dai

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China
daixinyi5@huawei.com

Rong Shan

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China
shanrong@sjtu.edu.cn

Bo Chen

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China
chenbo116@huawei.com

Ruiming Tang

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China
tangruiming@huawei.com

Yong Yu

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China
yyu@sjtu.edu.cn

Weinan Zhang *

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shenzhen, China
wnzhang@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable progress in the field of natural language processing (NLP), demonstrating remarkable abilities in producing text that resembles human language for various tasks. This opens up new opportunities for employing them in recommender systems (RSs). In this paper, we specifically examine the sample efficiency of LLM-enhanced recommender systems, which pertains to the model's capacity to attain superior performance with a limited quantity of training data. Conventional recommendation models (CRMs) often need a large amount of training data because of the sparsity of features and interactions. Hence, we propose and verify our core viewpoint: Large Language Models Make Sample-Efficient Recommender Systems. We propose a simple yet effective framework (i.e., Laser) to validate the viewpoint from two aspects: (1) LLMs themselves are sample-efficient recommenders; and (2) LLMs, as feature generators and encoders, make CRMs more sample-efficient. Extensive experiments on two public datasets show that Laser requires only a small fraction of training samples to match or even surpass CRMs that are trained on the entire training set, demonstrating superior sample efficiency.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable progress in the field of natural language processing (NLP), showing impressive abilities to generate human-like texts for a broad range of tasks [59, 33, 43, 9]. Consequently, recent works start to investigate the application of LLMs in recommender systems. They adopt LLMs for various recommendation tasks, and show promising performance from different aspects (*e.g.*, user profiling) [17, 52, 48]. In this paper, we mainly focus on promoting the **sample efficiency** of recommender systems by involving large language models [31].

*Corresponding author.

Sample efficiency refers to the ability of a model to achieve high performance with a limited amount of training data. A sample-efficient model can learn effectively from a smaller number of samples, reducing the resources and time required for training. In conventional recommender systems, we usually convert raw data into an ID data through one-hot encoding. Due to the data sparsity, conventional recommendation models (CRMs) typically require a large volume of training records to achieve satisfactory performance, resulting in sample inefficiency issue [38].

To this end, in this paper, we propose our core viewpoint, *i.e.*, **Large Language Models Make Sample-Efficient Recommender Systems (Laser)**, where a novel framework named **Laser** is designed to validate such a core viewpoint from the following two key aspects:

- **LLMs themselves are sample-efficient recommenders.**
- **LLMs make conventional recommender systems more sample-efficient.**

To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to systematically investigate the impact of LLMs on the sample efficiency of recommender systems. Experiments show that our proposed Laser framework require only a small fraction of training samples to match or even surpass (CRMs) that are trained on the entire training set.

2 Related Works

This paper is closely related to the following two research domains: (1) LLM-enhanced recommender systems, and (2) sample efficiency.

2.1 LLM-enhanced Recommender Systems

The emergence of large language models (LLMs) has flourish in the field of natural language processing (NLP), and LLMs are potentially revolutionizing various downstream applications like symbolic reasoning [22] code analysis [42] and recommender systems [27]. Generally, there are two major paradigms to leverage LLMs to further enhance the performance of recommender systems [27]: (1) adapting LLMs themselves as the recommender [30, 2, 47, 46], which corresponds to our $\text{Laser}_{LLM \text{ only}}$, and (2) adapting LLMs for the feature engineering or feature encoding [50, 13, 44], which corresponds to our $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$.

LLMs as the recommenders directly. In this paradigm, we do not involve conventional recommendation models (CRMs) for the user preference estimation, and should rely on LLMs themselves to directly infer the user’s preference towards a target item given his or her behavior history. In this way, we can benefit from the large capacity, open-world knowledge, and emerging abilities like reasoning of LLMs, which deepens the user intention understanding and thereby improves the final recommendation performance. According to existing works, in this case, LLMs are adopted to fulfill either the item scoring task [32, 57, 26, 2, 24, 58, 35], or item generation task [20, 15, 21, 54, 19, 5, 39, 49]. Also, various works [14, 8, 55] attempt to utilize the multi-task capacity of LLMs, and instruct LLMs to solve the multiple tasks (e.g., both scoring and generation) through a unified language interface.

LLMs for the feature engineering and features encoding. In this paradigm, we enhance the performance of traditional recommendation models, which corresponds to our proposed $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$. We still maintain the conventional recommendations (CRMs) as the major backbone of the recommender system, and adapt LLMs to generate auxiliary text data [34, 3, 23, 37, 4, 7] and encode the corresponding textual features [18, 56, 12, 53, 41, 25, 16, 36] (*e.g.*, item content understanding, user profile modeling), which would serve as the additional inputs for CRMs. In this way, we are able to omit the online inference of LLMs and make the LLM processing cachable to meet the strict online inference latency constrains of industrial applications.

2.2 Sample Efficiency

In the field of machine learning, the sample efficiency of a model refers to its ability to achieve satisfactory performance with a limited amount of training data [1]. Improving sample efficiency is crucial for addressing practical challenges in various domains, such as reducing data collection costs [11], mitigating data annotation efforts [10], and enabling rapid learning in real-world settings where labeled data is scarce [51]. In the realm of recommender systems, the sample efficiency

is of great importance due to the data sparsity problem [31, 38]. Various approaches have been proposed to improve the sample efficiency of recommender systems, ranging from leveraging auxiliary information through transfer learning and domain adaptation [61] to employing meta-learning techniques to enable quick adaption to new users or items with limited data [45]. Recently, the emerging of large language models have present a promising solution to potentially enhance the sample efficiency of recommender systems with their vast amount of open-world knowledge and powerful reasoning abilities. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to systematically investigate the impact of LLMs on the sample efficiency of recommender systems under two different paradigms, *i.e.*, LLMs as recommenders, and LLMs for feature engineering and encoding.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminary and Overview

We focus on a core task of recommender systems, *i.e.*, click-through rate (CTR) prediction, which is a binary classification problem to estimate the click probability $\hat{y} \in [0, 1]$ of a user on a target item given a certain context. The dataset can be formulated as $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where x_i is the input and $y_i \in \{1, 0\}$ is the label (*i.e.*, click or not) [28, 29].

There are two different types of data processing towards the same raw input x_i . For one thing, we can perform one-hot encoding to convert x_i into ID input x_i^{ID} for conventional recommendation models. For another, we can adopt hard prompt template to transform x_i into textual input x_i^{text} for LLMs. Accordingly, the label y_i is also converted into the binary answer words $y_i^{text} \in \{\text{“Yes”}, \text{“No”}\}$.

We illustrate the overall framework of our proposed Laser in Figure 1. The Laser framework consists of two different paradigms to enhance the recommender systems with large language models in terms of sample efficiency:

- Laser_{LLM only} directly adopts a pure large language model as the recommender itself for CTR estimation without involving conventional recommendation models (CRMs). In this paradigm, we require LLMs to answer the binary question about the user’s preference towards a target item with specified key words, *i.e.*, Yes or No.
- Laser_{LLM+CRM} uses LLMs as the feature generator and encoder to assist CRMs for CTR prediction. In this paradigm, we directly utilize the predicted probability from a conventional recommendation model augmented with textual features from LLMs as inputs.

Next, we will elaborate on these two paradigms of LLM-enhanced recommender systems.

3.2 Laser_{LLM only}: LLM as Recommender Itself

When directly adopting LLMs as the recommenders, we formulate CTR prediction as a binary question answering task. An example of input template is given as follows:

x^{text} = The user watched the following movies in order in the past and rated them: [’0. The Terminator (4 stars)’, ’1. Back to Future (5 stars)’, ’2. Matrix (4 stars)’. Please deduce (A) whether the user will like the movie Aliens. You should ONLY tell me yes or no.

Then, we apply instruction tuning over the LLM with the causal language modeling objective:

$$\max_{\Theta} \sum_{(x^{text}, y^{text}) \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{j=1}^{|y^{text}|} \log P_{\Theta}(y_j^{text} | x^{text}, y_{<j}^{text}), \quad (1)$$

where Θ is the parameters of the LLM, \mathcal{D} is the training set, y_j^{text} is the j -th token of the textual output y^{text} , and $y_{<j}^{text}$ denotes the tokens before y_j^{text} . During evaluation, since we want a continuous click probability in $[0, 1]$ rather than a generated discrete token (*i.e.*, Yes or No), we perform a bidimensional softmax over the logits of “Yes” and “No” tokens (denoted as s_{yes} and s_{no}) to obtain the estimated click probability \hat{y} :

$$\hat{y} = \frac{\exp(s_{yes})}{\exp(s_{yes}) + \exp(s_{no})} \in (0, 1). \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: The overall framework of Laser.

In this paradigm, we do not involve the conventional recommendation models like DIN [60] and SIM [40], and only adopt LLM itself for both instruction tuning and evaluation. It is worth noting that such an estimated click-through rate \hat{y}_i in Eq. 2 is only leveraged for the evaluation on the testing set. We preserve the common instruction tuning and causal language modeling paradigm for LLMs during the training phase.

3.3 Laser_{LLM+CRM}: LLM as Feature Enhancer for CRM

Laser_{LLM+CRM} uses LLMs as the feature generators and encoders to assist CRMs in a model-agnostic manner. Specifically, for input x_i , we construct textual instructions (x_i^{user} and x_i^{item}) to let LLM infer and generate the knowledge for both user-side preference and item-side facts. After generation, we apply mean pooling over the hidden states to get the knowledge vectors for both user and item:

$$h_i^{user} = \text{LLM}(x_i^{user}), \quad h_i^{item} = \text{LLM}(x_i^{item}). \quad (3)$$

To ensure the dimensional consistency and bridge the latent space between language and recommendation, we design two parallel mixture-of-experts (MoE) adapters for user and item knowledge vectors, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i^* &= \text{Softmax}(g^*(h_i^*)), \quad * \in \{user, item\}, \\ z_i^* &= \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_{i,j}^* \times e_j^*(h_i^*), \quad * \in \{user, item\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where J is the number of expert network. The gating networks $g^*(\cdot)$ and expert networks $e^*(\cdot)$ are all designed as multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs). Next, we can feed the LLM-augmented user & item representations z_i^{user} and z_i^{item} as additional input features into arbitrary CRMs to perform CTR estimation training and inference:

$$\hat{y}_i = \text{CRM}(x_i^{ID}, z_i^{user}, z_i^{item}). \quad (5)$$

In this paradigm, we utilize the predicted probability from a conventional recommendation model with augmented textual features from LLMs as inputs. In this way, the LLM processing for the augmented features is thereby cachable and can be conducted offline to satisfy the strict online inference latency for recommender systems.

3.4 Discussion

We would like to provide further discussion from the following two perspectives about our proposed Laser framework: sample efficiency and inference latency.

Sample Efficiency. LLMs possess extensive open-world knowledge and powerful logical reasoning capabilities. This enables them to infer the user preferences and factual knowledge about items under few-shot or even zero-shot settings. The formation of such prior knowledge within the recommender system (both on the user and item sides) can help the model to better understand and leverage the limited interaction data, and thus help alleviate sample inefficiency issue caused by feature and interaction sparsity, reducing our reliance on the quantity of training samples. Therefore, our proposed Laser gains better sample efficiency compared with CRMs. Note that we only discuss the sample efficiency for the recommendation training stage. The pretraining stage of LLMs is no longer considered since LLMs are actually off-the-shelf for various downstream applications.

Inference Latency. The inference latency of $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ is fairly high and unavoidable for practical recommender systems, since it directly uses LLMs to perform per-sample CTR estimation task. However, for $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$, we decompose the per-sample inference into user-level and item-level knowledge generation and encoding. The LLM-augmented representations z_i^{user} and z_i^{item} from LLM can therefore be prestored to avoid online real-time calls to LLM. Hence, the inference time of $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ is nearly the same as the original CRM backbone, which satisfies the strict inference latency constraint for real-world practical recommender systems. Specifically, assume the inference time complexity of the backbone CRM is $O(F(n, m))$, where n is the number of feature fields and m is the embedding size, and $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a polynomial function. Then, the time complexity of $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ is $O(F(n + l, m)) = O(f(n, m))$ if $l \ll n$, which is equivalent to the complexity of the backbone CRM.

4 Experiment

4.1 Experiment Setups

We conduct experiments on two real-world public datasets, *i.e.*, BookCrossing and MovieLens-1M. We adopt three types of baseline models: (1) feature interaction based CTR models, including DeepFM, AutoInt, DCNv2; (2) sequential CTR models, including GRU4Rec, Caser, SASRec, DIN, SIM; (3) language model enhanced CTR models, including CTR-BERT, PTab, P5. We use AUC and LogLoss as the evaluation metrics. For Laser, as default, we select Vicuna-13B [6] as the LLM backbone and SIM as the CRM backbone. SIM is the best baseline CRM, and we would choose different LLMs to analyze the compatibility of Laser. For fair comparison with SIM, we collect the user history behaviors with the same retrieval techniques. While all the baselines are trained on the entire training set, we randomly sample 10% and 50% data of the training set for $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ and $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$, respectively.

4.2 Experiment Results

We report the performance of Laser and baselines in Table 1, from which we can draw the following observations:

- With only a small fraction of training samples, both $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ (10% data) and $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ (50% data) are able to match or even surpass CRMs that are trained on the entire training set. This demonstrates that LLMs are not only inherently sample-efficient recommenders, but can also enhance the sample efficiency of CRMs.
- The sample efficiency of $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ is inferior to that of $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ due to the involvement of CRMs, which increases the demand on the quantity of training samples.
- To make the generated knowledge cachable to satisfy the inference latency, $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ merely leverages LLMs to generate open-world knowledge at user and item levels, which lacks mutual interactions between the users and items. On the contrary, $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ conducts the user preference modeling at sample level (*i.e.*, user-item pairs), which provides finer-grained interactions and results in better recommendation performance.

Table 1: Overall performance. The best result is in **bold**. The second-best value is underlined. Wavy underline denotes the third-best value. Rel.Impr indicates the relative AUC improvement of $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ against baselines. * indicates statistically significant improvement with $p < 0.001$.

Model	BookCrossing			MovieLens-1M		
	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	Rel.Impr	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	Rel.Impr
DeepFM	0.7496	0.5953	1.05%	0.7915	0.5484	1.49%
AutoInt	0.7481	0.6840	1.26%	0.7929	0.5453	1.31%
DCNv2	0.7472	0.6816	1.38%	0.7931	0.5464	1.29%
GRU4Rec	0.7479	0.5930	1.28%	0.7926	0.5453	1.35%
Caser	0.7478	0.5990	1.30%	0.7918	0.5464	1.45%
SASRec	0.7482	0.5934	1.24%	0.7934	0.5460	1.25%
DIN	0.7477	0.6811	1.31%	0.7962	0.5425	0.89%
SIM	<u>0.7541</u>	<u>0.5893</u>	0.45%	<u>0.7992</u>	<u>0.5387</u>	0.51%
CTR-BERT	0.7448	0.5938	1.71%	0.7931	0.5457	1.29%
PTab	0.7429	0.6154	1.97%	0.7955	0.5428	0.98%
P5	0.7438	0.6128	1.84%	0.7937	0.5478	1.21%
$\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$	0.7575*	<u>0.5919</u>	-	0.8033*	0.5362*	-
$\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$	<u>0.7508</u>	0.5848*	-	<u>0.7996</u>	<u>0.5375</u>	-

Table 2: The inference time (second) per sample.

Dataset	DCNv2	SIM	PTab	$\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$	$\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$
BookCrossing	2.34×10^{-4}	2.45×10^{-4}	5.23×10^{-3}	7.89×10^{-1}	2.77×10^{-4}
MovieLens-1M	1.65×10^{-4}	2.07×10^{-4}	3.95×10^{-3}	7.42×10^{-1}	2.34×10^{-4}

- Language model enhanced CTR baselines perform poorly since they only incorporate small language models like BERT. The superior performance and sample efficiency is closely related to the model size and emergent abilities (e.g., reasoning) of the involved language models.

Then, we report the inference time per sample with batch size as 128 for Laser, as well as baselines, to investigate whether they are practical for real-world applications. We choose DCNv2, SIM and PTab as representative models for the three types of baselines, and give the results in Table 2, from which we obtain the following observations:

- Despite the superior performance and sample efficiency $\text{Laser}_{LLM\ only}$ achieves, its inference overhead generally violates the latency constraint of real-world recommender systems, where each user request should be responded within tens of milliseconds.
- By pre storing the LLM-augmented user and item representations, $\text{Laser}_{LLM+CRM}$ is able to achieve nearly the same inference latency as other CRMs, which definitely satisfies the inference latency constraint. This shows that, with the help of LLMs and proper model design, we can achieve sample-efficient recommender systems for real-world applications.

Table 3: The compatibility of Laser w.r.t. different backbone LLMs on MovieLens-1M dataset.

Metric	SIM	Mistral-7B		Vicuna-7B		Vicuna-13B	
		LLM only	LLM+CRM	LLM only	LLM+CRM	LLM only	LLM+CRM
AUC	0.7992	0.8005	0.7990	0.8016	0.7997	0.8033	0.7996
LogLoss	0.5387	0.5388	0.5385	0.5365	0.5372	0.5362	0.5375

Next, we investigate the compatibility of Laser w.r.t. LLM backbones with different model architectures and sizes on MovieLens-1M dataset. We choose Mistral-7B, Vicuna-7B, and Vicuna-13B as the LLM backbones. The results are given in Table 3. We can observe that the sample efficient property commonly exists for various different LLMs under our proposed Laser framework, where Laser can generally achieve better performance compared with SIM to a sampled small fraction of training samples.

5 Conclusion

This paper investigates the sample efficiency property of recommender systems enhanced by large language models. We propose a simple yet effective framework (*i.e.*, Laser) to validate the core viewpoint - *large language models make sample-efficient recommender systems* - from two aspects: (1) LLMs themselves are sample-efficient recommenders; and (2) LLMs make conventional recommender systems more sample-efficient. Experiments show that, with only a small fraction of training samples, our proposed Laser can match or even surpass conventional recommendation models that are trained on the entire training set. For future work, we aim to improve the sample efficiency of LLM-based recommender systems from the following two aspects: (1) exploring effective strategy to select the few-shot training samples instead of uniformly sampling, and (2) applying Laser for downstream applications like code snippet recommendation.

References

- [1] Omar Y Al-Jarrah, Paul D Yoo, Sami Muhaidat, George K Karagiannidis, and Kamal Taha. Efficient machine learning for big data: A review. *Big Data Research*, 2(3):87–93, 2015.
- [2] Keqin Bao, Jizhi Zhang, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00447*, 2023.
- [3] Vadim Borisov, Kathrin Seßler, Tobias Leemann, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Language models are realistic tabular data generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06280*, 2022.
- [4] Aldo Gael Carranza, Reza Farahani, Natalia Ponomareva, Alex Kurakin, Matthew Jagielski, and Milad Nasr. Privacy-preserving recommender systems with synthetic query generation using differentially private large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05973*, 2023.
- [5] Zheng Chen. Palr: Personalization aware llms for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07622*, 2023.
- [6] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023. URL <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>.
- [7] Konstantina Christakopoulou, Alberto Lalama, Cj Adams, Iris Qu, Yifat Amir, Samer Chucrri, Pierce Vollucci, Fabio Soldo, Dina Bseiso, Sarah Scodel, et al. Large language models for user interest journeys. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15498*, 2023.
- [8] Zeyu Cui, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. M6-rec: Generative pretrained language models are open-ended recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08084*, 2022.
- [9] Sunhao Dai, Ninglu Shao, Haiyuan Zhao, Weijie Yu, Zihua Si, Chen Xu, Zhongxiang Sun, Xiao Zhang, and Jun Xu. Uncovering chatgpt’s capabilities in recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02182*, 2023.
- [10] Bosheng Ding, Chengwei Qin, Ruochen Zhao, Tianze Luo, Xinze Li, Guizhen Chen, Wenhan Xia, Junjie Hu, Anh Tuan Luu, and Shafiq Joty. Data augmentation using llms: Data perspectives, learning paradigms and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02990*, 2024.
- [11] Kehua Feng, Keyan Ding, Kede Ma, Zhihua Wang, Qiang Zhang, and Huajun Chen. Sample-efficient human evaluation of large language models via maximum discrepancy competition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08008*, 2024.
- [12] Junchen Fu, Fajie Yuan, Yu Song, Zheng Yuan, Mingyue Cheng, Shenghui Cheng, Jiaqi Zhang, Jie Wang, and Yunzhu Pan. Exploring adapter-based transfer learning for recommender systems: Empirical studies and practical insights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15036*, 2023.

- [13] Zichuan Fu, Xiangyang Li, Chuhan Wu, Yichao Wang, Kuicai Dong, Xiangyu Zhao, Mengchen Zhao, Huifeng Guo, and Ruiming Tang. A unified framework for multi-domain ctr prediction via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10743*, 2023.
- [14] Shijie Geng, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. Recommendation as language processing (rlp): A unified pretrain, personalized prompt & predict paradigm (p5). In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 299–315, 2022.
- [15] Shijie Geng, Juntao Tan, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, and Yongfeng Zhang. Vip5: Towards multimodal foundation models for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14302*, 2023.
- [16] Junda He, Bowen Xu, Zhou Yang, DongGyun Han, Chengran Yang, and David Lo. Ptm4tag: sharpening tag recommendation of stack overflow posts with pre-trained models. In *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Program Comprehension*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [17] Yupeng Hou, Shanlei Mu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Ji-Rong Wen. Towards universal sequence representation learning for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 585–593, 2022.
- [18] Yupeng Hou, Zhankui He, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. Learning vector-quantized item representation for transferable sequential recommenders. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 1162–1171, 2023.
- [19] Yupeng Hou, Junjie Zhang, Zihan Lin, Hongyu Lu, Ruobing Xie, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. Large language models are zero-shot rankers for recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08845*, 2023.
- [20] Wenyue Hua, Yingqiang Ge, Shuyuan Xu, Jianchao Ji, and Yongfeng Zhang. Up5: Unbiased foundation model for fairness-aware recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12090*, 2023.
- [21] Wenyue Hua, Shuyuan Xu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. How to index item ids for recommendation foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06569*, 2023.
- [22] Sumit Kumar Jha, Susmit Jha, Patrick Lincoln, Nathaniel D Bastian, Alvaro Velasquez, Rickard Ewetz, and Sandeep Neema. Neuro symbolic reasoning for planning: Counterexample guided inductive synthesis using large language models and satisfiability solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16436*, 2023.
- [23] Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, Jiayong Mao, Dian Li, and Ying Shan. Taggpt: Large language models are zero-shot multimodal taggers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03022*, 2023.
- [24] Jiacheng Li, Ming Wang, Jin Li, Jinmiao Fu, Xin Shen, Jingbo Shang, and Julian McAuley. Text is all you need: Learning language representations for sequential recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13731*, 2023.
- [25] Ruyu Li, Wenhao Deng, Yu Cheng, Zheng Yuan, Jiaqi Zhang, and Fajie Yuan. Exploring the upper limits of text-based collaborative filtering using large language models: Discoveries and insights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11700*, 2023.
- [26] Xinyi Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Edward C Malthouse. Pbnr: Prompt-based news recommender system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07862*, 2023.
- [27] Jianghao Lin, Xinyi Dai, Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Bo Chen, Hao Zhang, Yong Liu, Chuhan Wu, Xiangyang Li, Chenxu Zhu, Huifeng Guo, Yong Yu, Ruiming Tang, and Weinan Zhang. How can recommender systems benefit from large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05817*, 2023.
- [28] Jianghao Lin, Yanru Qu, Wei Guo, Xinyi Dai, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Map: A model-agnostic pretraining framework for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1384–1395, 2023.

- [29] Jianghao Lin, Bo Chen, Hangyu Wang, Yunjia Xi, Yanru Qu, Xinyi Dai, Kangning Zhang, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Clickprompt: Ctr models are strong prompt generators for adapting language models to ctr prediction. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 3319–3330, 2024.
- [30] Jianghao Lin, Rong Shan, Chenxu Zhu, Kounianhua Du, Bo Chen, Shigang Quan, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Rella: Retrieval-enhanced large language models for lifelong sequential behavior comprehension in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 3497–3508, 2024.
- [31] Xinyu Lin, Wenjie Wang, Yongqi Li, Shuo Yang, Fuli Feng, Yinwei Wei, and Tat-Seng Chua. Data-efficient fine-tuning for llm-based recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17197*, 2024.
- [32] Guang Liu, Jie Yang, and Ledell Wu. Ptab: Using the pre-trained language model for modeling tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.08060*, 2022.
- [33] Junling Liu, Chao Liu, Renjie Lv, Kang Zhou, and Yan Zhang. Is chatgpt a good recommender? a preliminary study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10149*, 2023.
- [34] Qijiong Liu, Nuo Chen, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. A first look at llm-powered generative news recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06566*, 2023.
- [35] Zhiming Mao, Huimin Wang, Yiming Du, and Kam-fai Wong. Unitrec: A unified text-to-text transformer and joint contrastive learning framework for text-based recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15756*, 2023.
- [36] Aashiq Muhamed, Iman Keivanloo, Sujan Perera, James Mracek, Yi Xu, Qingjun Cui, Santosh Rajagopalan, Belinda Zeng, and Trishul Chilimbi. Ctr-bert: Cost-effective knowledge distillation for billion-parameter teacher models. In *NeurIPS Efficient Natural Language and Speech Processing Workshop*, 2021.
- [37] Sheshera Mysore, Andrew McCallum, and Hamed Zamani. Large language model augmented narrative driven recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02250*, 2023.
- [38] Xiao Pan, Lei Wu, Fenjie Long, and Ang Ma. Exploiting user behavior learning for personalized trajectory recommendations. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 16:1–12, 2022.
- [39] Aleksandr V Petrov and Craig Macdonald. Generative sequential recommendation with gptrec. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11114*, 2023.
- [40] Qi Pi, Guorui Zhou, Yujing Zhang, Zhe Wang, Lejian Ren, Ying Fan, Xiaoqiang Zhu, and Kun Gai. Search-based user interest modeling with lifelong sequential behavior data for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of CIKM 2020*, pages 2685–2692, 2020.
- [41] Zhaopeng Qiu, Xian Wu, Jingyue Gao, and Wei Fan. U-bert: Pre-training user representations for improved recommendation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 4320–4327, 2021.
- [42] Sajjad Rahmani, AmirHossein Naghshzan, and Latifa Guerrouj. Improving code example recommendations on informal documentation using bert and query-aware lsh: A comparative study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03017*, 2023.
- [43] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Pengjie Ren, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. Is chatgpt good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09542*, 2023.
- [44] Zhen Tian, Changwang Zhang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Xin Zhao, Ji-Rong Wen, and Zhao Cao. Ufin: Universal feature interaction network for multi-domain click-through rate prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15493*, 2023.
- [45] Chunyang Wang, Yanmin Zhu, Haobing Liu, Tianzi Zang, Jiadi Yu, and Feilong Tang. Deep meta-learning in recommendation systems: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04415*, 2022.

- [46] Hangyu Wang, Jianghao Lin, Xiangyang Li, Bo Chen, Chenxu Zhu, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. Flip: Towards fine-grained alignment between id-based models and pretrained language models for ctr prediction. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2310, 2023.
- [47] Hangyu Wang, Jianghao Lin, Bo Chen, Yang Yang, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. Towards efficient and effective unlearning of large language models for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03536*, 2024.
- [48] Jie Wang, Fajie Yuan, Mingyue Cheng, Joemon M Jose, Chenyun Yu, Beibei Kong, Xiangnan He, Zhijin Wang, Bo Hu, and Zang Li. Transrec: Learning transferable recommendation from mixture-of-modality feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06190*, 2022.
- [49] Lei Wang and Ee-Peng Lim. Zero-shot next-item recommendation using large pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03153*, 2023.
- [50] Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Jieming Zhu, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Yong Yu. Towards open-world recommendation with knowledge augmentation from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10933*, 2023.
- [51] Yang Yu. Towards sample efficient reinforcement learning. In *IJCAI*, pages 5739–5743, 2018.
- [52] Yang Yu, Fangzhao Wu, Chuhan Wu, Jingwei Yi, and Qi Liu. Tiny-newsrec: Effective and efficient plm-based news recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00944*, 2021.
- [53] Zheng Yuan, Fajie Yuan, Yu Song, Youhua Li, Junchen Fu, Fei Yang, Yunzhu Pan, and Yongxin Ni. Where to go next for recommender systems? id-vs. modality-based recommender models revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13835*, 2023.
- [54] Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. Is chatgpt fair for recommendation? evaluating fairness in large language model recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07609*, 2023.
- [55] Junjie Zhang, Ruobing Xie, Yupeng Hou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Leyu Lin, and Ji-Rong Wen. Recommendation as instruction following: A large language model empowered recommendation approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07001*, 2023.
- [56] Xinyang Zhang, Yury Malkov, Omar Florez, Serim Park, Brian McWilliams, Jiawei Han, and Ahmed El-Kishky. Twhin-bert: a socially-enriched pre-trained language model for multilingual tweet representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07562*, 2022.
- [57] Yuhui Zhang, Hao Ding, Zeren Shui, Yifei Ma, James Zou, Anoop Deoras, and Hao Wang. Language models as recommender systems: Evaluations and limitations. 2021.
- [58] Zizhuo Zhang and Bang Wang. Prompt learning for news recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05263*, 2023.
- [59] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [60] Guorui Zhou, Xiaoqiang Zhu, Chenru Song, Ying Fan, Han Zhu, Xiao Ma, Yanghui Yan, Junqi Jin, Han Li, and Kun Gai. Deep interest network for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 1059–1068, 2018.
- [61] Feng Zhu, Yan Wang, Chaochao Chen, Jun Zhou, Longfei Li, and Guanfeng Liu. Cross-domain recommendation: challenges, progress, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01696*, 2021.