
Graph Reasoning for Explainable Cold Start Recommendation

Jibril Frej
EPFL
jibril.frej@epfl.ch

Marta Knežević
EPFL
marta.knezevic@epfl.ch

Tanja Käser
EPFL
tanja.frej@epfl.ch

Abstract

The cold start problem, where new users or items have no interaction history, remains a critical challenge in recommender systems (RS). A common solution involves using Knowledge Graphs (KG) to train entity embeddings or Graph Neural Networks (GNNs). Since KGs incorporate auxiliary data and not just user/item interactions, these methods can make relevant recommendations for cold users or items. Graph Reasoning (GR) methods, however, find paths from users to items to recommend using relations in the KG and, in the context of RS, have been used for interpretability. In this study, we propose GRECS: a framework for adapting GR to cold start recommendations. By utilizing explicit paths starting for users rather than relying only on entity embeddings, GRECS can find items corresponding to users' preferences by navigating the graph, even when limited information about users is available. Our experiments show that GRECS mitigates the cold start problem and outperforms competitive baselines across 5 standard datasets while being explainable. This study highlights the potential of GR for developing explainable recommender systems better suited for managing cold users and items.

1 Introduction

With the growth of digital commerce and content platforms, users are often overwhelmed by the number of choices available [19], negatively impacting user experience and engagement. By recommending a small set of personalized items, recommender systems (RS) can enhance user satisfaction and platform efficiency [25, 4, 18]. Moreover, explainable RS can further increase the effectiveness and persuasiveness of an RS [21, 38]. Since most of the modern RS uses supervised learning and neural networks (NN) trained on user interactions to make recommendations, two challenges these systems still face are the cold start problem and the lack of explainability of the recommendations.

The cold start problem occurs when few to no historical interactions are available for new users or items [27, 9, 10, 24]. The challenge extends to both recommending items to users with no or sparse previous history data (cold users) and suggesting new items that have not yet been interacted with by users (cold items). Solutions include meta-learning [29, 30, 22, 34], using large language models (LLM) to analyze new user preferences/review expressed as natural language [9, 26], or using knowledge graphs (KGs) to include additional information about users and items and make recommendations using entity embeddings or graph neural networks (GNNs) [12, 40, 31]. However, most of the aforementioned approaches rely on computing a similarity between a user and all items in the dataset, ranking the items by their similarity, and recommending the top-k items. This method of comparing a user to all items makes these approaches more prone to the popularity bias [6] since popular items tend to have a high similarity with users when supervised learning is used. This can result in top recommendations that do not necessarily align with the user's preferences. Furthermore, the majority of the suggested approaches provide no explanations for the recommendations.

The absence of explainability can diminish users’ trust and reduce their willingness to follow the recommendation [21, 38]. This is especially problematic in high-impact domains such as education where a learner needs to be given a clear explanation when recommended with a course [21]. Enhancing explainability in NN-based RS often involves using KGs that represent explicit relations between understandable entities [3, 15, 37]. Moreover, recent work shows that using graph reasoning (GR) to make a recommendation by finding a path from a user to an item in a KG leads to explainable recommendations while keeping performance competitive to black-box approaches [35, 28, 16, 5, 14].

In this paper, we leverage GR methods for explainable cold start recommendation. Since GR relies not only on user-item similarity, but also on the structure of the KG to move from a user to an item with a limited number of steps, the set of recommendable items is effectively reduced to reachable items only. We hence hypothesize that GR approaches are less susceptible to the popularity bias and more likely to recommend relevant items in the absence of interaction data.

Contributions. We propose GRECS: a lightweight Graph Reasoning for Explainable Cold Start framework that adapts GR for cold start recommendations, while keeping recommendations explainable. Specifically, we integrate cold entities (users or items) into a KG by employing non-interaction relations and computing relevant embeddings. GRECS can therefore be used on already optimized models without any additional training. Our implementation is publicly available¹. We evaluate our approach on five publicly available e-commerce and MOOC datasets and demonstrate that GRECS:

- [1] provides **relevant recommendations to strict cold start users** with no prior interactions, outperforming state-of-the-art baseline methods,
- [2] recommends relevant **strict cold start items** with no prior interactions, again outperforming baselines on cold item coverage,
- [3] is **less sensitive** to the **popularity bias** than existing methods,
- [4] require **few relations or interactions** to make relevant recommendations.

2 Background

Cold Start Recommendation. A cold start scenario occurs when there is no interaction data available for a user or an item. Common solutions include meta-learning and KG-based approaches.

Meta-learning involves learning prior (or meta) knowledge by solving multiple tasks to improve the generalization capacities of models on new examples or new tasks [29]. In the context of cold start recommendation, each user is treated as a different task, and the meta-knowledge enable the RS to make relevant recommendations to new users. To further improve performance in the cold start-scenario, PDMA [30] proposes to distinguish new users and novel preferences by decoupling the preference of a cold-start user into common preference transfer and novel preference adaptation. M2eu [34] uses similar warm user embeddings to enhance cold start user embeddings, and TAML [22] proposes to consider the temporal factor of users’ preferences for cold items in the context of news recommendations, where the time factor is crucial to consider.

KG-based Approaches use additional information about users and items from a KG to address the cold start problem. Since user-item interactions are not the only types of information being used in a KG, the approaches can make meaningful recommendations in a cold start scenario. MKR [31] trains entity embeddings using multiple tasks over the KG to transfer knowledge between the tasks. This approach produces embeddings that can be used for cold start recommendation, KG completion, or cross-domain recommendation. UCC [23] generates interactions for cold users that are distributed similarly to those of warm users. SDCRec [12] uses GNN to cold start social recommendation while reducing the popularity bias using contrastive learning. Metakg [13], a new framework to use Meta-Learning on KG, combines both approaches for cold start recommendation. Recently, several approaches have used Large Language Models (LLMs) to make cold-start recommendations. ColdGPT [9] proposes to address the strict cold-start item recommendation by using LLMs to find keywords in item descriptions and reviews and include them in a KG to be used for recommendation. [26] propose to tackle the user cold-start problem by analyzing user preferences expressed in natural language with an LLM to make cold-start recommendations.

Unfortunately, the aforementioned methods suffer from the popularity bias in cold start scenarios and the majority of them do not provide explainable recommendations.

¹https://anonymous.4open.science/r/cold_rec-B765




Figure 1: Illustration of the KGRE-REC problem on a KG with a warm user u_1 (in red), who has already purchased a product and a cold user u_2 (in blue) who has not purchased any product, but whose preferences are assumed to be known (e.g. through a questionnaire). The goal is to find paths from the users to the items to be recommended. The red and blue arrows indicate the paths chosen for the recommendations. While the agent uses past interactions for the warm start user (*purchased*), only non-interaction relations are leveraged to provide a recommendation for the cold start user. All recommendations are explainable as they use entities and relations from the KG.

Graph Reasoning for Explainable Recommendation. GR for recommendations identifies paths from a user to the recommended item in a KG, utilizing the relations between entities in the KG to provide human-understandable explanations for recommendations. PGPR [35] was the first approach to use graph reasoning for explainable recommendations, introducing a new Reinforcement Learning (RL) framework for recommendation using GR and pre-defined path patterns. Since PGPR, several approaches have been proposed to improve the quality of the recommendations or explanations. EKAR [28] is a framework similar to PGPR that uses a different reward to better guide the agent towards items in the training set. CAFE [36] proposes to replace RL with behavioral cloning to avoid some of the shortcomings emanating from RL. ReMR [33] proposes to organize the KG into multiple abstraction levels to better reveal users’ interests. Finally, UPGPR [14] adopts PGPR to educational use cases and improves its generalizability by removing the pre-defined patterns.

Recent approaches, such as PLM-Rec [16] have proposed to move beyond explicit GR by training LLMs over the relations triplets of the KG, avoiding the recall bias caused by unreachable items. While providing better recommendations, the explanations generated by the LLMs are not constrained by the KG, making them less faithful. PEARLM [5] proposes to address this problem by introducing constraints on the sequence decoding to guarantee path faithfulness.

To the best of our knowledge, GRECS is the first framework for adapting GR for cold start recommendations, resulting in a decreased popularity bias and explainable recommendations.

3 Methodology

GRECS, our framework for Graph Reasoning for Explainable Cold Start, adapts GR to cold start scenarios without requiring further training. In the following, we first define the Knowledge Graph Reasoning for Explainable Recommendations (KGRE-Rec) problem and then describe the GR models building the basis for the recommendations. (PGPR [35] and UPGPR [14]). Finally, we detail how GRECS integrates cold entities in the KG and assigns them with meaningful embeddings.

3.1 Problem Formulation

We define a KG as a set of triplets composed of a head entity e_h , a tail entity e_t , and a relation r : $\mathcal{G} = \{(e_h, r, e_t) | e_h, e_t \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$. \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{R} denote respectively the entity set and the relations set associated with \mathcal{G} . We assume that the set of entities contains a set of users \mathcal{U} and items \mathcal{I} : $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{E}$. If a user u has interacted with an item i , we add the triplet $(u, interacted, i)$ to \mathcal{G} . We define a k -hop path in \mathcal{G} as a sequence of $k + 1$ entities connected by k relations: $p = [e_1, r_1, e_2, r_2, \dots, r_k, e_{k+1}]$, where all entities in the path are unique (a path does not use the same entity twice) and all triplets are in the KG: $\forall i \in 1 \dots k : (e_i, r_i, e_{i+1}) \in p \rightarrow (e_i, r_i, e_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{G}$. Given a user $u \in \mathcal{U}$, KGRE-Rec aims to find a set of paths \mathcal{P}_u , each starting from u and terminating at a recommended item i , as illustrated in Figure 1.

3.2 Graph Reasoning Models

We use two GR models for explainable recommendations as a basis for GRECS: PGPR and UPGPR.

PGPR. PGPR [35] consists of two main steps: (1) train a KG embedding model to get entities and relations embeddings; (2) optimize an RL agent to find paths in the KG from users to items. We refer the reader to the original paper [35] for a full description of the agent optimization.

The goal of the first step is to embed every entity and relation in \mathcal{G} . PGPR uses translational embeddings [7], trained by maximizing the conditional probability of each triplet $(e_t, r, e_h) \in \mathcal{G}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(e_t|e_h, r) = \frac{\exp(f(e_h, e_t|r))}{\sum_{e'_t \in E} \exp(f(e_h, e'_t|r))} \quad (1)$$

where f is a translation similarity function between entities e_h and e_t connected with relation r :

$$f(e_h, e_t|r) = \langle \mathbf{e}_h + \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{e}_t \rangle + b_{e_t} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_h, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{e}_t$ are the embeddings of e_h, r and e_t respectively and b_{e_t} is the bias of e_t .

The goal of the second step is to optimize the RL agent, formulating KGRE-Rec as a Markov Decision Process (MDP). The *state* is a vector built by concatenating all entities and relations in the agent’s path. The initial state is always a user embedding. For example, if we consider the current path the agent took as $[u, r_1, e_1]$, the state s_1 is defined as $u||r_1||e_1$, where $||$ is the concatenation operation. The *action* is defined as the choice of the next hop from the current entity e_t . Hence, the action space A_t consists of all possible relations connected to entity e_t except the ones that lead to already visited graph entities. The agent can also take the action *self-loop* that keeps it on the current entity. KGRE-Rec has a deterministic *state transition* function, meaning that when that agent takes the action corresponding to going from entity e_i to entity e_{i+1} using relation r , the probability of the agent arriving on e_{i+1} for its next state is equal to 1. Finally, the *reward* is computed using the similarity function f defined in equation 2 and using a set of predefined path patterns \mathcal{P} :

$$R(u, e_T, p_T) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(u, e_T|r)}{\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} f(u, i|r)} & \text{if } p_T \in \mathcal{P} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where e_T is the final entity in the path taken by the agent, r is the relation *interacted*, and \mathcal{P} is a set of predefined path patterns. We define a k -hop path pattern in \mathcal{G} as a sequence of $k + 1$ entity types connected by k relations. Using predefined path patterns in the reward constrains the exploration of the agent toward paths that are relevant for explainability and that end on an item. However, the manual path definition requires time, expert-knowledge, and can be infeasible in practice for long paths with a large number of possible patterns.

UPGPR. To address the issues arising with the use of predefined path patterns in the reward, UPGPR [14] uses a new binary reward scheme, allowing to remove the predefined patterns without hurting the performances. Specifically, the agent receives a reward if it begins at user u and the final entity e_T is an item that u interacted with:

$$R_{0/1}(u, e_T) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e_T \in \mathcal{I}_u \text{ and } n_{sl} < k - 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_u \subseteq I$ is the set of items user u interacted with, k is the number of hops in the path and n_{sl} is the number of self loops. A reward of 0 is assigned to the agent if it uses $k - 1$ self-loops because rewarding paths with only one effective hop would lead to poor generalization. For example, if an agent was rewarded for the following path: $[user_1, interacted, item_1, self-loop, item_1]$, there would be a risk of overfitting to the training interactions. The other components of UPGPR, namely the KG embeddings, *state*, *actions*, *state transitions*, and *agent optimization* are the same as PGPR.

3.3 Graph Reasoning for Explainable Cold Start Recommendation

Our GRECS framework adapts GR models for cold start recommendations after the embeddings and agent are optimized. Hence, GRECS can be used on an already optimized model, not requiring any additional training. Specifically, GRECS follows two steps: (1) integrating the new entity (user or item) into the KG using their known (non-interaction) relations; (2) assigning the entity with a meaningful embedding using its neighboring entities’ embeddings.

KG integration. Given a new entity $e \notin \mathcal{E}$ related to a small set of entities via non-interaction relations ($r \neq interacted$), we add all triplets containing e to \mathcal{G} . Thanks to this integration, the agent

will have the capacity to either start from a cold user or land on a cold item using the non-interaction relations connected to these entities that were added to the graph. It should be noted that we are assuming to know at least one relation of the cold entity to integrate. For example, a new user can indicate the brand(s) they like on a questionnaire. If a new entity is not related to any existing entity in the KG, it will not be used by GRECS.

Cold Embeddings. While the agent can navigate the KG from a cold user (or to a cold item) via their integration in the KG, it needs meaningful embeddings in its state representation to take an action that will lead to a relevant recommendation. To this end, we propose to calculate the embedding for a new entity by using the average translations from its related entities:

$$e = \sum_{(r', e_t) \in \mathcal{G}_e} (e'_t - r') / |\mathcal{G}_e| \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{G}_e is the subset of all triplets in \mathcal{G} whose head entity is e . This choice is motivated by the KG embeddings being trained using a translation method as described in equation (2). To evaluate our cold embeddings assignment strategy, we will also compare it to using null embeddings (zeros values everywhere) that correspond to no prior knowledge about users or items. In the following sections, we denote models using the average translation embeddings as PGPR_a/UPGPR_a, null embeddings as PGPR₀/UPGPR₀, and both methods regardless of the embeddings as PGPR/UPGPR.

4 Datasets

We evaluated GRECS on four e-commerce datasets [17] and one education dataset [11].

E-commerce Datasets. The four e-commerce datasets [17] are: Amazon’s *Beauty*, *CDs and Vinyl*, *Clothing*, and *Cellphones*.² These datasets consist of user purchases, product reviews, and meta-information about products. In the context of the e-commerce datasets, we are interested in recommending a *Product* to a *User* and we use the relation *purchase* as the interaction. The full list of entities, relations, and statistics of the e-commerce datasets are displayed in Table 6 in Appendix A. To integrate cold start users in the KG, we added 2 relations to the original KG: *interested_in* and *like*. We connect a *User* with a *Category* using the relation *interested_in* if the user purchased a product belonging to that category. Similarly, we connect a *User* with a *Brand* using the relation *like* if the user purchased a product belonging to that brand.

Education Dataset. COCO [11] consists of online course from the UdeMy³ platform. This dataset provides user enrollments, course descriptions, instructors, and categories. On the COCO dataset, we recommend a *Course* to a *User* using the *enroll* relation as the interaction. The full list of entities, relations, and statistics of the dataset are in Table 6 in Appendix A. To include cold start users in the KG, we added the entity *Skill* and the relations *know* and *cover* to the original KG. Skills taught in each course were extracted from the course description using skillNER⁴. If a *Skill* is mentioned in a *Course* description, we connect them in the KG using the relation *cover*. If a user enrolled in a *Course* with the relation *cover* with a *Skill*, we connect the *User* and the *Skill* using the relation *know*.

Datasets Splits. All datasets were split into training, validation, and test sets at the user level. For each user, the first 80% of their interactions (*purchase* for the e-commerce datasets and *enroll* for COCO) were selected to be in the training set, the next 10% were added to the validation set, and the last 10% were added to the test set. Additionally, we randomly selected 20% of users and items to be strict cold start users and items and removed them from the training set. Half of the strict cold start users were assigned to the validation set and the other half to the test set. When adding them to the validation and test sets, we integrated cold start users into the e-commerce KG using the relations *interested_in* and *like* and into the COCO KG using the relation *has_skills*. Similarly, cold start items were integrated into the e-commerce KG using the relations *belong_to* and *produced_by* and into the COCO KG using the relation *cover*. To study the impact of the number of known relations and to have realistic cold start users, we limited the occurrences of the relations in the validation and the test KG. Specifically, we uniformly sampled a random integer k from 1 to 10 for each cold start user and relation and connected the user only to the top k entities in terms of relation frequency. For example, on the e-commerce datasets, this is similar to asking a new user to indicate their k favorite brands, and including the user using the *like* relation with their favorite brands.

²Datasets can be downloaded [here](#).

³<https://www.udemy.com/>.

⁴<https://github.com/AnasAito/SkillNER>

5 Results

We performed four experiments to demonstrate the advantages of GRECS. **[1]** GRECS outperforms all baselines on cold start users in terms of nDCG and HR. **[2]** GRECS outperforms all baselines in cold item coverage. **[3]** GRECS mitigates popularity bias. **[4]** GRECS needs only a small number of relations (not interactions) to provide an accurate recommendation, and providing few interactions increases the relevance of recommendations even further. Note that while being adopted for the cold start scenario, GR methods also match or outperform all the baselines on 4/5 datasets on warm users who already interacted with items. We report the full detailed results in Table 7 in Appendix B.

Baselines. We compared GRECS to eight competitive baselines with implementations publicly available on Recbole [39]. Pop ranks items based on their popularity, defined by their frequency in the training set. ItemKNN [4] uses k-nearest-neighbor to recommend items similar to those a user has previously selected. BPR [25] optimizes user-item similarity using a ranking-based Bayesian method. NeuMF [18] combines matrix factorization and a multi-layer perceptron to compute a user-item matching score. CFKG [3] uses the similarity between users and items KG embeddings for recommendations and constructs a path from users to items to generate a post-hoc explanation. KGCN [32] uses Knowledge Graph Convolutional Networks (KGCN) to train an end-to-end model for recommendation, directly on the KG. SpectralCF* [40] proposes to address the cold start problem by structuring the interactions between users and items as a bipartite graph and using information in the spectral domains to make relevant recommendations. MKR* [31] addresses the cold start problem by a multi-task approach that optimizes a model jointly on KG embeddings and for recommendation.

Evaluation Metrics. To assess recommendation relevance, we used two standard ranking metrics: nDCG@ K and Hit Ratio@ K . We use the POPB@ K [8] to measure the popularity bias. To evaluate the ability of the models to recommend strict cold items, we adapt 2 metrics from previous literature on long tail recommendation [1, 2]: **(1)** the Cold Item Coverage (Cov.*) reports the proportion of recommended cold items among all cold items across all users in the test set; **(2)** the Average Cold Item Proportion@ K (Prop.*) reports the average proportion of item recommended for each user. All metrics are computed on the top 10 recommended items for each user ($K = 10$). We define the Long Tail items as the 80% of items with the lowest number of interactions in the training set. We report the average and standard deviation of the metric across 3 runs with different seeds.

Implementation. For GRECS, we set PGPR and UPGPR embedding dimensions to 100 and trained them for 30 epochs. Other hyperparameters (learning rate, batch size, etc...) were the same as in the original PGPR implementation⁵. We used the full path history for the agent’s state with a path length fixed to 3, making our state composed of six KG entities embedding, each of size 100. RL agents were trained for 50 epochs using the Adam optimizer [20] with a learning rate of 0.001. Baselines were implemented and evaluated with Recbole⁶ [39] with batches of size 512 and Adam optimizer [20] with a learning rate of 0.001 for 50 epochs with early stopping on the validation set with a patience of 10 epochs. Baselines with embeddings had their dimensions set to 100, and all other hyperparameters were set to their default values. Training and evaluation took 2-4 hours on a single Intel Xeon Gold 6132 CPU on all datasets except CDs (the largest dataset), which took up to 48 hours per model.

5.1 Exp. 1: GRECS outperforms baselines on strict cold start users

Table 1 presents the performance of GRECS and baselines in a strict cold start scenario across all datasets using user-centric metrics. We observe that: **(1)** GRECS outperforms all baselines across all datasets, showing the ability of GR to make recommendations to users with no prior interactions that are more relevant than baselines that rely on heuristics (Pop), matrix factorization (NeuMF) or entity embeddings (CFKG). **(2)** Neither of the two cold embedding strategies shows a definitive advantage over the other. For instance, null embeddings prove more effective on the Beauty and Cellphones datasets, while the average translation strategy performs better on the Clothing dataset. **(3)** Despite being designed for cold start recommendations, MKR* and SpectralCF* underperform against the popularity-based recommender, which does not make personalized recommendations nor use the KG. This highlights the challenge of developing personalized recommendation models that outperform

⁵<https://github.com/orcax/PGPR>

⁶<https://recbole.io/>

simple heuristic approaches for strict cold-start users. (4) UPGPR performs better than PGPR on all E-commerce datasets and both methods display similar performances on the COCO dataset.

Measures (%)	Beauty		CDs		Cellphones		Clothing		COCO	
	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR
Pop	<u>1.03</u> ± 0.0	<u>1.92</u> ± 0.0	0.28 ± 0.0	0.76 ± 0.0	<u>1.67</u> ± 0.0	<u>3.24</u> ± 0.0	<u>0.48</u> ± 0.0	0.87 ± 0.0	<u>1.33</u> ± 0.0	2.61 ± 0.0
ItemKNN	0.04 ± 0.0	0.10 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.01 ± 0.0	0.01 ± 0.0	0.04 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.01 ± 0.0
BPR	0.18 ± 0.0	0.40 ± 0.1	0.01 ± 0.0	0.03 ± 0.0	0.36 ± 0.2	0.68 ± 0.3	0.10 ± 0.0	0.19 ± 0.1	0.07 ± 0.0	0.16 ± 0.0
NeuMF	0.80 ± 0.1	1.67 ± 0.0	0.24 ± 0.0	0.63 ± 0.0	1.63 ± 0.0	3.23 ± 0.0	<u>0.48</u> ± 0.0	<u>0.88</u> ± 0.0	0.26 ± 0.0	0.78 ± 0.2
CFKG	0.69 ± 0.0	1.48 ± 0.1	<u>0.30</u> ± 0.0	<u>0.78</u> ± 0.1	0.64 ± 0.1	1.50 ± 0.3	0.17 ± 0.0	0.33 ± 0.1	1.01 ± 0.4	2.32 ± 0.7
KGCN	0.04 ± 0.0	0.10 ± 0.0	0.02 ± 0.0	0.08 ± 0.0	0.10 ± 0.0	0.21 ± 0.0	0.03 ± 0.0	0.07 ± 0.0	0.11 ± 0.1	0.24 ± 0.1
MKR*	0.74 ± 0.1	1.46 ± 0.2	0.17 ± 0.0	0.39 ± 0.0	1.46 ± 0.1	3.02 ± 0.2	0.38 ± 0.0	0.83 ± 0.1	0.53 ± 0.2	1.46 ± 0.6
SpectralCF*	0.81 ± 0.2	1.76 ± 0.4	0.21 ± 0.0	0.54 ± 0.1	1.54 ± 0.1	3.17 ± 0.1	0.45 ± 0.1	0.80 ± 0.2	1.27 ± 0.4	<u>2.63</u> ± 0.8
PGPR _a	1.65 ± 0.3	4.30 ± 0.8	0.83 ± 0.1	1.49 ± 0.2	0.78 ± 0.2	1.77 ± 0.3	1.07 ± 0.1	2.55 ± 0.3	2.98 ± 0.5	4.36 ± 0.8
PGPR ₀	1.78 ± 0.3	3.83 ± 0.7	0.31 ± 0.1	0.86 ± 0.3	1.85 ± 0.3	4.18 ± 0.6	0.51 ± 0.0	1.32 ± 0.1	3.07 ± 0.2	6.83 ± 0.3
UPGPR _a	2.26 ± 0.5	5.01 ± 1.3	1.05 ± 0.1	1.68 ± 0.2	1.74 ± 0.4	4.32 ± 0.8	1.76 ± 0.1	4.05 ± 0.2	3.49 ± 0.2	4.71 ± 0.1
UPGPR ₀	3.07 ± 0.2	6.75 ± 0.7	1.06 ± 0.2	2.61 ± 0.4	3.61 ± 0.1	7.97 ± 0.2	1.05 ± 0.1	2.64 ± 0.2	1.86 ± 0.2	3.56 ± 0.5

Table 1: Performance of GRECS compared to the baselines for strict cold start users. The best results are highlighted in bold and the best baseline is underlined.

To further explore performance differences between PGPR and UPGPR, we analyzed the proportion of paths the agents followed on each dataset. Table 2 shows the proportion of paths on the Beauty test set. The symbol (♥) represents paths used for warm users and the symbol (*) for cold users. UPGPR selects patterns more evenly than PGPR and frequently uses those suitable for cold start users even in warm start scenarios. Specifically, PGPR uses cold start-compatible patterns (marked in blue in Table 2) on warm users 19.03% of the time, whereas UPGPR does so 52.70% of the time. This likely contributes to UPGPR’s superior performance in cold start situations compared to PGPR since UPGPR’s agents are more familiar with patterns that can be used for cold start users. Similarly, on the COCO dataset (see Table 3), GRECS applies cold start-compatible patterns to warm users over 90% of the time for both PGPR and UPGPR, explaining their close performances. This trend is consistent across all datasets, with detailed proportions listed in Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 in Appendix C.

	PGPR _a ♥	UPGPR _a ♥	PGPR _a *	UPGPR _a *
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	71.58%	46.72%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Product	16.78%	29.18%	65.18%	64.95%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}}$ Brand $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}}$ Product	2.26%	23.52%	31.3%	35.0%

Table 2: Proportion of the three most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the Beauty dataset for warm users (♥) and cold users (*). Rows highlighted in blue denote cold start-compatible patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

	PGPR _a ♥	UPGPR _a ♥	PGPR _a *	UPGPR _a *
User $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ Skill $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course	59.0%	9.86%	65.45%	6.5%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ Skill $\xrightarrow{\text{cover}}$ Course	40.18%	83.84%	34.55%	93.5%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course	0.0%	5.61%	0%	0%

Table 3: Proportion of the three most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the COCO dataset for warm users (♥) and cold users (*). Rows highlighted in blue denote patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

GRECS provides the most relevant recommendations for strict cold start users across all 5 datasets.

5.2 Exp. 2: GRECS achieves high coverage of cold start items

Table 4 details the performance of GRECS compared to baselines for strictly cold items. We observe that: (1) GRECS outperforms all baselines in cold item coverage across all five datasets, indicating that GRECS is capable of identifying a wider variety of relevant cold items across different users

Measures (%)	Beauty		CDs		Cellphones		Clothing		COCO	
	Cov.*	Prop.*	Cov.*	Prop.*	Cov.*	Prop.*	Cov.*	Prop.*	Cov.*	Prop.*
Pop	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0
ItemKNN	0.21 ± 0.0	5.74 ± 0.0	0.08 ± 0.0	11.34 ± 0.0	0.48 ± 0.0	11.54 ± 0.0	0.22 ± 0.0	11.51 ± 0.0	0.25 ± 0.0	11.42 ± 0.0
BPR	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0
NeuMF	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0
CFKG	<u>5.00</u> ± 0.2	0.20 ± 0.0	<u>9.96</u> ± 0.9	1.23 ± 0.1	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.27 ± 0.2	0.18 ± 0.1
KGCN	0.34 ± 0.3	0.01 ± 0.0	0.15 ± 0.1	0.00 ± 0.0	<u>1.02</u> ± 1.3	0.02 ± 0.0	0.20 ± 0.1	0.01 ± 0.0	<u>0.40</u> ± 0.3	0.01 ± 0.0
MKR*	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0
SpectralCF*	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0	0.00 ± 0.0
PGPR _a	46.03 ± 1.2	10.27 ± 0.3	28.98 ± 0.9	7.35 ± 0.4	39.79 ± 1.3	11.18 ± 0.3	40.66 ± 1.7	9.59 ± 0.3	21.88 ± 1.8	0.88 ± 0.0
PGPR ₀	2.85 ± 0.2	0.05 ± 0.0	0.08 ± 0.1	0.00 ± 0.0	1.58 ± 0.1	0.02 ± 0.0	0.97 ± 0.3	0.03 ± 0.0	10.86 ± 0.7	0.25 ± 0.0
UPGPR _a	33.10 ± 3.1	11.46 ± 1.2	23.96 ± 3.0	5.70 ± 0.5	35.83 ± 4.2	11.97 ± 2.2	31.72 ± 5.2	8.34 ± 0.4	27.72 ± 2.8	3.52 ± 0.2
UPGPR ₀	21.05 ± 1.1	2.96 ± 0.1	2.31 ± 0.0	0.34 ± 0.0	14.41 ± 1.6	2.07 ± 0.0	11.09 ± 1.0	1.47 ± 0.1	19.15 ± 0.6	2.86 ± 0.3

Table 4: Performance of GRECS compared to the baselines for strict cold start items on all datasets. The best results are highlighted in bold and the best baseline is underlined.

than baseline approaches. (2) ItemKNN shows high Prop.*, matching or exceeding GRECS on four out of the five datasets. ItemKNN recommends on average one cold item in the top 10 for each user. However, the low coverage of ItemKNN (less than 1% on all datasets) indicates that the method tends to recommend the same cold items to all users, revealing a lack of personalization. (3) UPGPR_a/PGPR_a significantly outperform UPGPR₀/PGPR₀ in terms of coverage and proportion, suggesting that agents avoid recommending items with zero-initialized cold embeddings. Despite this observation, the null embedding strategy still manages to recommend relevant items to cold users (see Table 1), as the agents have to start from these users to provide a recommendation (regardless of their embedding values). Combining the results from Tables 1 and 4, the average translation strategy for cold embeddings is the most effective for covering both cold user and cold item scenarios.

GRECS archives the highest cold item coverage, indicating its ability to recommend cold items.

5.3 Exp. 3: GRECS mitigates the popularity bias

Table 5 shows the popularity bias of GRECS compared to the baselines across all datasets. Interestingly, ItemKNN exhibits the lowest bias because it relies only on items each user has interacted with, it is less sensitive to the popularity bias than supervised methods optimized on the entire dataset. Despite this low bias, ItemKNN performs poorly in scenarios with cold users (as shown in Table 1). UPGPR is the second-best method, consistently outperforming all other baselines as well as PGPR. These results suggest that GRECS is better suited to handle popularity bias than the baseline approaches, due to its exploration of the KG, which restricts the set of recommendable items. The large difference between PGPR and UPGPR indicates that the reward mechanism greatly impacts mitigating popularity bias in RL-based GR methods. PGPR relies on embedding-similarity-based rewards, while UPGPR relies solely on the relevance of the recommendation, leading to less biased outcomes. Finally, PGPR₀/UPGPR₀ are more bias towards popular items than PGPR_a/UPGPR_a. This finding highlights the importance of embedding initialization in mitigating the popularity bias, showing that using neighboring embeddings instead of null embeddings makes recommendations less biased.

GRECS archives the best trade-off between unbiased and relevant recommendations.

5.4 Exp. 4: GRECS requires few relations to provide accurate recommendations

Lastly, we evaluated the effectiveness of GRECS for sparse cold start scenarios with few interactions and explored the impact of the number of known relations on performance for strict cold start users. Figure 2 shows the HR against the number of interactions in the training set, ranging from 0 (strict cold start) to 3. We only display the Pop and BPR baselines, as they perform the best for strict cold start and warm users respectively. As expected, the performance of the Pop baseline does not improve with the number of interactions, since it recommends the most popular items regardless of the user's

	Beauty	CDs	Cellphones	Clothing	COCO
Pop	1.00 ± 0.0	1.00 ± 0.0	1.00 ± 0.0	1.00 ± 0.0	1.00 ± 0.0
ItemKNN	0.06 ± 0.0	0.05 ± 0.0	0.03 ± 0.0	0.02 ± 0.0	0.13 ± 0.0
BPR	0.32 ± 0.0	0.21 ± 0.0	0.33 ± 0.0	0.26 ± 0.0	0.23 ± 0.0
NeuMF	0.36 ± 0.0	0.21 ± 0.0	0.37 ± 0.0	0.39 ± 0.0	0.25 ± 0.0
CFKG	0.39 ± 0.0	0.28 ± 0.0	0.26 ± 0.0	0.22 ± 0.0	0.47 ± 0.1
KGCN	0.34 ± 0.0	0.16 ± 0.0	0.38 ± 0.1	0.31 ± 0.0	0.25 ± 0.0
MKR*	0.42 ± 0.1	0.31 ± 0.1	0.52 ± 0.0	0.43 ± 0.1	0.36 ± 0.1
SpectralCF*	0.75 ± 0.2	0.25 ± 0.0	0.96 ± 0.0	0.83 ± 0.1	0.90 ± 0.0
PGPR _a	0.27 ± 0.0	0.37 ± 0.0	0.36 ± 0.0	0.27 ± 0.0	0.24 ± 0.0
PGPR ₀	0.32 ± 0.0	0.41 ± 0.0	0.51 ± 0.0	0.46 ± 0.0	0.27 ± 0.0
UPGPR _a	0.12 ± 0.0	0.10 ± 0.0	0.09 ± 0.0	0.12 ± 0.0	0.05 ± 0.0
UPGPR ₀	0.15 ± 0.0	0.11 ± 0.0	0.11 ± 0.0	0.14 ± 0.0	0.05 ± 0.0

Table 5: Popularity Bias (POPB) of GRECS compared to the baselines on all datasets. The best results (lowest) are highlighted in bold and the best baseline is underlined.




Figure 2: Evolution of the HR against the number of training interactions. The shaded area represents the standard deviation across 3 runs.




Figure 3: Evolution of the HR against the number of relations for strict cold start users. The shaded area represents the standard deviation across 3 runs.

profile. Conversely, all other approaches show improvement, even from minimal interaction data. The results show that even a single known interaction in the training set can significantly enhance model performance. Finally, we see that $UPGPR_a$ surpasses $PGPR_a$ in performance on the E-commerce datasets, while both methods exhibit comparable results on the COCO dataset.

Figure 3 shows the HR relative to the number of known relations for strict cold start users. For instance, in an E-Commerce dataset, a strict cold start user without any *purchase* interactions still has relations such as *like* or *interested_in*, indicating preferences for categories or brands. Generally, GRECS benefits from an increase in known relations for strict cold start users, with HRs improving initially with the addition of a few relations. However, HR declines and its variance increases with too many known relations and no interactions. This is expected: recommending items to a cold user who likes a variety of brands is more difficult than recommending items to a user with specific preferences.

GRECS is best suited for strict cold start recommendations when a small number of relations are known, and knowing a few interactions increases the relevance of recommendations even further.

6 Discussion & Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed GRECS, a framework for adapting GR-based recommendations to cold start scenarios while keeping recommendations explainable. By explicitly using relationships in the KG to connect users to items, GRECS can find items matching users' preferences even with limited information about users. Our experiments across five datasets show that GRECS provides better and less biased recommendations for new users than state-of-the-art baselines. GRECS is also able to recommend cold items, requiring only few relations to make relevant recommendations. Furthermore, we show that both the strategy for initializing the embeddings of cold-start users and items as well as the choice of reward are crucial for recommending cold items and mitigating the popularity bias.

Limitations and future work. GRECS relies on KGs and can therefore make recommendations without pre-existing relational data about cold users or items. It can for example not take advantage of attributes with real values such as the item's price. Furthermore, the GR methods at the basis of GRECS exhibit an inherent recall bias [16]. Specifically, their recall is limited by the existence of user-item pairs that cannot be connected through paths of length k , restricting their ability to recommend certain relevant items. Finally, our cold embedding assignment method is specific to PGPR and UPGPR. Future work should extend GRECS to other GR approaches, namely LLM-based approaches that are not subject to the recall bias.

References

- [1] Himan Abdollahpour, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2017. Controlling popularity bias in learning-to-rank recommendation. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM conference on recommender systems*. 42–46.
- [2] Himan Abdollahpour, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2019. Managing popularity bias in recommender systems with personalized re-ranking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07555* (2019).
- [3] Qingyao Ai, Vahid Azizi, Xu Chen, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2018. Learning heterogeneous knowledge base embeddings for explainable recommendation. *Algorithms* 11, 9 (2018), 137.
- [4] Fabio Aioli. 2013. Efficient top-n recommendation for very large scale binary rated datasets. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM conference on Recommender systems*. 273–280.
- [5] Giacomo Balloccu, Ludovico Boratto, Christian Cancedda, Gianni Fenu, and Mirko Marras. 2023. Faithful Path Language Modelling for Explainable Recommendation over Knowledge Graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16452* (2023).
- [6] Alejandro Bellogín, Pablo Castells, and Iván Cantador. 2017. Statistical biases in information retrieval metrics for recommender systems. *Information Retrieval Journal* 20 (2017), 606–634.
- [7] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [8] Rodrigo Borges and Kostas Stefanidis. 2021. On mitigating popularity bias in recommendations via variational autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 36th annual ACM symposium on applied computing*. 1383–1389.
- [9] Yuwei Cao, Liangwei Yang, Chen Wang, Zhiwei Liu, Hao Peng, Chenyu You, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Multi-task item-attribute graph pre-training for strict cold-start item recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 322–333.
- [10] Iason Chaimalas, Duncan Martin Walker, Edoardo Gruppi, Benjamin Richard Clark, and Laura Toni. 2023. Bootstrapped personalized popularity for cold start recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 715–722.
- [11] Danilo Dessì, Gianni Fenu, Mirko Marras, and Diego Reforgiato Recupero. 2018. Coco: Semantic-enriched collection of online courses at scale with experimental use cases. In *Trends and Advances in Information Systems and Technologies: Volume 2 6*. Springer, 1386–1396.
- [12] Jing Du, Zesheng Ye, Lina Yao, Bin Guo, and Zhiwen Yu. 2022. Socially-aware dual contrastive learning for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1927–1932.
- [13] Yuntao Du, Xinjun Zhu, Lu Chen, Ziquan Fang, and Yunjun Gao. 2022. Metakg: Meta-learning on knowledge graph for cold-start recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2022).
- [14] Jibril Frej, Neel Shah, Marta Knezevic, Tanya Nazaretsky, and Tanja Käser. 2024. Finding Paths for Explainable MOOC Recommendation: A Learner Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 14th Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference*. 426–437.
- [15] Zuohui Fu, Yikun Xian, Ruoyuan Gao, Jieyu Zhao, Qiaoying Huang, Yingqiang Ge, Shuyuan Xu, Shijie Geng, Chirag Shah, Yongfeng Zhang, et al. 2020. Fairness-aware explainable recommendation over knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 69–78.
- [16] Shijie Geng, Zuohui Fu, Juntao Tan, Yingqiang Ge, Gerard De Melo, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2022. Path language modeling over knowledge graphs for explainable recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 946–955.

- [17] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering. In *proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*. 507–517.
- [18] 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.
- [19] Sheena S Iyengar and Mark R Lepper. 2000. When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of personality and social psychology* 79, 6 (2000), 995.
- [20] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [21] René F Kizilcec. 2016. How much information? Effects of transparency on trust in an algorithmic interface. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 2390–2395.
- [22] Jingyuan Li, Yue Zhang, Xuan Lin, Xinxing Yang, Ge Zhou, Longfei Li, Hong Chen, and Jun Zhou. 2023. TAML: Time-Aware Meta Learning for Cold-Start Problem in News Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2415–2419.
- [23] Taichi Liu, Chen Gao, Zhenyu Wang, Dong Li, Jianye Hao, Depeng Jin, and Yong Li. 2023. Uncertainty-aware Consistency Learning for Cold-Start Item Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2466–2470.
- [24] Dilina Chandika Rajapakse and Douglas Leith. 2022. Fast and Accurate User Cold-Start Learning Using Monte Carlo Tree Search. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 350–359.
- [25] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2012. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.2618* (2012).
- [26] Scott Sanner, Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, Ben Wedin, and Lucas Dixon. 2023. Large language models are competitive near cold-start recommenders for language-and item-based preferences. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 890–896.
- [27] Andrew I Schein, Alexandrin Popescul, Lyle H Ungar, and David M Pennock. 2002. Methods and metrics for cold-start recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 25th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 253–260.
- [28] Weiping Song, Zhijian Duan, Ziqing Yang, Hao Zhu, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. 2019. Ekar: an explainable method for knowledge aware recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09506* (2019).
- [29] Chunyang Wang, Yanmin Zhu, Haobing Liu, Tianzi Zang, Jiadi Yu, and Feilong Tang. 2022. Deep Meta-learning in Recommendation Systems: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04415* (2022).
- [30] Chunyang Wang, Yanmin Zhu, Aixin Sun, Zhaobo Wang, and Ke Wang. 2023. A Preference Learning Decoupling Framework for User Cold-Start Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1168–1177.
- [31] Hongwei Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Miao Zhao, Wenjie Li, Xing Xie, and Minyi Guo. 2019. Multi-task feature learning for knowledge graph enhanced recommendation. In *The world wide web conference*. 2000–2010.
- [32] Hongwei Wang, Miao Zhao, Xing Xie, Wenjie Li, and Minyi Guo. 2019. Knowledge graph convolutional networks for recommender systems. In *The world wide web conference*. 3307–3313.

- [33] Xiting Wang, Kunpeng Liu, Dongjie Wang, Le Wu, Yanjie Fu, and Xing Xie. 2022. Multi-level recommendation reasoning over knowledge graphs with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 2098–2108.
- [34] Zhenchao Wu and Xiao Zhou. 2023. M2eu: Meta learning for cold-start recommendation via enhancing user preference estimation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1158–1167.
- [35] Yikun Xian, Zuohui Fu, Shan Muthukrishnan, Gerard De Melo, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2019. Reinforcement knowledge graph reasoning for explainable recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 285–294.
- [36] Yikun Xian, Zuohui Fu, Handong Zhao, Yingqiang Ge, Xu Chen, Qiaoying Huang, Shijie Geng, Zhou Qin, Gerard De Melo, Shan Muthukrishnan, et al. 2020. CAFE: Coarse-to-fine neural symbolic reasoning for explainable recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 1645–1654.
- [37] Lijie Xie, Zhaoming Hu, Xingjuan Cai, Wensheng Zhang, and Jinjun Chen. 2021. Explainable recommendation based on knowledge graph and multi-objective optimization. *Complex & Intelligent Systems* 7 (2021), 1241–1252.
- [38] Yongfeng Zhang and Xu Chen. 2018. Explainable Recommendation: A Survey and New Perspectives. *CoRR* abs/1804.11192 (2018). arXiv:1804.11192 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1804.11192>
- [39] Wayne Xin Zhao, Shanlei Mu, Yupeng Hou, Zihan Lin, Yushuo Chen, Xingyu Pan, Kaiyuan Li, Yujie Lu, Hui Wang, Changxin Tian, et al. 2021. Recbole: Towards a unified, comprehensive and efficient framework for recommendation algorithms. In *proceedings of the 30th acm international conference on information & knowledge management*. 4653–4664.
- [40] Lei Zheng, Chun-Ta Lu, Fei Jiang, Jiawei Zhang, and Philip S Yu. 2018. Spectral collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 311–319.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We claim that Graph Reasoning methods are effective at addressing the cold start problem. Our experiments show that this is the case.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss the limitations of our work in Section 6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We do not have theoretical results in this work.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provided the libraries and hyperparameter values used in our experiments and indicated when we used default values and where to find them. We also indicated the pre-processing and splitting strategies performed on our datasets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our code is publicly available as well as the datasets we performed our experiments on.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss the experiential setting in Section 4.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We ran experiments across multiple seeds and reported the standard deviation on tables as a number and on graphs as a shaded area.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).

- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We specified the CPU model and time of execution in Section 5

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics [https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?](https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines)

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our experiments did not involve human participants and were performed on public, anonymized datasets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Because the models we study are explainable, we consider that their potential societal impact is positive. In the introduction, we mention the importance of providing explanations for recommendations in high-impact domains.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.

- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our work presents no such risk, the models can only make recommendations on the datasets they have been trained on, which are anonymized.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We cite the relevant papers and provide the URLs for both the code and datasets.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.

- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The code is commented and the overall project is described in the README.md in https://anonymous.4open.science/r/cold_rec-B765.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.

- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

A Datasets Statistics

	E-commerce				Education	
	CDs	Cloth.	Cell.	Beauty	COCO	
#Entities					#Entities	
User	75k	39k	27k	22k	User	25k
Product	64k	23k	10k	12k	Course	23k
Word	202k	21k	22k	22k	Category	132
Brand	1.4k	1.1k	955	2k	Teacher	4.1k
Category	770	1.1k	206	248	Skill	5.5k
#Relations					#Relations	
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product	1.1M	278k	194k	198k	User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course	428k
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mention}}$ Word	191M	17M	18M	18M	User $\xrightarrow{\text{know}^*}$ Skill	278k
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}^*}$ Brand	192k	60k	90k	132k	Course $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}^*}$ Category	23k
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}^*}$ Category	2.0M	949k	288k	354k	Course $\xrightarrow{\text{cover}^*}$ Skill	47k
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{described_by}}$ Word	191M	17M	18M	18M	Course $\xrightarrow{\text{taught_by}^*}$ Teacher	23k
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}^*}$ Category	466k	154k	36k	49k		
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}^*}$ Brand	64k	23k	10k	12k		
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	3.6M	1.4M	590k	891k		
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_viewed}}$ Product	78k	147k	22k	155k		
Product $\xrightarrow{\text{bought_together}}$ Product	78k	28k	12k	14k		

Table 6: Statistics of the e-commerce and education datasets. Relations indicated with $*$ are used to integrate cold users or cold items into the KG.

B Results on all users

Graph Reasoning approaches match or outperform all the baselines on 4 out of the 5 datasets for warm users whose interactions are available in the training set. These results confirm the findings of Xian et al. [35] and Frej et al. [14]: Graph Reasoning methods can make explainable and relevant recommendations competitively even against non-interpretable baselines. It should be noted that the results reported here are different than the ones reported in the PGPR [35] and UPGPR [14] papers because our method for splitting the datasets is different than theirs. We adopted a different splitting method (user level splitting, and removing users and items from the training set) to study the recommendations under cold start scenarios.

Measures (%)	Beauty		CDs		Cellphones		Clothing		COCO	
	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR	nDCG	HR
Pop	1.00 ± 0.0	1.97 ± 0.0	0.29 ± 0.0	0.71 ± 0.0	1.60 ± 0.0	3.18 ± 0.0	0.40 ± 0.0	0.78 ± 0.0	0.98 ± 0.0	2.30 ± 0.0
ItemKNN	3.02 ± 0.0	5.58 ± 0.0	3.15 ± 0.0	6.28 ± 0.0	2.19 ± 0.0	4.10 ± 0.0	0.75 ± 0.0	1.33 ± 0.0	<u>2.90</u> ± 0.0	<u>6.03</u> ± 0.0
BPR	<u>3.13</u> ± 0.1	<u>6.02</u> ± 0.2	2.45 ± 0.0	5.37 ± 0.0	<u>3.32</u> ± 0.0	<u>6.10</u> ± 0.1	<u>0.84</u> ± 0.0	<u>1.54</u> ± 0.0	2.54 ± 0.0	5.37 ± 0.1
NeuMF	2.28 ± 0.0	4.55 ± 0.1	1.67 ± 0.0	3.75 ± 0.0	2.24 ± 0.1	4.18 ± 0.1	0.35 ± 0.0	0.68 ± 0.0	0.93 ± 0.1	2.17 ± 0.0
CFKG	2.54 ± 0.1	5.08 ± 0.2	1.88 ± 0.0	4.33 ± 0.0	1.35 ± 0.1	2.68 ± 0.1	0.27 ± 0.0	0.53 ± 0.0	1.31 ± 0.2	2.87 ± 0.5
KGCN	1.90 ± 0.1	3.93 ± 0.1	1.40 ± 0.0	3.36 ± 0.0	2.07 ± 0.2	3.94 ± 0.4	0.35 ± 0.0	0.70 ± 0.1	0.78 ± 0.5	1.81 ± 1.0
MKR $*$	0.75 ± 0.0	1.58 ± 0.1	1.27 ± 0.0	2.98 ± 0.0	0.93 ± 0.1	2.02 ± 0.1	0.19 ± 0.0	0.41 ± 0.0	0.35 ± 0.1	0.89 ± 0.2
SpectralCF $*$	0.91 ± 0.1	1.95 ± 0.1	0.55 ± 0.0	1.50 ± 0.0	1.51 ± 0.0	3.10 ± 0.1	0.35 ± 0.0	0.70 ± 0.1	0.67 ± 0.2	1.53 ± 0.4
PGPR $_a$	3.08 ± 0.1	5.77 ± 0.0	1.20 ± 0.1	2.76 ± 0.3	2.53 ± 0.2	4.86 ± 0.4	1.35 ± 0.1	2.58 ± 0.2	4.21 ± 0.3	9.40 ± 0.6
PGPR $_0$	3.07 ± 0.1	5.81 ± 0.0	1.17 ± 0.1	2.75 ± 0.3	1.95 ± 0.1	3.87 ± 0.2	0.65 ± 0.0	1.29 ± 0.0	4.22 ± 0.2	10.30 ± 0.1
UPGPR $_a$	4.15 ± 0.2	8.16 ± 0.5	2.17 ± 0.0	4.26 ± 0.1	3.86 ± 0.1	7.42 ± 0.2	1.75 ± 0.0	3.85 ± 0.2	7.29 ± 0.2	12.25 ± 0.4
UPGPR $_0$	4.30 ± 0.2	8.61 ± 0.3	2.19 ± 0.1	4.41 ± 0.1	4.07 ± 0.1	7.90 ± 0.3	1.68 ± 0.1	3.73 ± 0.2	7.26 ± 0.2	12.15 ± 0.3

Table 7: Performance of Graph reasoning approaches compared to the baselines across all users on all datasets. The best results are highlighted in bold and the best results for the baselines are underlined.

C Pattern proportion on all datasets

	PGPR _a [⚡]	PGPR ₀ [⚡]	UPGPR _a [⚡]	UPGPR ₀ [⚡]	PGPR _a ^{❄️}	PGPR ₀ ^{❄️}	UPGPR _a ^{❄️}	UPGPR ₀ ^{❄️}
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	71.58%	70.17%	46.72%	44.21%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Product	16.78%	18.7%	29.18%	30.52%	65.18%	73.58%	64.95%	61.99%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	4.12%	3.38%	0.51%	0.48%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	3.98%	4.1%	0.05%	0.05%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}}$ Brand $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}}$ Product	2.26%	2.31%	23.52%	24.73%	31.3%	25.07%	35.0%	38.01%

Table 8: Proportion of the most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the Beauty dataset for warm users (⚡) and cold users (❄️). Rows highlighted in blue denote cold start-compatible patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

	PGPR _a [⚡]	PGPR ₀ [⚡]	UPGPR _a [⚡]	UPGPR ₀ [⚡]	PGPR _a ^{❄️}	PGPR ₀ ^{❄️}	UPGPR _a ^{❄️}	UPGPR ₀ ^{❄️}
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	49.09%	48.74%	63.54%	61.31%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Product	30.35%	30.56%	23.24%	24.77%	85.01%	80.6%	80.3%	75.4%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product	6.81%	6.76%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	6.26%	6.22%	1.55%	1.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	4.51%	4.47%	6.78%	6.53%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}}$ Brand $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}}$ Product	2.28%	2.54%	4.59%	5.59%	14.25%	18.32%	19.59%	24.49%

Table 9: Proportion of the most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the CDs dataset for warm users (⚡) and cold users (❄️). Rows highlighted in blue denote cold start-compatible patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

	PGPR _a [⚡]	PGPR ₀ [⚡]	UPGPR _a [⚡]	UPGPR ₀ [⚡]	PGPR _a ^{❄️}	PGPR ₀ ^{❄️}	UPGPR _a ^{❄️}	UPGPR ₀ ^{❄️}
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	65.4%	61.2%	49.6%	49.18%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Product	30.19%	31.14%	29.18%	28.03%	78.96%	77.22%	70.46%	57.42%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}}$ Brand $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}}$ Product	3.88%	4.22%	19.87%	21.45%	20.99%	22.75%	29.49%	42.53%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	0.36%	1.3%	1.18%	1.16%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	0.08%	1.89%	0.13%	0.13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_viewed}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	0.03%	0.06%	0.01%	0.02%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 10: Proportion of the most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the Cellphones dataset for warm users (⚡) and cold users (❄️). Rows highlighted in blue denote cold start-compatible patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

	PGPR _a [⚡]	PGPR ₀ [⚡]	UPGPR _a [⚡]	UPGPR ₀ [⚡]	PGPR _a ^{❄️}	PGPR ₀ ^{❄️}	UPGPR _a ^{❄️}	UPGPR ₀ ^{❄️}
User $\xrightarrow{\text{mentioned}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	74.23%	74.41%	58.27%	57.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{interested_in}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Product	16.24%	20.48%	37.19%	38.43%	92.02%	95.7%	81.99%	90.31%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{also_bought}}$ Product	4.49%	2.04%	0.73%	0.73%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{purchase}}$ Product $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Word $\xrightarrow{\text{described}}$ Product	4.01%	2.28%	0.13%	0.13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{like}}$ Brand $\xrightarrow{\text{produced_by}}$ Product	0.41%	0.26%	3.63%	3.18%	7.41%	4.14%	17.85%	9.69%

Table 11: Proportion of the most frequent patterns used by the agents on the test set of the Clothing dataset for warm users (⚡) and cold users (❄️). Rows highlighted in blue denote cold start-compatible patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.

	PGPR _a [⚡]	PGPR ₀ [⚡]	UPGPR _a [⚡]	UPGPR ₀ [⚡]	PGPR _a ^{❄️}	PGPR ₀ ^{❄️}	UPGPR _a ^{❄️}	UPGPR ₀ ^{❄️}
User $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ Skill $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course	59.0%	24.11%	9.86%	10.58%	65.45%	16.31%	6.5%	4.24%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{know}}$ Skill $\xrightarrow{\text{cover}}$ Course	40.18%	72.36%	83.84%	82.34%	34.55%	83.69%	93.5%	95.76%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Category $\xrightarrow{\text{belong_to}}$ Course	0.47%	1.81%	0.27%	0.24%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course $\xrightarrow{\text{taught_by}}$ Teacher $\xrightarrow{\text{taught_by}}$ Course	0.29%	0.9%	0.3%	0.31%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course $\xrightarrow{\text{cover}}$ Skill $\xrightarrow{\text{cover}}$ Course	0.07%	0.08%	0.12%	0.05%	0%	0%	0%	0%
User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ User $\xrightarrow{\text{enroll}}$ Course	0.0%	0.74%	5.61%	6.48%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 12: Proportion of all the patterns used by the agents on the test set of the COCO dataset for warm users (⚡) and cold users (❄️). Rows highlighted in blue denote patterns that can be used for recommending an item to a strict cold user.