

Boosting Multimedia Recommendation via Separate Generic and Unique Awareness

Zhuangzhuang He*
Hefei University of Technology
Hefei, China
hyicheng223@gmail.com

Zihan Wang*
Hefei University of Technology
Hefei, China
zhwang.hfut@gmail.com

Yonghui Yang
Hefei University of Technology
Hefei, China
yyh.hfut@gmail.com

Haoyue Bai
Hefei University of Technology
Hefei, China
baihaoyue621@gmail.com

Le Wu†
Hefei University of Technology
Institute of Dataspace,
Hefei Comprehensive National
Science Center
Hefei, China
lewu.ustc@gmail.com

Abstract

Multimedia recommendation, which incorporates various modalities (e.g., images, texts, etc.) into user or item representation to improve recommendation quality, has received widespread attention. Recent methods mainly focus on cross-modal alignment with self-supervised learning to obtain higher quality representation. Despite remarkable performance, we argue that there is still a limitation: completely aligning representation undermines modal-unique information. We consider that cross-modal alignment is right, but it should not be the entirety, as different modalities contain generic information between them, and each modality also contains unique information. Simply aligning each modality may ignore modal-unique features, thus degrading the performance of multimedia recommendation.

To tackle the above limitation, we propose a **Separate Alignment and Distancing** framework (SAND) for multimedia recommendation, which concurrently learns both modal-unique and -generic representation to achieve more comprehensive items representation. First, we split each modal feature into generic and unique part. Then, in the alignment module, for better integration of semantic information between different modalities, we design a SoloSimLoss to align generic modalities. Furthermore, in the distancing module, we aim to distance the unique modalities from the modal-generic so that each modality retains its unique and complementary information. In the light of the flexibility of our framework, we give two technical solutions, the more capable mutual information minimization and the simple negative ℓ_2 distance. Finally, extensive

experiments on three datasets demonstrate the effectiveness and generalization of our proposed framework. The code is available at [SAND](#) and the [full training record](#) of the main experiment.

1 Introduction

With the development of multimedia platforms (e.g., YouTube, Twitter, etc.), users easily express their emotions with various modalities information (images, text, etc.). This gives recommender system [1, 2, 4, 5, 14, 22, 23, 30, 31, 35] more data resources and more possibilities for modeling accurate user profile. Therefore, multimedia recommendation has emerged, which can deeply understand user preferences by modeling multiple modalities. Early well-known methods, such as VBPR [12], gained remarkable performance by adding item modal features to the general representation. And after years of exploitation, graph neural network-based multimodal recommendation [29, 33, 39, 44] obtains notable performance. This is because these obtains not only higher-order connectivity but also items semantic associations.

Building on this success, self-supervised learning (SSL) [15, 36] carries multimedia recommendation to a new plateau of performance. The SSL-based methods have the advantage of both exploring potential relationships between modalities and preventing preference shortcuts [32] from unimodal, yielding expressive representation. In practice, most methods [32, 34, 45] focus on aligning the representation of each modality by contrastive learning (We illustrate this method in Figure 1 (a)). Because, although representation can be obtained from visual or textual encoders, they are not in the same space, and forcing unaligned representation to be fused leads to sub-optimal results [16, 17, 21].

Despite their notable performance, we argue that current SSL-methods still has a limitation: **Aligning full modal features may compromise their unique information**. By considering the textual and the visual modalities, both of which describe the colour, shape, etc. of an item, they reflect the information shared between them. However, depth information, texture that is not available in text can be provided in images; text can provide unique syntactic structure, morphological information [7]. These are unique pieces for each modality, and aligning all modalities results in the

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>




Figure 1: We illustrate the difference between the two strategies, (a) The alignment modality strategy of most SSL-based methods, (b) Our method for aligning and distancing modalities for representation.

loss of this information. Overlooking unique information to each modality may reduce the expressive capability of the representation [3, 10, 11, 38].

To address the above limitation, we assume that *aligning modality is good, but it should not be the entirety*. Few previous methods [37, 40] attempt to acquire modal-unique features from the entire modal features using simple subtraction. However, if the modal-generic is not adequately learned, then the modal-unique will be impeded. Therefore, we are presented with first challenge **(C1) How to design a more effective modal-generic and -unique learning solution**. In addition, multimedia recommendation usually require additional resources (e.g., video memory), leading to practical challenges such as resource constraints during model implementation. Flexible methods are crucial for adapting to varying resource scenarios. Therefore, the second challenge is **(C2) How to design distancing and alignment strategy available under various resource conditions**.

To address previous challenges, we propose a **Separate Alignment and Distancing** framework (SAND) for multimedia recommendation, which concurrently learns both modal-unique and -generic representation. To address **C1**, we *split each modal feature into two parts to separately concurrent learn modal-unique and -generic*, as shown in Figure 1 (b). To better learn the modal-unique and allow it to produce complementary information to the modal-generic, we distance them both. And we only align the modal-generic between the different modalities for more general information. To address **C2**, we *design a novel SoloSimLoss* to avoid the dilemma of time inefficiency in the distancing module, compared to the general contrastive learning that requires negative sampling. In addition, we *provide two technical options, i) the more capable mutual information minimization and ii) the simple negative ℓ_2 distance* in distancing module, which can be chosen flexibly depending on the available resources. To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- **New Awareness:** We propose a separate concurrent learning of modal-unique and modal-generic awareness, which acquire more comprehensive multimodal representation, making multimedia recommendation more effective.
- **New Framework:** We design a flexible framework SAND that enables modal alignment with SoloSimLoss, and additionally optionally the more capable mutual information minimisation

and the simple negative ℓ_2 distance for modal-unique learning, depending on the available resources.

- **Evaluations:** After empirical experiments on several datasets and various analytical validations, SAND is well demonstrated in terms of effectiveness, generalization and flexibility.

2 TASK DESCRIPTION

We give a formal definition of the multimedia recommendation, which focuses on using multiple modalities m , including text t , visual v and so on. First, we give some notational conventions. We use $u \in \mathcal{U}$ to represent user and $i \in \mathcal{I}$ to represent item. For user and item embedding, $\mathbf{E}_u^f \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f \times |\mathcal{U}|}$ represents the user’s randomly initialized free embedding, $\mathbf{E}_i^v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v \times |\mathcal{I}|}$ represents item initialized embedding with image features, and $\mathbf{E}_i^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_t \times |\mathcal{I}|}$ represents item initialized embedding with text features. A is the adjacency matrix of a user-item bipartite graph, $\mathcal{I}n$ addition, $\mathcal{R} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{U}| \times |\mathcal{I}|}$ denotes user interaction history, in which entry $\mathcal{R}_{u,i} = 1$ represents a user interacting with an item, while $\mathcal{R}_{u,i} = 0$ represents a user not interacting with an item. We predict the rating $\hat{r}_{u,i}$ by graph neural networks G with parameters θ . The optimization objective for multimedia recommendation is as follows:

$$\theta_G^* = \arg \min_{\theta_G} \mathbb{E}_{(u,i) \sim \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}}(G(A, \mathbf{E}_u^f, \mathbf{E}_i^v, \mathbf{E}_i^t), \mathcal{R}), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{P} denotes distribution of training data, \mathcal{L}_{rec} is BPR (Bayesian Personalized Ranking) loss function, θ_G^* is optimal parameters. Furthermore, we build homogeneous item-item multimodal graphs to establish semantic correlations within modalities. Specifically, the modal features are clustered by k NN (k -Nearest Neighbor) [19] to obtain the item-item visual connection matrix S_v and textual S_t . Finally, we adjust Eq. (1) as follows:

$$\theta_G^* = \arg \min_{\theta_G} \mathbb{E}_{(u,i) \sim \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}}(G(A, S_v, S_t, \mathbf{E}_u^f, \mathbf{E}_i^v, \mathbf{E}_i^t), \mathcal{R}). \quad (2)$$

3 The Proposed SAND Framework

Most previous SSL-based multimedia recommendation methods mainly focus on cross-modal alignment, but this may lead to neglecting modal-unique features, thus compromising the completeness of representation. To overcome this limitation, we propose SAND for separately concurrent learning both modal-unique and modal-generic representation to acquire a more comprehensive modal representation. Specifically, two modules are designed, 1) GNN-based multimodal representation, and 2) modal-unique and modal-generic representation learning module. For modal-generic learning, we achieve this goal through our proposed SoloSimLoss. For modal-unique learning, we propose two solutions, the more capable mutual information minimization and the simple negative ℓ_2 distance, which can be chosen according to the available resources. This shows the full flexibility of our framework. The overall model framework is shown in Figure 2.

3.1 GNN-based Multimodal Representation

In previous works [40, 44], GNN-based multimedia recommendation has shown remarkable capabilities. We extend that advantage in our proposed framework by modeling two kinds of multimodal graphs using graph convolution network, heterogeneous user-item




Figure 2: Overall our proposed framework.

graph, and homogeneous item-item graph. These two kinds of graphs model the collaborative signals and the semantic associations between items.

3.1.1 Heterogeneous Multimodal User-Item Graph. First, we construct two heterogeneous multimodal user-item graphs \mathcal{G}_v and \mathcal{G}_t based on the initial modality features. Specific graph forms is $\mathcal{G}_v = \{A, \mathbf{E}_u^f \parallel \mathbf{E}_i^v\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_t = \{A, \mathbf{E}_u^f \parallel \mathbf{E}_i^t\}$, where \parallel denotes concatenation operation. We perform the graph convolution operation [13] to get the user and item representation. Specifically, the convolution form is shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_u^{m(k+1)} &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u|} \sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_i|}} \mathbf{E}_i^{m(k)}, \\ \mathbf{E}_i^{m(k+1)} &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_i|} \sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u|}} \mathbf{E}_u^{m(k)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where k denotes the convolution k times, m represents modalities, and \mathcal{N}_u where comes from the row corresponding to u in A , which represents the one-hop neighbourhood of u and vice versa for i . We stack the representation of the k -layer convolutional network to get the final representation:

$$\mathbf{E}_u^m = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E}_u^{m(k)}; \quad \mathbf{E}_i^m = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{E}_i^{m(k)}. \quad (4)$$

3.1.2 Homogeneous Multimodal Item-Item Graph. To further enhance the expression of item representation, we follow [39, 44] to model the semantic associations between items. First, we use k NN technique to model the connection S between items. Additionally, the initial representation of the graph is a fusion of the multiple modal representation $\mathbf{E}_i = \{\mathbf{E}_i^v \parallel \mathbf{E}_i^t\}$ obtained above. Specifically, we calculate the two-by-two (i and j) cosine similarity between items, for example between item i and i' , as follows:

$$S_{i,i'}^m = \frac{(\mathbf{E}_i^m)^\top \mathbf{E}_{i'}^m}{\|\mathbf{E}_i^m\| \|\mathbf{E}_{i'}^m\|}, \quad (5)$$

where m stands for textual modality or visual modality. We then use k NN sparsification [44] to preserve top- k similarity connections as

edges of our item-item graph:

$$S_{i,i'}^m = \begin{cases} 1, & S_{i,i'}^m \in \text{top-}k(S_{i,i'}^m), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

In addition, to prevent some vertices with high degrees and those with low degrees from having a large difference in the feature distribution, we perform a symmetric normalization for S^m ,

$$S^m = (\mathbf{D}^m)^{-1/2} S^m (\mathbf{D}^m)^{-1/2}, \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{D}^m represents the diagonal degree matrix of S^m . We weight and sum the connection matrix of each modality v and t to obtain the final matrix S as follows:

$$S = \mathbf{W}_s \cdot S^v + (1 - \mathbf{W}_s) \cdot S^t, \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{W}_s is learnable weight matrix. We define the initial graph convolutional representation as $\mathbf{H}^{(0)} = \mathbf{E}_i$. We then aggregate the neighborhood representation of item i to extract semantic associations as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}^{(k)} = S \cdot \mathbf{H}^{(k-1)}. \quad (9)$$

In summary, we obtain the final items representation \mathbf{H} of the homogeneous graph after k times convolution.

3.2 Modal-unique and -generic Representation Learning

In order to avoid the limitation that only modality-alignment methods may lead to incomplete modality information, we propose separate concurrent learning of modal-unique and modal-generic representation. We first split each modal representation into two parts to separately learn modal-unique and -generic. **① For modal-generic representation**, we expect the representation to be as close as possible between different modalities, thus we design a novel loss function, *SoloSimLoss*. This loss function avoids the dilemma of negative sampling that takes time for general contrastive learning. **② For modal-unique representation**, we distance each modal representation to ensure that modality-independent information is retained. Specifically, we provide two technical options, i) the more capable mutual information minimization and ii) the simple negative ℓ_2 distance, which can be chosen flexibly depending on the available resources.

3.2.1 Splitting modal Representation. Inspired by [7], we split items representation \mathbf{E}_i^m into two parts and name them modal-unique \mathbf{E}_i^m and modal-generic \mathbf{E}_i^g . After that, we describe how to learn both specifically.

3.2.2 Mining Modal-generic Representation. Cross-modal alignment models the correlation between modalities and allows the modalities to convey general information to each other [3]. We first model vision and text features into the same representation space, enabling interoperability between natural language and visual semantics. Previous works [32, 45] use contrastive learning to obtain modal-generic representation. However, we argue that this strategy is time-inefficient. Thus we design a novel modalities alignment loss, SoloSimLoss, which is characterised by **time-efficient** and adaptively extracts modality-generic information from various modalities. The goal of this loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SoloSimLoss}}$ is to maximize the scores of visual-text pairs for better alignment. The specific form is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SoloSimLoss}} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \log(\text{Softmax}\{\exp(\mathbf{E}_i^v \cdot \mathbf{E}_i^t/\tau)\}). \quad (10)$$

Specifically, first, the inner product of the visual \mathbf{E}_i^v and textual \mathbf{E}_i^t representation of each sample is calculated. Then, a softmax function is applied to the results to obtain the similarity of each sample to all other samples. In addition, we define a temperature parameter τ that acts as a scaling factor that adjusts the smoothness of the softmax distribution.

3.2.3 Mining Modal-unique Representation. Modal-unique representation reveals information that is distinctive to each modality, which is essential for enhancing the expression of modal representation [3, 10, 11, 38]. Therefore, our goal is to **maximize the dissimilarity between modal-unique representation and corresponding modal-generic**, ensuring they contain uniquely complementary information. In addition, we give two technical solutions to extract modal-unique representation. i) the more capable mutual information minimization and ii) the simple negative ℓ_2 distance, respectively. These two methods can be chosen according to the available resources.

Method 1: Mutual Information Minimization. From a mutual information point of view, we expect the mutual information between the two to be as small as possible to acquire modal-unique representation. Therefore we separate the unique and generic parts of each modality by minimizing the mutual information (MI). Directly minimizing mutual information $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{E}_i^m; \mathbf{E}_i^g)$ is hard, thus derive a sample-based MI upper bound based on the Contrastive Log-ratio Upper Bound (CLUB) [6]. For the sake of notational simplicity in subsequent reasoning, we rewrite that expression here as $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{E}^g; \mathbf{E}^q)$.

Proposition 1. Given that $\mathbf{E}_j^g \sim p(\mathbf{E}^g)$, if the conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q)$ between \mathbf{E}_i^g and \mathbf{E}_i^q is known, then

$$\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{E}_i^g; \mathbf{E}_i^q) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log p(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q) - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \log p(\mathbf{E}_j^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q) \right]. \quad (11)$$

Based on above proposition, the task is to compute the conditional probability $p(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q)$. To address this, we utilize a neural network $q_\phi(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q)$ to estimate this probability. This estimation is achieved by minimizing the KL-divergence between the distributions:

$$\min_{q_\phi} \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}} \left[q_\phi(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q) \parallel p(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q) \right]. \quad (12)$$

Specifically, we posit that $q_\phi(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q)$ conforms to a conditional Gaussian distribution. Subsequently, we employ log-likelihood maximization to iteratively learn the parameters ϕ accordingly. Consequently, the upper bound of MI can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_dis} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \log q_\phi(\mathbf{E}_i^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q) - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{I}|} \log q_\phi(\mathbf{E}_j^g | \mathbf{E}_i^q), \quad (13)$$

where, \mathcal{L}_{m_dis} is distancing module loss. We highlight that the parameters of the network $q_\phi(\cdot)$, as well as \mathbf{E}^g and \mathbf{E}^q , iterative updates. Up to this point, we can learn to get modal-unique by Eq. (13).

Method 2: Negative ℓ_2 Distance. We have already introduced capable mutual information minimization, but the time complexity is relatively high. Inspired by [7], we provide a simpler solution, negative ℓ_2 distance, for use when resources are constrained. To achieve that purpose, we utilize a negative ℓ_2 loss function as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_dis} = -\left\| \mathbf{E}_q^m - \mathbf{E}_g^m \right\|_2^2, \quad (14)$$

where $|m|$ represents the number of modalities, \mathbf{E}_q^m denotes the modal-unique features, and \mathbf{E}_g^m represents the modal-generic features.

3.3 Fusion and Optimization

We have obtained the representation of each modality of users and items under the heterogeneous graph, and the representation of the item obtained under the homogeneous graph, and modal-unique and learned modal-unique and modal-generic representation of the items. Now we conduct modal fusion to get the final representation of users \mathbf{E}_i and items \mathbf{E}_u .

$$\mathbf{E}_i = \{\mathbf{E}_i^t \parallel \mathbf{E}_i^g \parallel \mathbf{E}_i^v \parallel \mathbf{H}\}; \quad \mathbf{E}_u = \{\mathbf{W}_t \cdot \mathbf{E}_u^t \parallel \mathbf{W}_v \cdot \mathbf{E}_u^v\}. \quad (15)$$

So far, we have the final representation. Then we employ BPR (Bayesian Personalized Ranking) as a fundamental part of our optimization. Specifically, in BPR, we denote the set of training triplets as \mathcal{D} , where each triplet (u, i, j) represents a user u preferring interacted item i over uninteracted item j . The BPR loss function can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{bpr} = - \sum_{(u,i,j) \in \mathcal{D}} \log \sigma(\mathbf{E}_u \cdot \mathbf{E}_i - \mathbf{E}_u \cdot \mathbf{E}_j), \quad (16)$$

where $\sigma(x)$ denotes the sigmoid function. We then combine the previous alignment loss and distancing loss (Note that from Figure 2 we can see that we distancing from the visual and textual modalities separately, hence there are two losses.) to form the final loss function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{bpr} + \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{align}} + \beta \cdot (\mathcal{L}_{v_dis} + \mathcal{L}_{t_dis}), \quad (17)$$

where α and β are important hyperparameters and we will perform sensitivity analyses in the experimental section.

4 Experiments

In this section, we conduct various experiments to verify the effectiveness of our method and various analytical experiments that demonstrate our generalization, flexibility, and efficiency. The entire experimental section is developed with the following questions (RQs):

- **RQ1:** Does our SAND remain advanced in comparison to recently published methods?
- **RQ2:** Does each component of our SAND benefit performance?
- **RQ3:** How does the parameter tuning of SAND affect performance?
- **RQ4:** How about a comprehensive analysis of our model in terms of generalization, flexibility, and efficiency?
- **RQ5:** Does analyzing SAND visually still demonstrate advantages?

4.1 Experimental Settings

A - Datasets. Follow previous work [34, 39, 44], we conduct empirical study on three popular datasets. Specifically, we use **Baby**, **Sports**, and **Clothing**. All datasets are processed according to MMRec¹ [42]. Table 1 shows the basic information of the three datasets.

Table 1: Statistics of three popular datasets.

Dataset	# Users	# Items	# Interaction	Sparsity
Baby	19,445	7,050	160,792	99.88%
Sports	35,598	18,357	296,337	99.95%
Clothing	39,387	23,033	278,677	99.97%

B - Evaluation Protocols Following the usual principle [34, 39, 44] of a fair comparison, we use the two Top- K metrics, Recall ($R@k$) and NDCG@ K ($N@k$) [24, 25] to measure our model performance. Specifically, we set k to 10 and 20. The dataset is divided according to the popular partitioning criterion [34] of 8:1:1 for training: validation: testing.

C - Compared Methods. To ensure that our comparison models are diverse, we compare not only collaborative filtering models, but also existing multimodal models, which include classical, as well as recently published ones (for presentation purposes, we add the publication avenue as well as the year after the model name). For this purpose, We choose the following methods.

- **BPR** [20] is bayesian personalised ranking, one of the classical recommendation methods.
- **LightGCN** [13] simplifies the components in GCN, lightweighting the model while gaining better performance.
- **LayerGCN** [43] alleviates the oversmoothing problem and sparsifies the user-item graph.
- **VBPR** [12] incorporates visual information on the basis of BPR, fusing latent representation with visual features extracted by convolutional neural networks for recommendation.

- **MMGCN** [33] process the textual user-item graph and the visual user-item graph separately with GCN and fuse the information from both.
- **DualGNN** [29] fuses the user representation obtained from the user-item graph and the user-user co-occurrence graph as the final representation.
- **LATTICE** [39] obtains the item-item graph by KNN (K-Nearest Neighbors) algorithm and fuses its obtained representation with those of the user-item graph.
- **SLMRec** [26] introduces self-supervised learning, treating ID, vision, text, and sound as one modality each, and constructing separate modal-unique graphs for each modality.
- **MICRO** [40] is an extension of LATTICE that mines the latent structure between items by learning an item-item graph and obtaining the items' multimodal representation by contrastive fusion.
- **BM3** [45] utilizes self-supervised learning to do intra-modal alignment and inter-modal alignment.
- **MMSSL** [32] propose cross-modal contrastive learning that jointly preserves the commonality of cross-modal semantics and the diversity of user preferences.
- **FREEDOM** [44] is the plus version of LATTICE, specifically, denoising the user-item graph, and freezing the item-item graph.
- **MGCN** [37] adopts attention layers to capture the modalities' importance and design a self-supervised auxiliary task that aims to maximize the mutual information between modal and behavioral features.
- **LGMRec** [9] uses a hypergraph neural network to extract various modal information deeply.

D - Implementation details. To verify the effectiveness of our method more fairly and open source, we implement our method using the popular framework MMRec [42]. We observe that the popular baseline results remain consistent in [34, 41, 44], both of them are based on MMRec. Therefore, in order to maintain a fair performance comparison, for the baseline results, we use the results of the original [34, 44] as the results of our baseline. For our method, consistent with all baselines, we initialize the embedding with Xavier initialization[8] of dimension 64 and optimize SAND with Adam optimizer. The learning rate is fixed at $1e-4$, and the number of GCN layers in the heterogeneous graph is set to 2.

4.2 Performance Comparison (RQ1)

To verify the superiority of our proposed method, we compare our method with the kinds of existing well-known methods. We present the results on three popular datasets as well as four commonly used metrics. Table 2 shows the results of the experiment and we obtain the following observations:

Obs 1. Our method is consistently better than all baselines across all metrics. Specifically, on the sports dataset, we improve 3.84% ($R@10$) and 7.21% ($R@20$) compared to the best baseline. We attribute the enhancement that we split the initial representation and perform separate alignment and distancing to obtain a more expressive representation. With this strategy, we can make the overall representation of each modality more complete. Most baselines either just utilize more graph structure or just align modality

¹<https://github.com/enoch/MMRec>

Table 2: Performance comparison of baselines and our method in terms of Recall@K (R@K), and NDCG@K (N@K).

Datasets	Baby				Sports				Clothing			
Methods	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20
MF-BPR (UAI'09)	0.0357	0.0575	0.0192	0.0249	0.0432	0.0653	0.0241	0.0298	0.0187	0.0279	0.0103	0.0126
LightGCN (SIGIR'20)	0.0479	0.0754	0.0257	0.0328	0.0569	0.0864	0.0311	0.0387	0.0340	0.0526	0.0188	0.0236
LayerGCN (ICDE'23)	0.0529	0.0820	0.0281	0.0355	0.0594	0.0916	0.0323	0.0406	0.0371	0.0566	0.0200	0.0247
VBPR (AAAI'16)	0.0423	0.0663	0.0223	0.0284	0.0558	0.0856	0.0307	0.0384	0.0281	0.0415	0.0158	0.0192
MMGCN (MM'19)	0.0378	0.0615	0.0200	0.0261	0.0370	0.0605	0.0193	0.0254	0.0218	0.0345	0.0110	0.0142
DualGNN (TMM'21)	0.0448	0.0716	0.0240	0.0309	0.0568	0.0859	0.0310	0.0385	0.0454	0.0683	0.0241	0.0299
LATTICE (MM'21)	0.0547	0.0850	0.0292	0.0370	0.0620	0.0953	0.0335	0.0421	0.0492	0.0733	0.0268	0.0330
SLMRec (TMM'22)	0.0529	0.0775	0.0290	0.0353	0.0663	0.0990	0.0365	0.0450	0.0452	0.0675	0.0247	0.0303
MICRO (TKDE'22)	0.0584	0.0929	0.0318	0.0407	0.0679	0.1050	0.0367	0.0463	0.0521	0.0772	0.0283	0.0347
BM3 (WWW'23)	0.0564	0.0883	0.0301	0.0383	0.0656	0.0980	0.0355	0.0438	0.0422	0.0621	0.0231	0.0281
MMSSL (WWW'23)	0.0613	0.0971	0.0326	0.0420	0.0673	0.1013	0.0380	0.0474	0.0531	0.0797	0.0291	0.0359
FREEDOM (MM'23)	0.0627	0.0992	0.0330	0.0424	0.0717	0.1089	0.0385	0.0481	0.0629	0.0941	0.0341	0.0420
MGCN (MM'23)	0.0620	0.0964	0.0339	0.0427	<u>0.0729</u>	<u>0.1106</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0496</u>	<u>0.0641</u>	<u>0.0945</u>	<u>0.0347</u>	<u>0.0428</u>
LGMRec (AAAI'24)	<u>0.0644</u>	<u>0.1002</u>	<u>0.0349</u>	<u>0.0440</u>	0.0720	0.1068	0.0390	0.0480	0.0555	0.0828	0.0302	0.0371
SAND (Ours)	0.0663	0.1033	0.0354	0.0449	0.0757	0.1145	0.0408	0.0508	0.0659	0.0953	0.0358	0.0432

using self-supervised learning, ignoring modal-unique information. Although some methods [37, 40] attempt to disentangle the modal-generic and -unique, they simply split the modal representation into two parts by subtraction, and do not constrain both by explicitly aligning the modal-generic representation and distancing modal-unique representation, hence the performance potential is not better exploited.

Obs 2. Self-supervised learning-based methods perform relatively well. In terms of overall performance, SSL-based methods are superior to traditional CF and GNN-based methods, such as MGCN, MMSSL, BM3. These methods use contrastive learning to align modality so that they are in the same representation space, producing more effective modal fusion. This allows the modalities to be fully coupled for multi-modal recommendation performance. In addition, we note that LGMRec using hypergraph networks also works well, which we attribute to a more powerful graph representation modeling capability.


4.3 Ablation Study (RQ2)

Previously, we have observed the overall performance of SAND. Now, we take it a step further and explore the performance impact of each module of SAND with ablation experiments. We design three variants:

- **w/o All:** We remove both distancing and alignment modules.
- **w/o Distancing:** We remove the representation distancing module to eliminate modal-unique effects.
- **w/o Alignment:** We remove the representation alignment module to eliminate modal-generic effects.
- **SAND:** We retain all modules for comprehensive comparison.

Specifically, as shown in Figure 3, we obtain the following observations in three datasets:

Obs 3. Each module has a beneficial effect. On all three datasets, we find that adding any of our proposed modules to the model is able to improve the results, compared to the case where no module

**Figure 3: The effect of each module on SAND.**

is added. This is partly due to the success of modal alignment, which models the representation of different modal patterns in the same space, allowing for more subtle modal fusion. On the other hand, the preservation of modal-unique gives the models a relatively good performance improvement.

Obs 4. Multiple modules combine to yield better performance. We observe that the combination of modules produces the best results and consider that this matches our motivation. This is due to our separate concurrent learning of modal-unique and modal-generic features, which complement each other with a more powerful representation. In addition, the performance improvements observed through module combinations highlight the collaborative effects of module integration. This observation also further validates our motivation that **aligning modality is right, but it should not be entirety**. SAND can further unleash its performance potential through more reasonable constraints to delineate the modal-generic and -unique parts.

4.4 Parameter Sensitivity Analysis (RQ3)

In this section, we experimentally explore the sensitivity under different parameter settings to understand performance trends. Our framework involves three main parameters, i) the weight α of the alignment module, ii) the weight β of the distancing module, and iii) the temperature coefficient τ . The experiment is conducted as a




Figure 4: Impact of the alignment weight α , distancing weight β and temperature coefficient τ .

controlled variable in the Baby and Sports dataset. As shown in Figure 4, we can observe that:

Obs 5. As the value of the parameter increases, there is a tendency for the performance to increase and then decrease. As the values of the parameters increase, the performance of the model may improve as well, as an increase in the values of the parameters may enhance the ability of the model to fit the data better. For example, as α increases, it will pull the representation closer together well to make them in the same space, allowing for a finer modal fusion. However, as it continues to increase, it pulls the information too close together, resulting in impaired information on both sides, which in turn leads to a decrease in performance. The other two parameters are similarly so.

4.5 Framework Generalization, Flexibility, Efficiency Analysis (RQ4)

In this section, we perform a comprehensive analysis, in terms of generalization, flexibility, and efficiency, respectively. To demonstrate the generalization of our framework, which allows us to plus the alignment and distancing modules on other methods; as well as the flexibility of our framework itself, which allows us to replace the modules in it to adapt to various available resource conditions; and the efficiency of our framework, which compares the time and memory under different modules.

A - Generalization Analysis. Our alignment and distancing modules are not only applicable to our proposed GNN-based Encoder. It can also be applied to other models. We select two popular methods plus our two modal strategies. The VBPR multimodal model and the GNN-based FREEDOM. The results are shown in Table 3. We observe that both VBPR and FREEDOM have different performance improvements after incorporating our alignment and distancing modules, and FREEDOM’s performance improvement is slightly lower than VBPR’s due to its own powerful multi-graph convolutional structure. We get the following Conclusion:

Con 1. Our framework is a plug-and-play module that can be easily integrated into various multimodal models and achieve better results.

Table 3: Generalization analysis on Baby dataset.

Model	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20
VBPR	0.0423	0.0663	0.0223	0.0284
VBPR + SAND	0.0457	0.0743	0.0243	0.0317
Improv.	8.04%	12.07%	8.97%	11.62%
FREEDOM	0.0627	0.0992	0.0330	0.0424
FREEDOM + SAND	0.0636	0.1013	0.0336	0.0433
Improv.	1.44%	2.12%	1.82%	2.12%

B - Flexibility Analysis. We provide 2×2 combinations of four methods to extract modal-generic and -unique representation. In particular, the mutual information minimization (MI) and negative ℓ_2 loss (ℓ_2) are proposed for the distancing module, and the Solosim and InfoNCE loss are designed for the alignment module. Therefore many modules can be replaced, and here we experiment with various combinations of modules. The results of various combinations of experiments are shown in Table 4. We find that Solosimloss and MI achieve the best results. $SAND_a$ performs slightly better than $SAND_c$, which implies that there may be a large number of pseudo-negative samples between modalities (e.g. textual descriptions that are similar to the anchor image). Therefore, aligning only inter-modal positive samples may be sufficient. In addition, even the worst-performing combination, $SAND_d$, can compete with the optimal baseline, LGMRec. We get the following Conclusion:

Con 2. Our framework is effective and flexible, providing four combinations to better delineate between modal-generic and -unique representation to enhance items representation and achieve optimal or sub-optimal results.

Table 4: Flexibility analysis on Baby dataset.

Variants	Solosim	InfoNCE	MI	ℓ_2	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20
$SAND_a$	✓			✓	0.0663	0.1033	0.0354	0.0449
$SAND_b$	✓			✓	0.0650	0.1012	0.0349	0.0441
$SAND_c$		✓	✓		0.0657	0.1026	0.0348	0.0449
$SAND_d$		✓	✓		0.0644	0.1007	0.0345	0.0436

C - Efficiency Analysis. In this section, we compare the efficiency of each model. We conduct an efficiency analysis of several variants mentioned in the previous flexibility analysis. We perform the following combinations to validate efficiency. Specific statistical memory and time are shown in Table 5. We observe an increase in both memory and training time for the multimodal model. This is because this adds more modal features compared to the generic CF model. With several of our methods, it is evident that the MI-based approach has a large increase in resource consumption.



Con 3. Compared to existing multimodal recommendation methods, our framework provides options for various resource conditions and ensures acceptable model efficiency.

4.6 Visual Analysis (RQ5)

To gain a better understanding of the advantages of splitting modal representation, we take a step: randomly pick 500 items from the Baby dataset and use the TSNE [28] algorithm to map their representation into a two-dimensional space. Afterward, we use Gaussian kernel density estimation (KDE) [27] to create plots showing the

Table 5: Efficiency Analysis. We statistics the memory and the running time per epoch for each model.

Dataset	Metric	General CF model				Multimodal model					
		BPR	LightGCN	VBPR	MMGCN	LATTICE	FREEDOM	SAND _d	SAND _c	SAND _b	SAND _a
Baby	Memory (GB)	1.59	1.69	1.89	2.69	4.53	2.13	2.54	3.42	2.54	3.42
	Time (s/epoch)	0.86	1.81	1.04	6.35	3.42	2.58	4.58	18.81	3.75	16.04
Sports	Memory (GB)	2.00	2.24	2.71	3.91	19.93	3.34	3.94	8.83	3.94	8.83
	Time (s/epoch)	1.24	3.74	1.67	20.88	13.59	4.52	16.13	60.97	13.75	58.81
Clothing	Memory (GB)	2.16	2.43	3.02	4.24	28.22	4.15	4.69	13.78	4.69	13.78
	Time (s/epoch)	1.52	4.58	2.02	26.13	23.96	5.74	23.59	59.25	21.41	57.35

**Figure 5: Distribution of text representation with modal-generic part on the left and modal-unique part on the right.****Figure 6: Distribution of visual representation with modal-generic part on the left and modal-unique part on the right.**

distribution of these two-dimensional features. To make it clearer, each figure includes a Gaussian kernel density estimate on the unit hypersphere S^1 displayed at the bottom. Upon analyzing the distribution of 2D features from Figure 5 and Figure 6, we have found that the distribution of modal-generic representation tends to align for visual and textual modalities, while modal-generic and -unique representation are well-distanced across modalities. Meanwhile, text and visual modal-unique parts seem to capture a different distribution of information. SAND only aligns modal-generic parts while retaining modal-unique parts to serve the final recommendation, avoids the performance loss caused by aligning unnecessary information between modalities, and ensures state-of-the-art performance. Finally, we give the last conclusion:

Con 4. Aligning each modality is good, but it should not be the entirety. And distinction between modal-generic features and -unique features is crucial. Aligning generic features and retaining modal unique enhances recommendation performance.

5 Related Works

Multimedia recommendation has been widely studied because it introduces a rich variety of modal information that enhances the effectiveness of recommendation. We categorise existing methods into two groups, GNN-based [9, 29, 33, 39, 44] and SSL-based [18, 26, 32, 34, 37, 39, 40, 45], based on their technical characteristics.

GNN-based Methods. The impressive representational modelling capabilities of graph neural networks have led to significant improvements not only in collaborative filtering methods (e.g., LightGCN), but also in multimedia recommendation [9, 29, 33, 39, 44]. MMGCN [33] firstly uses GCN to model two interaction graphs, containing visual and textual information respectively, and then fuses the item representation obtained from each party to obtain the final representation. LATTICE [39] argue that the underlying structural information behind the modalities reflects the underlying relationships between the modalities, and therefore not only construct interaction graphs as well as item homogeneity graphs learnt from the modal features, inference yields more expressive representation. DualGNN [29] differs from LATTICE which focuses on obtaining the user-user co-occurrence graph and enhancing the users' modal representation. LGMRec [9] utilises hypergraph neural networks for capturing higher-order interactions, and richer modal fusion.

SSL-based Methods. Self-supervised learning (SSL) effectively mitigates supervised signal sparsity, advancing the fields of computer vision [15], natural language processing [15], recommendation [36], and so on. The SSL-based multimedia recommendation [18, 26, 32, 34, 37, 39, 40, 45] builds on the success of the GNN-based methods. It excels in extracting potential relationships between modalities [26], modal feature fusion [40, 45], and mitigating label sparsity [32]. For example, SLMRec [26] explores potential relationships between modalities using contrastive learning to produce powerful representation. BM3 [45] builds multiple views by dropout

strategy and reconstructs the interaction graph, and designs the intra- and inter-modal contrastive loss to learn the representation with promising results. MMSSL [32] mitigates label sparsity with two-stage self-supervised learning, generation and comparison, and achieved excellent performance.

Comparison with Our Method. MICRO [40] and MGCN [37] extract the modal features from the modal generic features to obtain modal specific features, and achieve preliminary results. We argue that obtaining modality-specific presupposes correctly inference of modality-generic features, but this may lead to cumulative errors. Instead, our solution is that both modal parts are obtained by independent constraint learning, rather than simply depending computation. In addition, the most relevant work with ours is SimMMDG [7]. However, it tackles the domain generalization and modal missing problem, which is not feasible in multimedia recommendation. As well as our method being more flexible, the modules can all be changed flexibly to suit complex situations.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel framework SAND for multimedia recommendation, which concurrently learns both modal-unique and -generic representation. For modal-generic representation, we expect the representation between different modalities to be as close as possible. Therefore, we introduce SoloSimLoss, which avoids the time cost associated with negative sampling compared to general comparison learning. As for the modality-unique representation, we distance the representation for each modality to ensure that modality-independent information is retained. Specifically, we provide two technical solutions that allow the framework to be flexibly applied to various resources. We conduct comprehensive experiments that demonstrate the effectiveness and generalization and flexibility of our framework.

References

- [1] Haoyue Bai, Min Hou, Le Wu, Yonghui Yang, Kun Zhang, Richang Hong, and Meng Wang. 2024. Unified Representation Learning for Discrete Attribute Enhanced Completely Cold-Start Recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2024).
- [2] Haoyue Bai, Le Wu, Min Hou, Miaomiao Cai, Zhuangzhuang He, Yuyang Zhou, Richang Hong, and Meng Wang. 2024. Multimodality Invariant Learning for Multimedia-Based New Item Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15783* (2024).
- [3] Tadas Baltrušaitis, Chaitanya Ahuja, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2018. Multimodal machine learning: A survey and taxonomy. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 41, 2 (2018), 423–443.
- [4] Miaomiao Cai, Lei Chen, Yifan Wang, Haoyue Bai, Peijie Sun, Le Wu, Min Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2024. Popularity-Aware Alignment and Contrast for Mitigating Popularity Bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20718* (2024).
- [5] Miaomiao Cai, Min Hou, Lei Chen, Le Wu, Haoyue Bai, Yong Li, and Meng Wang. 2024. Mitigating Recommendation Biases via Group-Alignment and Global-Uniformity in Representation Learning. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* (2024).
- [6] Pengyu Cheng, Weituo Hao, Shuyang Dai, Jiachang Liu, Zhe Gan, and Lawrence Carin. 2020. Club: A contrastive log-ratio upper bound of mutual information. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1779–1788.
- [7] Hao Dong, Ismail Nejjar, Han Sun, Eleni Chatzi, and Olga Fink. 2024. SimMMDG: A Simple and Effective Framework for Multi-modal Domain Generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [8] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. JMLR, 249–256.
- [9] Zhiqiang Guo, Jianjun Li, Guohui Li, Chaoyang Wang, Si Shi, and Bin Ruan. 2023. LGMRec: Local and Global Graph Learning for Multimodal Recommendation. (2023).
- [10] Tengyue Han, Pengfei Wang, Shaozhang Niu, and Chenliang Li. 2022. Modality matches modality: Pretraining modality-disentangled item representations for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 2058–2066.
- [11] Devamanyu Hazarika, Roger Zimmermann, and Soujanya Poria. 2020. Misa: Modality-invariant and-specific representations for multimodal sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 1122–1131.
- [12] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. VBPR: visual bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 30.
- [13] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 639–648.
- [14] Zhuangzhuang He, Yifan Wang, Yonghui Yang, Peijie Sun, Le Wu, Haoyue Bai, Jinqi Gong, Richang Hong, and Min Zhang. 2024. Double Correction Framework for Denoising Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11272* (2024).
- [15] Ashish Jaiswal, Ashwin Ramesh Babu, Mohammad Zaki Zadeh, Debapriya Banerjee, and Fillia Makedon. 2020. A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies* 9, 1 (2020), 2.
- [16] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4904–4916.
- [17] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. 2021. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 9694–9705.
- [18] Yifan Liu, Kangning Zhang, Xiangyuan Ren, Yanhua Huang, Jiarui Jin, Yingjie Qin, Ruilong Su, Ruiwen Xu, and Weinan Zhang. 2024. An Aligning and Training Framework for Multimodal Recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12384* (2024).
- [19] Leif E Peterson. 2009. K-nearest neighbor. *Scholarpedia* 4, 2 (2009), 1883.
- [20] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. 452–461.
- [21] Amanpreet Singh, Ronghang Hu, Vedanuj Goswami, Guillaume Couairon, Wojciech Galuba, Marcus Rohrbach, and Douwe Kiela. 2022. Flava: A foundational language and vision alignment model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 15638–15650.
- [22] Peijie Sun, Yifan Wang, Min Zhang, Chuhan Wu, Yan Fang, Hong Zhu, Yuan Fang, and Meng Wang. 2024. Collaborative-Enhanced Prediction of Spending on Newly Downloaded Mobile Games under Consumption Uncertainty. *WWW2024, Industry Track* (2024).
- [23] Peijie Sun, Le Wu, Kun Zhang, Xiangzhi Chen, and Meng Wang. 2023. Neighborhood-Enhanced Supervised Contrastive Learning for Collaborative Filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [24] Shisong Tang, Qing Li, Xiaoteng Ma, Ci Gao, Dingmin Wang, Yong Jiang, Qian Ma, Aoyang Zhang, and Hechang Chen. 2022. Knowledge-based temporal fusion network for interpretable online video popularity prediction. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 2879–2887.
- [25] Shisong Tang, Qing Li, Dingmin Wang, Ci Gao, Wentao Xiao, Dan Zhao, Yong Jiang, Qian Ma, and Aoyang Zhang. 2023. Counterfactual Video Recommendation for Duration Debiasing. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4894–4903.
- [26] Zhulin Tao, Xiaohao Liu, Yewei Xia, Xiang Wang, Lifang Yang, Xianglin Huang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2022. Self-supervised learning for multimedia recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2022).
- [27] George R. Terrell and David W. Scott. 1992. Variable kernel density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1236–1265.
- [28] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research* 9, 11 (2008).
- [29] Qifan Wang, Yinwei Wei, Jianhua Yin, Jianlong Wu, Xuemeng Song, and Liqiang Nie. 2021. Dualgnn: Dual graph neural network for multimedia recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 25 (2021), 1074–1084.
- [30] Yifan Wang, Peijie Sun, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Yuan Zhang, Peng Jiang, and Shaoping Ma. 2024. Intersectional Two-sided Fairness in Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 3609–3620.
- [31] Yifan Wang, Peijie Sun, Min Zhang, Qinglin Jia, Jingjie Li, and Shaoping Ma. 2023. Unbiased Delayed Feedback Label Correction for Conversion Rate Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2456–2466.
- [32] Wei Wei, Chao Huang, Lianghao Xia, and Chuxu Zhang. 2023. Multi-modal self-supervised learning for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 790–800.
- [33] Yinwei Wei, Xiang Wang, Liqiang Nie, Xiangnan He, Richang Hong, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. MMGCN: Multi-modal graph convolution network for personalized recommendation of micro-video. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 1437–1445.

- [34] Jinfeng Xu, Zheyu Chen, Shuo Yang, Jinze Li, Hwei Wang, and Edith C-H Ngai. 2024. MENTOR: Multi-level Self-supervised Learning for Multimodal Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19407* (2024).
- [35] Yonghui Yang, Le Wu, Kun Zhang, Richang Hong, Hailin Zhou, Zhiqiang Zhang, Jun Zhou, and Meng Wang. 2023. Hyperbolic Graph Learning for Social Recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [36] Junliang Yu, Hongzhi Yin, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Jundong Li, and Zi Huang. 2023. Self-supervised learning for recommender systems: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [37] Penghang Yu, Zhiyi Tan, Guanming Lu, and Bing-Kun Bao. 2023. Multi-view graph convolutional network for multimedia recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 6576–6585.
- [38] Wenmeng Yu, Hua Xu, Ziqi Yuan, and Jiele Wu. 2021. Learning modality-specific representations with self-supervised multi-task learning for multimodal sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 10790–10797.
- [39] Jinghao Zhang, Yanqiao Zhu, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Shuhui Wang, and Liang Wang. 2021. Mining latent structures for multimedia recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 3872–3880.
- [40] Jinghao Zhang, Yanqiao Zhu, Qiang Liu, Mengqi Zhang, Shu Wu, and Liang Wang. 2022. Latent structure mining with contrastive modality fusion for multimedia recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2022).
- [41] Hongyu Zhou, Xin Zhou, Zhiwei Zeng, Lingzi Zhang, and Zhiqi Shen. 2023. A Comprehensive Survey on Multimodal Recommender Systems: Taxonomy, Evaluation, and Future Directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04473* (2023).
- [42] Xin Zhou. 2023. MMRec: Simplifying Multimodal Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03497* (2023).
- [43] Xin Zhou, Donghui Lin, Yong Liu, and Chunyan Miao. 2023. Layer-refined graph convolutional networks for recommendation. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1247–1259.
- [44] Xin Zhou and Zhiqi Shen. 2023. A tale of two graphs: Freezing and denoising graph structures for multimodal recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 935–943.
- [45] Xin Zhou, Hongyu Zhou, Yong Liu, Zhiwei Zeng, Chunyan Miao, Pengwei Wang, Yuan You, and Feijun Jiang. 2023. Bootstrap latent representations for multi-modal recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 845–854.