

# Preference Distillation for Personalized Generative Recommendation

Jerome Ramos Bin Wu Aldo Lipani

University College London, London, UK

{jerome.ramos.20, bin.wu.23, aldo.lipani}@ucl.ac.uk

## Abstract

Recently, researchers have investigated the capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) for generative recommender systems. Existing LLM-based recommender models are trained by adding user and item IDs to a discrete prompt template. However, the disconnect between IDs and natural language makes it difficult for the LLM to learn the relationship between users. To address this issue, we propose a **PErsonALized PrOmpt Distillation (PeaPOD)** approach, to distill user preferences as personalized soft prompts. Considering the complexities of user preferences in the real world, we maintain a shared set of learnable prompts that are dynamically weighted based on the user’s interests to construct the user-personalized prompt in a compositional manner. Experimental results on three real-world datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our PeaPOD model on sequential recommendation, top-n recommendation, and explanation generation tasks.

## 1 Introduction

Recommender systems (Ge et al., 2022) have emerged as pivotal tools in guiding users through vast amounts of items and tailoring personalized experiences across various tasks, including sequential recommendation, top-n recommendation and explanation generation. Recently, recommender systems trained using large language models (LLMs), known as generative recommender systems, have unlocked the ability to perform multiple tasks with a single model. It has been shown to perform well in a zero- and few-shot setting (Sanner et al., 2023) and can be further fine-tuned on a specific domain to improve performance (Ramos et al., 2024).

P5 (Geng et al., 2022) formulates recommendation as a text-to-text sequence task and trains the model to perform generative recommendation based on discrete prompt templates. User and

item IDs serve as important identifiers for discrete prompt templates, beyond the simple semantic meaning within their word embeddings. Thus, the disconnect between IDs and natural language and the inherent rigidity of discrete prompts makes it difficult for the LLM to learn the relationship between users, limiting the effectiveness of this approach. *Prompt Distillation* has been proposed to distill the knowledge in discrete prompts into continuous prompt vectors which do not map to any specific words (Li et al., 2023). However, the existing work distills the knowledge into global-shared prompts, which is in conflict with the fact that users’ personalized preferences greatly differ across the entire user population. Given that each user has their own unique preferences (Wu et al., 2022), it is imperative to design a method to effectively distill preferences for personalized recommendation.

One intuitive way to introduce distilled preferences is to create unique prompts per user based solely on their individual interaction history. However, there are two key issues: (1) Distilling separated prompts for each user is costly and difficult, where the number of prompts increases with the number of the user and in most cases, each user’s interaction history is too sparse to effectively personalize the recommender; and (2) This approach does not allow the model to match users with similar interests, which has been shown to increase performance for traditional recommender models in a warm-start setting (Koren et al., 2009; Mnih and Salakhutdinov, 2007; Cheng et al., 2016).

In this work, we propose **PErsonALized PrOmpt Distillation (PeaPOD)**, a more flexible and effective framework to distill user preferences as personalized soft prompts. Specifically, we construct a set of decomposed prompt components, which maintains a many-to-many mapping between user preferences and continuous prompts. This is due to the compositional nature of user preferences, meaning that users might share similar interests

but maintain their distinction as well. By updating only a small set of prompt components, we can efficiently share prompts among users rather than maintaining a unique prompt per user.

Moreover, to construct the many-to-many mapping (Wu et al., 2023) between users and the distilled prompt components, we propose a compositional strategy to dynamically weight the prompts based on user preference. First, we use matrix factorization (Koren et al., 2009) to generate a user embedding, which compresses a user’s interaction history into a high-dimensional space. The user embeddings are used to identify user preferences, helping to create a weighted summation of the decomposed prompt components, called the *user-personalized prompt*. Importantly, the construction of the user-personalized prompt are dynamic across users but only maintains a limited set of shared prompt components. From experiments across three datasets, PeaPOD is able to achieve state-of-the-art performance in three recommendation tasks. We provide all data and code used at <https://github.com/jeromeras70/peapod>.

In summary, our key contributions are:

1. We provide a novel architecture, namely **PersonAlized PrOmpt Distillation (PeaPOD)**, to distill complex user preferences into a limited set of learnable prompts.
2. We propose a compositional strategy, dynamically weighting the decomposed prompt components to construct the user-specific prompt based on user preference.
3. We conduct extensive experiments, showing the effectiveness and superiority of our proposed PeaPOD model.

## 2 Related Works

### 2.1 LLMs for Recommendation

In recent years, researchers have explored the effectiveness of using LLMs for recommendation. The two main methods of LLMs for recommender systems are (1) using the LLM’s pre-trained knowledge to recommend items in a zero-shot or few-shot setting and (2) fine-tuning the model for a given domain.

One advantage of LLMs is that they are pre-trained with a large amount of data from various domains. Thus, Sanner et al. (2023) crowdsourced a dataset of natural language summaries of user

preferences and showed that prompting a language model with these user summaries yielded competitive performance with traditional baselines in a near cold-start setting. Ramos et al. (2024) showed that a generative recommendation system trained solely on natural language user profiles are also competitive with traditional recommender systems in a warm-start setting, with the added benefit of transparency and scrutability. In addition, the zero-shot prompting of GPT-4 has also beaten SOTA models in a conversational recommender setting (He et al., 2023). Although prompting LLMs can lead to strong performance in recommender tasks, they are heavily reliant on better content knowledge rather than collaborative knowledge (He et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2024). Thus, if the item metadata is not already learned in the pre-trained knowledge base or if the target dataset users interact differently than the users that the LLM was originally trained on, the performance of the recommender system will suffer.

To mitigate these issues, the model can be further fine-tuned on target datasets in order to train the model based on the given user population and add or update its knowledge on the item dataset. P5 (Geng et al., 2022) is the first work that trains a T5-based (Raffel et al., 2020) foundational recommender model to unify various recommendation tasks in a shared framework. VIP5 (Geng et al., 2023) extended P5 to a multi-modal foundational recommender system. POD (Li et al., 2023) builds upon the P5 model and appends a task-specific, continuous prompt to the input to improve performance. Although these models pass in the `user_id` as inputs, they still do not leverage the collaborative information contained from similar users. In particular, they do not implement a user-specific component to identify and share knowledge between users with similar preferences. Previous work in continual learning for image classification has shown that an attention-based mechanism based on the image input is able to learn similarities across similar images to achieve state-of-the-art performance (Smith et al., 2023). In this work, we focus on adding an attention-based mechanism to our model in order to leverage the shared collaborative knowledge between users to improve the recommendation performance.

### 2.2 Structural Prompt

One issue with generative approaches to recommendation is how to effectively encode user-item

interactions to use with LLMs. Researchers have proposed numerous methods to bridge the gap between item IDs and natural language. One option is to add the user’s name and item title to the input prompt. However, this data may be unavailable or non-unique, making it difficult to personalize recommendations. Another option is to directly insert the user and item IDs to the discrete prompt template. However, LLMs are trained on natural language text rather than IDs, which limits the effectiveness of this approach.

To tackle these issues, many researchers have explored how to effectively encode item IDs with LLMs. For example, [Rajput et al. \(2023\)](#) proposed using RQ-VAE with item metadata to generate semantically meaningful tuples of tokens to serve as the Semantic ID for each item. GPTRec uses a novel SVD tokenization method to generate quantized item embeddings based on user-item interactions ([Petrov and Macdonald, 2023](#)). [Tan et al. \(2024\)](#) proposed training a textual ID generator alongside the LLM-based recommender to convert item ids to meaningful text descriptions. Although these approaches have improved item IDs encoding for generative recommendations, the effective encoding of user information remains largely unexplored. In particular, existing works do not tackle the problem of how to encode both a user’s personalized preferences and the shared knowledge between similar users to an LLM. Thus, our work focuses on how to develop user-personalized prompts to improve the performance of a generative recommender system.

### 3 Preliminary

#### 3.1 Recommendation Tasks

Following the existing works ([Geng et al., 2022](#)), we focus mainly on three important recommendation tasks: (1) Sequential Recommendation, (2) Top-n Recommendation, and (3) Explanation Generation. Let  $u \in U$  denote a user in the user set and  $i \in I$  denote an item in the item set across all three tasks. We aim to train a unified model to complete the following tasks:

- *Sequential Recommendation*: given a user  $u$  and a list of historical interactions in chronological order  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{n-1}$ , the task is to predict the next item  $i_n$  that  $u$  will interact with.
- *Top-n Recommendation*: given a pool of randomly sampled items from  $I$ , the model must

select the top  $N$  items that the user wants to interact with.

- *Explanation Generation*: given a user  $u$  and item  $i$ , the model must generate an explanation  $E_{u,i}$  that explains why  $u$  likes/dislikes  $i$ .

Importantly, the scope of our study focuses only on user and item IDs for recommendation and excludes additional information such as item metadata or user profiles because this information may be sensitive or unavailable.

#### 3.2 Prompt Distillation

In traditional recommender systems, user and item IDs are commonly used to identify unique users and items. However, since these IDs are unique to the dataset and are not natural language text, it is necessary to perform additional fine-tuning to allow the LLM to effectively understand these IDs. The most common methodology is to train the model with *discrete prompt templates*. For example, in the case of explanation generation, the discrete prompt could be “Explain why user\_1234 enjoys item\_5678”. When using IDs with discrete prompt templates, recent research proposes adding an additional embedding space, called whole-word embeddings, so that the model can recognize which tokens belong to the appropriate ID ([Geng et al., 2022](#)). In particular, each ID consists of the same whole-word embedding and all other tokens are tokenized as normal.

Although discrete prompts can lead to good performance, they are inflexible and require manually crafted prompts. Thus, the performance of the model may depend strongly on how well the instructions were written. On the other hand, continuous prompts are dynamically adjusted and fine-tuned through techniques like soft prompt tuning, which optimizes prompts by learning continuous embeddings. This approach allows the model to learn regardless of the the quality of the prompt template. [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) introduced *Prompt Distillation*, which distills discrete prompts into continuous prompt vectors. The authors used prompt distillation to add task-specific continuous prompts per recommendation task globally shared across all users to improve the model’s performance. Since this method adds a shared continuous prompt per recommendation task, we will refer to these continuous prompts as *task-specific prompts*. Although task-specific prompts were shown to improve performance in our recommendation tasks, they can-




Figure 1: Method to create the user-personalized prompt. The user embedding from matrix factorization is used to weight the decomposed prompt components. The distilled user preferences are then compositionally combined into a single soft prompt that can be passed to the model as input.

not express personalization because each user uses the exact same prompts. Thus, it is imperative to construct a new method to distill each user’s preferences into a personalized soft prompt.

## 4 User-Personalized Prompt

The goal of the *user-personalized prompt* is to distill user preferences into a soft prompt that is able to represent the user’s personal interests while also leveraging collaborative knowledge between similar users. We maintain a set of *decomposed prompt components*, which represents a many-to-many mapping between user preferences and continuous prompt vectors. This allows us to efficiently maintain a limited group of prompts and share knowledge across similar users. The decomposed prompt vectors are then dynamically weighted and combined based on the user’s interaction history to form a single continuous prompt. Using this methodology, user with similar preferences should have similar weight distributions. For example, if a decomposed prompt component contained information about action movies, then all users with an affinity to actions movies will contribute significant weight to this prompt component.

### 4.1 Query Function

Since we want to weight the decomposed prompt components based on each user’s preferences, we introduce a query function  $q(x)$ . The purpose of  $q(x)$  is to obtain an embedding that effectively captures a user’s personalized interests. In our case, we choose to use a user embedding generated from matrix factorization (Koren et al., 2009) as the query function. In particular, given a user-item feedback matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|U| \times |I|}$ , the model learns a user embedding  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{|U| \times D}$  and item embedding  $I \in \mathbb{R}^{|I| \times D}$ , where  $D$  is the dimension size and  $|U|$  and  $|I|$  are the number of users and items, respectively. By using a user embedding as the query

function, we can effectively encode user preferences into the shared set of prompt components.

### 4.2 Prompt-Component Weighting

We use an attention-based architecture (Vaswani et al., 2017) to attend the prompt components based on the user’s personalized preferences. Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times D}$  be a learnable attention vector, where  $M$  is the number of decomposed prompt components. We calculate the element-wise multiplication between  $q(x)$  and  $A$  to obtain the attended query, denoted as  $\lambda$ . The attended query allows the model to focus on the most important aspects of the user’s interaction history. To obtain the attended query we calculate:

$$\lambda = q(x) \odot A \quad (1)$$

where  $\odot$  is the element-wise product. We then calculate the cosine similarity, denoted as  $\gamma$ , between  $\lambda$  and  $K \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times D}$ , where  $k_M \in K$  is a learnable key that has a corresponding attention vector  $A_M$  and prompt component  $p_M$ . The cosine similarity between the attended query  $\lambda$  and  $K$  is used to determine the magnitude that each prompt component should receive, which we define as:

$$\alpha = \gamma(\lambda, K) \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times D}$  is a weighting vector. Since  $\alpha$  is updated during training, the model is able to update its representation of the user embedding rather than fixing it to a single representation.  $\alpha$  can then be used to weight the prompt components based on attended query function. Thus, we can determine how much each preference should contribute to the user’s overall user-personalized prompt.

### 4.3 Prompt Composition

Finally, we introduce the user-personalized prompt  $P$ , which is calculated as a weighted summation over the set of decomposed prompt components:

$$P = \sum_M \alpha_M p_M \quad (3)$$

where  $p \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D \times M}$  is a decomposed prompt component and  $L$  is the length of each prompt component. Each decomposed prompt component is a soft prompt that represents information that can be collaboratively shared across similar users. We base this idea on the assumption that users may share similar interests and this shared collaborative knowledge can be used to improve personalization.






Figure 2: Full PeaPOD model architecture. PeaPOD prepends two continuous prompts to the discrete prompt template: (1) a user-personalized prompt based on the user’s preferences and (2) a global task-specific prompt shared across all users. We add the additional whole-word embedding to distinguish tokens belonging to a given ID and train an encoder-decoder model.

Our many-to-many mapping between user preferences and soft prompts are dynamically weighted using  $\alpha$  based on each user’s interactions, distilling user preferences to a user-personalized prompt in a compositional manner. Notably, our model can capture the complexities of a personalized user profile while maintaining a fixed number of prompts. Since the user-personalized prompt focuses on the most important parts of the user embedding, our method is similar high dimension clustering, meaning that users with similar preferences will have similar user-personalized prompts. We show how to obtain the user-personalized prompt in Figure 1.

#### 4.4 Orthogonal Initialization

To reduce interference in knowledge between prompt components, we can initialize  $P$ ,  $K$ , and  $A$  orthogonally using QR Decomposition. Namely, let  $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times C}$  be a real matrix with  $R$  rows and  $C$  columns.  $Z$  can be broken into an orthogonal matrix  $Q$  and upper matrix  $R$ . The columns of  $Q$  will thus be a set of  $C$  orthogonal unit vectors which we can use as the initial vectors. We can repeat this initialization process for matrices  $P$ ,  $K$ , and  $A$ .

#### 4.5 Training and Generative Recommendation

Using the task-alternated training strategy proposed by Li et al. (2023), we alternate the task trained for each batch. This allows us to save time during training because the samples in the batch have the same data format and will therefore be a similar length to one another. Importantly, task-alternated training did not show any degradation in generative recommendation performance versus traditional random batching strategies (Li et al., 2023). We combine user-personalized prompts, task-specific prompts, and discrete prompts as input during training. We

also add whole-word embeddings to help the model identify which tokens belong to a particular ID. We show the whole mode architecture in Figure 2.

As all the generative recommendation tasks are posed as a sequence-to-sequence task, we use the Negative Log-Likelihood (NLL) loss to optimize the model parameters  $\Theta$ .

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Theta} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{(X,Y) \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{t=1}^{|Y|} -\log p(y_t | Y_{<t}, X) \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}$  is the training set that consists of input output pairs  $(X,Y)$  and  $\log p(y_t | Y_{<t})$  is the probability of generating token  $y_t$ , given input sequence  $X$  and the tokens previously generated.

In addition, the model must output a sequence of text that forms an item ID (or a natural language text in the case of explanation generation). For this task, we choose beam search, which is commonly used for its effectiveness in sequence-to-sequence generation. Suppose we set the number of beams to  $b$ . At each time step, are  $b$  candidate sequences. In the next step, any word in the vocabulary  $V$  are appended to the end of the candidate sequences, resulting in  $b \times V$  combinations. We can then select  $b$  sequences that have the maximum log-likelihood. The LLM can continue this process until the candidate sequences reach a predefined maximum length. For sequential recommendation and top- $N$  recommendation, the  $b$  candidate sequences form the recommendation list. For explanation, we select the sequence with the largest log-likelihood from the candidates.

Dataset	Sports	Beauty	Toys
#Users	35,598	22,363	19,412
#Items	18,357	12,101	11,924
#Reviews	296,337	198,502	167,597
#Sparsity (%)	0.0453	0.0734	0.0724

Table 1: Statistics of the datasets.

## 5 Experimental Setup

### 5.1 Datasets

For experimentation, we use the Sports, Beauty, and Toys & Games Dataset from Amazon <sup>1</sup>. We reuse the preprocessing steps and the 8:1:1 train/validation/test splits created by Geng et al. (2022). Each sample consists of a user ID, an item ID, a text review, a rating, and a time stamp. We provide the dataset statistics in Table 1. For explanation generation, the Sentires toolkit (Zhang et al., 2014) was used to extract ground-truth explanations for a given (user, item) pair. For sequential recommendation, the last item in a user’s history is part of the test set, the penultimate item is part of the validation set, and all other items are included in the train set. To prevent data leakage, the same training split used for sequential recommendation is used for top-n recommendation. For reproducibility, we provide all code used in the supplementary materials section of our submission and will release the code publicly upon publication.

### 5.2 Baselines

For sequential recommendation, we compare our model with the following baselines: **Caser** (Tang and Wang, 2018), **HGN** (Ma et al., 2019), **GRU4Rec** (Jannach and Ludewig, 2017), **BERT4Rec** (Sun et al., 2019), **FDSA** (Zhang et al., 2019), **SASRec** (Kang and McAuley, 2018), **P5** (Geng et al., 2022), **VIP5** (Geng et al., 2023), and **POD** (Li et al., 2023).

For top-n recommendation, we compare our method with: **MF** (Koren et al., 2009), **MLP** (Cheng et al., 2016), **P5** (Geng et al., 2022), **VIP5** (Geng et al., 2023), and **POD** (Li et al., 2023).

Finally, for explanation generation, we use the following baselines: **Att2Seq** (Dong et al., 2017);, **NRT** (Li et al., 2020), **PETER** (Li et al., 2021), and **POD** (Li et al., 2023). For a fair comparison, we exclude P5 and VIP5 because we are focused

exclusively on models that only use user and item IDs rather than additional user or item metadata.

### 5.3 Evaluation Metrics

For sequential and top-n recommendation, we evaluate models using two commonly used metrics, normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (nDCG) and Hit Ratio (HR). nDCG is a metric used to evaluate the quality of ranked lists by considering the position of relevant items, while HR measures the fraction of relevant items that appear in the top-n positions of a ranked list. In particular, we measure  $HR@{5,10}$  and  $nDCG@{5,10}$  for sequential recommendation and  $HR@{1,5,10}$  and  $nDCG@{5,10}$  for top-n recommendation. For explanation generation, we evaluate models using BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and ROUGE (Lin and Hovy, 2003). BLEU evaluates machine translation quality using n-gram precision against reference translations, while ROUGE assesses text summarization and translation by comparing n-gram overlaps with reference texts. We report the F1 scores for BLEU-4, ROUGE-1, ROUGE-2, and ROUGE-L. For all metrics, a greater score indicates better performance. In all tables, the best performing model for each metric is in **bold** and the second best model is underlined.

### 5.4 Implementation Details

To ensure a fair comparison, we compare PeaPOD with POD (Li et al., 2023), P5 (Geng et al., 2022), and VIP5 (Geng et al., 2023) using T5-small (60.5 M parameters) (Raffel et al., 2020) as the pre-trained LLM. On average, each experiment took 6 hours to run. Since the main focus of our study is not on formulating discrete prompts, we reuse the same discrete prompts as Geng et al. (2022). We adapt task-alternated training, as proposed by (Li et al., 2023), to speed up training time by alternating each task per batch. Notably, both VIP5 and P5 both mention that fine-tuning with the T5-small pre-trained checkpoint often outperforms fine-tuning with T5-base.

For all models, we train the model on an Nvidia RTX 3090 for 30 epochs, a batch size of 64, the AdamW optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2015), and a learning rate of  $5e-3$ . We save the best performing model on the validation set. The length of the task-specific prompts and prompt components are both set to 3. We set the number of prompt components to 20. For our hyperparameter search, we tested prompt lengths of {3, 5, 8, 10} and the number of

<sup>1</sup><https://jmcauley.ucsd.edu/data/amazon/>

Table 2: Performance comparison on sequential recommendation.

Methods	Sports				Beauty				Toys			
	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10
Caser	0.0116	0.0072	0.0194	0.0097	0.0205	0.0131	0.0347	0.0176	0.0166	0.0107	0.0270	0.0141
HGN	0.0189	0.0120	0.0313	0.0159	0.0325	0.0206	0.0512	0.0266	0.0321	0.0221	0.0497	0.0277
GRU4Rec	0.0129	0.0086	0.0204	0.0110	0.0137	0.0099	0.0283	0.0137	0.0097	0.0059	0.0176	0.0084
BERT4Rec	0.0115	0.0075	0.0191	0.0099	0.0203	0.0124	0.0347	0.0170	0.0116	0.0071	0.0203	0.0099
FDSA	0.0182	0.0122	0.0288	0.0156	0.0267	0.0163	0.0407	0.0208	0.0228	0.0140	0.0381	0.0189
SASRec	0.0233	0.0154	0.0350	0.0192	0.0387	0.0249	0.0605	0.0318	0.0463	0.0306	0.0675	0.0374
S <sup>3</sup> -Rec	0.0251	0.0161	0.0364	0.0204	0.0387	0.0247	0.0607	0.0327	0.0443	0.0294	0.0640	0.0376
P5	0.0272	0.0169	0.0361	0.0198	0.0530	0.0370	0.0659	0.0421	0.0460	0.0567	0.0709	0.0587
VIP5	0.0412	0.0345	0.0475	0.0365	0.0556	0.0427	0.0677	0.0467	0.0662	0.0577	0.0749	0.0604
POD	0.0496	0.0396	0.0576	0.0419	0.0537	0.0395	0.0688	0.0443	0.0691	0.0599	0.0742	0.0610
PeaPOD	<b>0.0505</b>	<b>0.0400</b>	<b>0.0611</b>	<b>0.0432</b>	<b>0.0588</b>	<b>0.0445</b>	<b>0.0738</b>	<b>0.0493</b>	<b>0.0692</b>	<b>0.0583</b>	<b>0.0787</b>	<b>0.0609</b>

Table 3: Performance comparison on top-n recommendation.

Methods	Sports					Beauty					Toys				
	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10
MF	0.0314	0.1404	0.0848	0.2563	0.1220	0.0311	0.1426	0.0857	0.2573	0.1224	0.0233	0.1066	0.0641	0.2003	0.0940
MLP	0.0351	0.1520	0.0927	0.2671	0.1296	0.0317	0.1392	0.0848	0.2542	0.1215	0.0252	0.1142	0.0688	0.2077	0.0988
P5	0.0567	0.1514	0.1049	0.2196	0.1269	0.0571	0.1566	0.1078	0.2317	0.1318	0.0451	0.1322	0.0889	0.2023	0.1114
VIP5	0.0699	0.1882	0.1304	0.2717	0.1572	0.0615	0.1655	0.1147	0.2407	0.1388	0.0433	0.1301	0.0875	0.2037	0.1110
POD	0.0895	0.2086	0.1506	0.2873	0.1756	0.0829	0.1926	0.1391	0.2670	0.1629	0.0567	0.1433	0.1009	0.2082	0.1215
PeaPOD	<b>0.1212</b>	<b>0.2741</b>	<b>0.2007</b>	<b>0.3616</b>	<b>0.2286</b>	<b>0.1097</b>	<b>0.2441</b>	<b>0.1780</b>	<b>0.3260</b>	<b>0.2039</b>	<b>0.0728</b>	<b>0.1618</b>	<b>0.1190</b>	<b>0.2315</b>	<b>0.1411</b>

prompts of {10, 20, 30, 100}. To obtain the user embedding, we train a probabilistic matrix factorization model (Mnih and Salakhutdinov, 2007), a variant of matrix factorization, for 100 iterations with an embedding size of 512, learning rate of 1e-3, and a lambda regularization of 1e-3. During inference time, the number of beams is set to 20 and the inference batch size is set to 32 for all tasks.

## 6 Results

### 6.1 Sequential Recommendation

In Table 2, we compare our models with our selected baseline models. Our results show that PeaPOD outperforms all baselines in the Sports and Beauty datasets and is either the first or second best model for all metrics in the Toys dataset. Notably, the only difference between our method and POD, which is the second best performing model, is the additional personalized-user prompt that is prepended to the input. Interestingly, even though the user embedding passed to the attention mechanism is trained on a top-n recommender model, the additional information still provides a performance boost to sequential recommendation. This performance gain may be attributed to the way the data was split. In particular, the sequential and top-n recommendation contains the same user-item interactions, meaning that information about the users can be shared to improve performance in both tasks.

### 6.2 Top-n Recommendation

In Table 3, we report the performance of the top-n recommendation task. We note that PeaPOD performs the best in all metrics for all datasets, with a significant improvement in performance. We note that matrix factorization, which is used to generate the user embedding, is trained for top-n recommendation. Thus, the boost in performance may be more significant when compared to the other two tasks because of the user embedding selected as the query function. Nevertheless, we also find that PeaPOD outperforms matrix factorization itself, meaning that combining traditional collaborative filtering methods with LLMs leads to increased performance.

### 6.3 Explanation Generation

In Table 4, we report the performance of all models on the explanation generation task. Interestingly PeaPOD performs particularly well on both Sports and Toys datasets, but performs significantly worse in Beauty when compared to the top baseline models. Nevertheless, PeaPOD ranks first or second best on six out of the twelve evaluations, meaning that it is still competitive in explanation generation.

Upon manual inspection across all models, we notice that there are a significant amount of duplicates across explanations, meaning that the same explanations are generated regardless of the (user, item) pair. Thus, we posit that limiting the explanation generation to exclusively user and item IDs hurts performance. Similar to how performance for sequential and top-n recommendation was im-

Table 4: Performance comparison on explanation generation.

Methods	Sports				Beauty				Toys			
	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L
Att2Seq	0.5305	12.2800	1.2107	9.1312	0.7889	12.6590	1.6820	9.7481	1.6238	13.2245	2.9942	10.7398
NRT	0.4793	11.0723	1.1304	7.6674	0.8295	12.7815	<u>1.8543</u>	9.9477	1.9084	13.5231	3.6708	11.1867
PETER	0.7112	<u>12.8944</u>	1.3283	<u>9.8635</u>	<b>1.1541</b>	<u>14.8497</u>	<b>2.1413</b>	<b>11.4143</b>	1.9861	<b>14.2716</b>	3.6718	<b>11.7010</b>
POD	<b>1.0013</b>	<b>14.0168</b>	<b>2.0436</b>	<b>11.1236</b>	<u>1.0630</u>	<b>15.2517</b>	1.5737	<u>11.3283</u>	<u>2.3053</u>	12.2889	<u>3.8512</u>	10.3923
PeaPOD	<u>0.9148</u>	11.2685	<u>1.7870</u>	8.8078	1.0050	13.4532	1.5863	10.3238	<b>2.4295</b>	<u>13.5537</u>	<b>3.9567</b>	<u>11.3863</u>




Figure 3: Comparison between PeaPOD and an ablated version (PeaPOD-X) trained without the task-specific prompts on our three tasks.

proved by providing collaborative user embeddings, the performance of item explanations can be improved by providing additional item metadata to the model. Previous research (Geng et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024; Rajput et al., 2023) has already explored how discrete item IDs can be transformed to provide more informative tokens to the model. However, we leave the additional experiments of combining enhanced item IDs with PeaPOD to future work.

#### 6.4 Training without Task-Specific Prompts

To understand the effectiveness of user-personalized prompts versus globally shared prompts, we fine-tune the model with the same architecture and hyperparameters, but omit the task-specific prompts. We refer to the ablated model as ‘PeaPOD-X’.

As shown in Figure 3, we find that in all three datasets, the performance of the sequential recommendation marginally decreases, but the top-n recommendation performance improves. For explanation generation, the original model performs better for the Beauty dataset, but worse for Sports and Toys. We attribute the boost in top-n recommendation performance to the user embedding used for the query function. In particular, matrix factorization is a top-n recommendation model, meaning that the model is most likely to excel in this task. However, the lack of a task-specific prompt for se-

quential recommendation hinders the performance on this task. Nevertheless, we observe for the sequential recommendation task, the ablated model is still better than solely using the discrete prompt and has similar performance to POD. Thus, we show the effectiveness of a user-personalized prompt that utilizes preferences shared between similar users to improve recommendation performance. We report all metrics for this experiment in Appendix B.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose PeaPOD, a novel recommender model that dynamically weights a set of decomposed prompt components to distill user preferences in a compositional manner. We maintain a many-to-many mapping between user preferences and continuous prompts to enable knowledge sharing among users with similar preferences. We utilize an attention-based mechanism to weight prompt components based on the user’s interaction history, thus creating a user-personalized prompt that distills both the user’s and similar users’ preferences into a learnable soft prompt. In our experiments, we show that our user-personalized prompt is effective in increasing the performance for three common recommendation tasks. Our model shows the effectiveness of preference distillation to improve personalized generative recommendation.



## 8 Limitations and Ethical Concerns

One limitation to our approach is that we limit our study to exclusively use user and item IDs. Thus, we do not incorporate any additional metadata such as user profiles or item descriptions. We find that this may hinder performance on explanation generation, which relies on having a strong understanding of both the user and item to provide a personalized response. We predict that providing additional metadata to the model can improve performance, particularly if it is given in natural language text as the LLM is already pre-trained on such data. We plan to extend PeaPOD to utilize this information in future work.

In addition, our model takes a two-step approach to generate user-personalized prompts. Namely, the user embedding is generated using matrix factorization, which is then passed to the model as the query function. However, the models are not connected end-to-end, which means that the user embedding cannot be continuously updated during training. For future work, we plan to combine these two models into a single end-to-end framework.

Another concern is the issue of fairness in generative recommender systems. For example, prior research has shown that LLM-based recommenders skew towards popular items, which causes a disparity in recommendations and can lead to a bias-amplification loop (Yoon et al., 2024). In addition, past research has investigated the issue of fairness in the LLM itself (Salutari et al., 2023). Thus, careful consideration must be made when deploying a generative recommender model to mitigate unfair recommendations.

## References

- Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishikesh Aradhya, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, Wei Chai, Mustafa Ispir, Rohan Anil, Zakaria Haque, Lichan Hong, Vihan Jain, Xiaobing Liu, and Hemal Shah. 2016. [Wide & Deep Learning for Recommender Systems](#). In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems*, pages 7–10, Boston MA USA. ACM.
- Li Dong, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, Mirella Lapata, Ming Zhou, and Ke Xu. 2017. Learning to Generate Product Reviews from Attributes. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long Papers*, pages 623–632, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yingqiang Ge, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Juntao Tan, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Yunqi Li, Yikun Xian, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2022. [A Survey on Trustworthy Recommender Systems](#). *Preprint*, arxiv:2207.12515.
- Shijie Geng, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2022. [Recommendation as Language Processing \(RLP\): A Unified Pretrain, Personalized Prompt & Predict Paradigm \(P5\)](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 299–315, Seattle WA USA. ACM.
- Shijie Geng, Juntao Tan, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. [VIP5: Towards Multimodal Foundation Models for Recommendation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 9606–9620, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhankui He, Zhouhang Xie, Rahul Jha, Harald Steck, Dawen Liang, Yesu Feng, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Nathan Kallus, and Julian McAuley. 2023. [Large Language Models as Zero-Shot Conversational Recommenders](#). In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 720–730, Birmingham United Kingdom. ACM.
- Dietmar Jannach and Malte Ludewig. 2017. [When Recurrent Neural Networks meet the Neighborhood for Session-Based Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 306–310, Como Italy. ACM.
- Wang-Cheng Kang and Julian McAuley. 2018. Self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*, pages 197–206. IEEE.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*.
- Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. 2009. [Matrix Factorization Techniques for Recommender Systems](#). *Computer*, 42(8):30–37.
- Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Li Chen. 2020. [Generate Neural Template Explanations for Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 755–764, Virtual Event Ireland. ACM.
- Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Li Chen. 2021. [Personalized Transformer for Explainable Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4947–4957, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Li Chen. 2023. [Prompt Distillation for Efficient LLM-based Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International*

- Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1348–1357, Birmingham United Kingdom. ACM.
- Chin-Yew Lin and Eduard Hovy. 2003. [Automatic evaluation of summaries using N-gram co-occurrence statistics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics on Human Language Technology - NAACL '03*, volume 1, pages 71–78, Edmonton, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chen Ma, Peng Kang, and Xue Liu. 2019. [Hierarchical Gating Networks for Sequential Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 825–833, Anchorage AK USA. ACM.
- Andriy Mnih and Russ R Salakhutdinov. 2007. Probabilistic Matrix Factorization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 20. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [BLEU: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL '02, pages 311–318, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aleksandr V. Petrov and Craig Macdonald. 2023. [Generative Sequential Recommendation with GPTRec](#). *Preprint*, arxiv:2306.11114.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):140:5485–140:5551.
- Shashank Rajput, Nikhil Mehta, Anima Singh, Raghunandan Hulikal Keshavan, Trung Vu, Lukasz Heldt, Lichan Hong, Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Jonah Samost, Maciej Kula, Ed Chi, and Maheswaran Sathiamoorthy. 2023. Recommender Systems with Generative Retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:10299–10315.
- Jerome Ramos, Hossein A. Rahmani, Xi Wang, Xiao Fu, and Aldo Lipani. 2024. [Natural Language User Profiles for Transparent and Scrutable Recommendations](#). *Preprint*, arxiv:2402.05810.
- Flavia Salutati, Jerome Ramos, Hossein A Rahmani, Leonardo Linguaglossa, and Aldo Lipani. 2023. Quantifying the bias of transformer-based language models for african american english in masked language modeling. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 532–543. Springer Nature Switzerland Cham.
- 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](#). *Preprint*, arxiv:2307.14225.
- James Seale Smith, Leonid Karlinsky, Vyshnavi Gutta, Paola Cascante-Bonilla, Donghyun Kim, Assaf Arbel, Rameswar Panda, Rogerio Feris, and Zsolt Kira. 2023. [CODA-Prompt: Continual Decomposed Attention-Based Prompting for Rehearsal-Free Continual Learning](#). In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11909–11919, Vancouver, BC, Canada. IEEE.
- Fei Sun, Jun Liu, Jian Wu, Changhua Pei, Xiao Lin, Wenwu Ou, and Peng Jiang. 2019. [BERT4Rec: Sequential Recommendation with Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1441–1450, Beijing China. ACM.
- Juntao Tan, Shuyuan Xu, Wenyue Hua, Yingqiang Ge, Zelong Li, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024. [IDGenRec: LLM-RecSys Alignment with Textual ID Learning](#). In *SIGIR*. arXiv.
- Jiayi Tang and Ke Wang. 2018. [Personalized Top-N Sequential Recommendation via Convolutional Sequence Embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 565–573, Marina Del Rey CA USA. ACM.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam M. Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Bin Wu, Jinyuan Fang, Xiangxiang Zeng, Shangsong Liang, and Qiang Zhang. 2023. Adaptive compositional continual meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 37358–37378. PMLR.
- Bin Wu, Zaiqiao Meng, Qiang Zhang, and Shangsong Liang. 2022. Meta-learning helps personalized product search. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 2277–2287.
- Bin Wu, Zhengyan Shi, Hossein A Rahmani, Varsha Ramineni, and Emine Yilmaz. 2024. Understanding the role of user profile in the personalization of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17803*.
- Se-eun Yoon, Zhankui He, Jessica Maria Echterhoff, and Julian McAuley. 2024. [Evaluating Large Language Models as Generative User Simulators for Conversational Recommendation](#). *Preprint*, arxiv:2403.09738.
- Tingting Zhang, Pengpeng Zhao, Yanchi Liu, Victor S. Sheng, Jiajie Xu, Deqing Wang, Guanfeng Liu, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2019. [Feature-level Deeper Self-Attention Network for Sequential Recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages

4320–4326, Macao, China. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

Yongfeng Zhang, Guokun Lai, Min Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2014. [Explicit factor models for explainable recommendation based on phrase-level sentiment analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 83–92, Gold Coast Queensland Australia. ACM.

Kun Zhou, Hui Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yutao Zhu, Sirui Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Zhongyuan Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2020. [S3-Rec: Self-Supervised Learning for Sequential Recommendation with Mutual Information Maximization](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 1893–1902, Virtual Event Ireland. ACM.

## A Baselines

For each of our three tasks, we compare our model with the following baselines.

### A.1 Sequential Recommendation

Sequential recommendation predicts a user’s next preferred items based on their previous interactions, which are given in historical order.

- **Caser**: Convolutional Sequence Embedding Recommendation (Tang and Wang, 2018) uses a convolutional neural network to learn the sequential pattern of the user interaction history.
- **HGN** (Ma et al., 2019): Hierarchical Gating Network uses two gating modules to model a user’s short and long term interests.
- **GRU4Rec** (Jannach and Ludewig, 2017): Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) for Recommendation uses a GRU to process a user’s recommender session.
- **BERT4Rec** (Sun et al., 2019): Fine-tunes a bidirectional encoder representations from transformers model for sequential recommendation.
- **FDSA** (Zhang et al., 2019): Feature-level Deeper Self-Attention network. Integrates item features as feature sequences, which are then combined with item sequences to generate recommendations.

- **SASRec** (Kang and McAuley, 2018): Self-Attentive based Sequential Recommendation model. Uses self-attention mechanisms for short-term semantics and Recurrent Neural Networks for long-term semantics.
- **S<sup>3</sup>-Rec** (Zhou et al., 2020): Self-Supervised learning for Sequential Recommendation. Uses four self-supervised learning objectives to capture the correlations between items in sequential data.
- **P5** (Geng et al., 2022): Pretrain, Personalized Prompt, and Predict Paradigm. Trains a model for multi-task generative recommendation using discrete prompt templates (e.g. “Which item of the following to recommend for user\_{ }? item\_list:{ }”)
- **VIP5** (Geng et al., 2023): An extension of P5 that trains on multimodal data.
- **POD** (Li et al., 2023): An extension of P5 that uses a task-specific, distilled prompt as part of the input.

### A.2 Top-n Recommendation

Top-n recommendation predicts a list of the top-n items based on the user’s interaction history.

- **MF** (Koren et al., 2009): Matrix Factorization is a collaborative filtering technique that decomposes a user-item interaction matrix into latent user and item embeddings.
- **MLP** (Cheng et al., 2016): Multi-Layer Perceptron is a neural network trained to learn captures non-linear interactions between users and items.
- **P5** (Geng et al., 2022): See definition in Section A.1.
- **VIP5** (Geng et al., 2023): See definition in Section A.1.
- **POD** (Li et al., 2023): See definition in Section A.1.

### A.3 Explanation Generation

Given a user ID and item ID, the model must return a natural language explanation describing why the user might like/dislike the target item. Notably, we exclude P5 and VIP5 because we are exclusively focused on models that exclusively use only user

and item IDs rather than item titles or other item metadata.

- **Att2Seq** (Dong et al., 2017): an attention based model that learns to generate product reviews from item attributes.
- **NRT** (Li et al., 2020): Neural Ratings and Tips generation simultaneously returns a rating and a tip based on a neural network.
- **PETER** (Li et al., 2021): a transformer based model that performs rating prediction and explanation generation.

## **B Training without Task-Specific Prompts**

We report the original model including task-specific prompts (denoted as PeaPOD) versus training the model without them (denoted as PeaPOD-X). All inputs and hyperparameters are otherwise the same.



Table 5: Performance comparison on sequential recommendation.

Methods	Sports				Beauty				Toys			
	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10
PeaPOD	<b>0.0505</b>	<b>0.0400</b>	<b>0.0611</b>	<b>0.0432</b>	<b>0.0588</b>	<b>0.0445</b>	<b>0.0738</b>	<b>0.0493</b>	0.0692	<b>0.0583</b>	0.0787	<b>0.0609</b>
PeaPOD-X	0.0480	0.0381	0.0581	0.0412	0.0565	0.0402	0.0732	0.0456	<b>0.0705</b>	0.0557	<b>0.0835</b>	0.0594

Table 6: Performance comparison on top-n recommendation.

Methods	Sports					Beauty					Toys				
	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10	HR@1	HR@5	NDCG@5	HR@10	NDCG@10
PeaPOD	0.1212	0.2741	0.2007	0.3616	0.2286	0.1097	0.2441	0.1780	0.3260	0.2039	0.0728	0.1618	0.1190	0.2315	0.1411
PeaPOD-X	<b>0.1232</b>	<b>0.2744</b>	<b>0.2017</b>	<b>0.3662</b>	<b>0.2309</b>	<b>0.1130</b>	<b>0.2480</b>	<b>0.1820</b>	<b>0.3304</b>	<b>0.2079</b>	<b>0.0790</b>	<b>0.1795</b>	<b>0.1308</b>	<b>0.2513</b>	<b>0.1536</b>

Table 7: Performance comparison on explanation generation.

Methods	Sports				Beauty				Toys			
	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L	BLEU-4	ROUGE-1	ROUGE-2	ROUGE-L
PeaPOD	0.9148	11.2685	<b>1.7870</b>	8.8078	<b>1.0050</b>	<b>13.4532</b>	1.5863	<b>10.3238</b>	2.4295	13.5537	<b>3.9567</b>	11.3863
PeaPOD-X	<b>0.9561</b>	<b>12.1112</b>	1.7613	<b>9.4255</b>	0.9598	11.3673	<b>1.7317</b>	8.8236	<b>2.5306</b>	<b>15.3696</b>	3.8183	<b>12.6750</b>