

# DUCHO meets ELLIOT: Large-scale Benchmarks for Multimodal Recommendation

MATTEO ATTIMONELLI, Politecnico di Bari, Italy

DANILO DANESE, Politecnico di Bari, Italy

ANGELA DI FAZIO, Politecnico di Bari, Italy

DANIELE MALITESTA, Université Paris-Saclay, CentraleSupélec, Inria, France

CLAUDIO POMO, Politecnico di Bari, Italy

TOMMASO DI NOIA, Politecnico di Bari, Italy

With the advent of deep learning and, more recently, large models, recommendation systems have greatly refined their capability of profiling users' preferences and interests that, in most cases, are complex to disentangle. This is especially true for those recommendation algorithms that hugely rely on external side information, such as multimodal recommender systems. In specific domains like fashion, music, and movie recommendation, the multi-faceted features characterizing products and services may influence each customer on online selling platforms differently, paving the way to novel multimodal recommendation models that can learn from such multimodal content. According to the literature, the common multimodal recommendation pipeline involves (i) extracting multimodal features, (ii) refining their high-level representations to suit the recommendation task, (iii) optionally fusing all multimodal features, and (iv) predicting the user-item score. While great effort has been put into designing optimal solutions for (ii-iv), to the best of our knowledge, very little attention has been devoted to exploring procedures for (i). In this respect, the existing literature outlines the large availability of multimodal datasets and the ever-growing number of large models accounting for multimodal-aware tasks, but (at the same time) an unjustified adoption of limited standardized solutions. This motivates us to explore more extensive techniques for the (i) stage of the pipeline. To this end, this paper settles as the first attempt to offer a large-scale benchmarking for multimodal recommender systems, with a specific focus on multimodal extractors. Specifically, we take advantage of two popular and recent frameworks for multimodal feature extraction and reproducibility in recommendation, DUCHO and ELLIOT, to offer a unified and ready-to-use experimental environment able to run extensive benchmarking analyses leveraging novel multimodal feature extractors. Results, largely validated under different hyper-parameter settings for the chosen extractors, provide important insights on how to train and tune the next generation of multimodal recommendation algorithms.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Multimodal Recommendation, Benchmarking, Large Multimodal Models

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The latest trends in machine learning have lately shaped research into recommendation [59]. Among the most notable examples, deep learning [97] and, in recent times, large models [84], have boosted the performance of recommender systems (RSs) leading them to unprecedented capabilities of profiling users' preferences and interests on e-commerce platforms. Specifically, when user-item data interactions are sparse, RSs may struggle to learn meaningful preference patterns [27]. Thus, augmenting models' knowledge of the training data through multimodal side information [4, 53], such as product images and descriptions in the e-commerce domain, or video and audio tracks for movies or songs in online multimedia streaming, has shown to be greatly beneficial.

In this respect, the literature enumerates a wide spectrum of multimodal recommender systems (RSs) [39, 40, 45, 98] spanning, among others, tasks such as fashion [2, 10, 18], micro-video [6, 12, 80], food [33, 51, 74], and music [15, 55, 71] recommendation. Unlike the usual recommendation pipeline, where only the user-item interaction data is processed and exploited for models' training, the multimodal recommendation pipeline involves multiple stages outlined and formalized in a recent survey [45]. Concretely, four main stages are recognized (Figure 1): (i) multimodal features are extracted from recommendation data, generally representing items' multifaceted characteristics; (ii) processing and




Fig. 1. The formal multimodal schema for multimedia recommendation as outlined in [45]. The pipeline involves four main stages (answering three questions): (i) *Which?*, indicating multimodal features extraction, (ii-iii) *How?* indicating the multimodal features processing and refining, and (iv) *When?* indicating an optional fusion stage, followed by the score prediction.

refining the extracted multimodal features so that their representation may suit the downstream recommendation task; (iii) as an optional phase, performing different fusion strategies to combine all modalities into a single multimodal representation; (iv) finally, predicting the user-item score.

As evident, the literature regarding multimodal recommendation has greatly focused on steps (ii-iv), proposing several possible strategies to address each of the highlighted phases of the pipeline [27, 77, 79, 80, 95, 100, 101]. Nevertheless, to the best of our knowledge, considerably limited (if any) attention has been put into examining optimal solutions to tailor stage (i) of the pipeline. Extracting meaningful multimodal features to provide the recommendation model is of the utmost importance to produce high-quality recommendations [3, 17, 45, 47]. In this regard, we highlight a worrying limitation in current multimodal recommendation pipelines. Despite the large availability of multimodal recommendation datasets, and the ever-growing number of large (multimodal) models designed, tested, and loaded to popular frameworks almost daily [88], limited and common standardized solutions are usually exploited. Indeed, we believe this crucial aspect could slow down the research into multimodal recommendation, by (in fact) undermining the goodness and soundness of the newly-proposed approaches.

Motivated by the outlined literature and experimental gap, in this work, we seek to propose one of the largest benchmarking studies on multimodal recommendation (i.e., **1,500 conducted experiments**), with a dedicated focus on multimodal feature extraction. To this end, we first select two popular and recent frameworks in multimodal recommendation. On the one hand, we exploit DUCHO [3, 47], a recent unified framework for the customizable extraction of multimodal features in recommendation; the idea is to extend the usual exploration of multimodal feature extractors [25, 54] to **five solutions** encompassing, among others, models properly **fine-tuned** to specific **domains** (e.g., fashion [41]) and recent **large models** capable of working on all **multimodal features at once** [13, 29, 56]. On the other hand, we consider ELLIOT [1, 45], a framework for the training and evaluation of recommender systems, to conduct rigorous hyper-parameter explorations (**ten** for each model in a grid-search manner) on **five common** multimodal recommendation datasets [26, 50] and **six state-of-the-art** multimodal recommender systems [27, 48, 79, 95, 100, 101].

Besides **validating** the DUCHO + ELLIOT environment to benchmark multimodal recommendation pipelines, results show the superior performance of usually-untested **multimodal-by-design** features extractors over the standard adopted solutions from the current literature. Nevertheless, a deeper analysis conducted on the main extractors’ hyper-parameters highlights how such models might provide improved recommendation performance at the expense of **computational complexity**; thus, **careful design choices** (e.g., batch sizes) regarding these extractors are needed to reach an optimal performance-complexity trade-off.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 2, we conduct an extensive literature review to analyze popular recommendation datasets and feature extractors observed in multimodal recommendation that justifies the proposed multimodal benchmarking analysis. Then, in Section 3, we focus on DUCHO, the recently proposed framework for the extraction of multimodal features in recommendation, outlining its rationales and main architectural modules, along with its evolution over the two existing versions. After that, in Section 4, we present our proposed experimental study, describing the explored multimodal feature extractors, (multimodal) recommender systems, and useful reproducibility details. Moreover, in Section 5, we provide a summarized outline of the overall multimodal recommendation pipeline obtained from the joint usage of DUCHO and ELLIOT for our benchmarking analysis. Furthermore, in Section 6, we present the results of our study, answering three research questions leading from more common to unexplored and more refined experimental settings. Finally, in Section 7, we point out the main take-home messages of our empirical study, while in Section 8 we provide hints about future directions of the work.

To foster the reproducibility of this work, we provide the codes, datasets, and configurations to run the experiments and results presented in this work, as well as the implementation of the complete multimodal recommendation pipeline<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, the joint combination of DUCHO and ELLIOT constitutes, to the best of our knowledge, the **first attempt in the literature** to build and provide an **end-to-end, out-of-the-box**, and **highly-customizable** working pipeline for multimodal recommendation, ranging from dataset collection and processing up to the evaluation of the recommendation models. Moreover, our long-term goal with this paper is to incentivize **standardized** and **unified** experimental settings for multimodal recommendation; to this end, and for the first time in the literature, we make our benchmarking results available on **Papers With Code**<sup>2</sup>, one of the most popular open-source repositories for machine learning research collecting, apart from papers, also codes and datasets to replicate and benchmark the presented results. Following previous and similar ideas from the recommendation community (but in other domains and scenarios [102]<sup>3</sup>) we invite future researchers, practitioners, and experienced scholars to start from this benchmarking analysis and contribute.

## 2 LITERATURE ANALYSIS

This section reviews the datasets and multimodal feature extractors commonly used in the literature to develop multimodal recommender systems. This overview is crucial for understanding the current trends in the literature regarding the first stage of the multimodal pipeline (refer again to Figure 1). We begin by analyzing the most popular datasets, followed by a detailed examination of the multimodal extractors. In both cases, we started our investigation from the literature review provided in [45] regarding multimodal recommendation models as of the last five years, by further expanding the analysis to the current year (2024 at the time of this submission).

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/sisinflab/Ducho-meets-Elliot>.

<sup>2</sup><https://paperswithcode.com/task/multimodal-recommendation>.

<sup>3</sup><https://openbenchmark.github.io/BARS/>.

## 2.1 Datasets

We reviewed multimodal recommendation papers published between 2017 and 2024 to establish a comprehensive foundation for our benchmarking study on multimodal recommender systems. We aimed to identify the most relevant multimodal datasets employed in recent literature.

Table 1 summarizes various popular multimodal datasets across different application domains, ordered by year. For each dataset, we report the supported modalities (visual, textual, and audio), the available data format (original data or already pre-processed into multimodal features), and provide a reference if the dataset is publicly available. Our analysis revealed several challenges in dataset accessibility and reproducibility, such as missing direct links, outdated versions, and privately held datasets. Notably, audio-containing datasets were significantly underrepresented compared to other modalities. Figure 2 illustrates the frequency of dataset usage in the literature, with Amazon datasets being the most prevalent (35 occurrences), followed by MovieLens (22 occurrences) and TikTok (14 occurrences). Interestingly, 16 datasets were used only once, often in the specific papers that introduced them. What is more, the vast majority of datasets come with available and accessible multimodal content data (e.g., images, texts), while very few of them provide already-processed multimodal features.

## 2.2 Multimodal feature extractors

We conducted a comprehensive review of state-of-the-art multimedia recommendation papers published in the proceedings of leading conferences and journals over the past seven years. From these, we selected 38 notable papers which are analyzed in Table 2. A careful review and analysis aimed at outlining recurrent schematic and observed patterns suggest categorizing the retrieved papers considering the extractor chosen for each of the modalities considered while designing the respective proposed recommendation models.

It appears that only Liu et al. [43] consider the employment of a multimodal-by-design model for the extraction of multimodal features, while all the others rely on independent models for each of the considered modalities. It is noteworthy that the majority of the works still employ old architectures, such as VGG [11, 20, 61, 72, 74, 77, 86, 90, 96, 99] or AlexNet [9, 38], while many models employ classical ResNet [8, 10, 14, 63, 67, 68, 80, 81, 85, 94] models for the visual modality. For the textual modality, initially, researchers tended to employ custom architectures, from TextCNN to Bag-of-words or custom LSTM. Since 2021, Transformers [70] have been largely employed, from Sentence-BERT [52, 71, 77, 95, 99, 101] to ViLBERT [81] and BERT [42]. For the audio, the majority of the works employ VGGish.

## 2.3 Summary

In light of the above, it becomes evident that the vast majority of works: (i) adopt multimodal recommendation datasets where the original data (e.g., images, texts) are available, while a limited subset of those datasets offer pre-processed multimodal features; (ii) exploit limited and standardized multimodal extractors, while the recent literature outlines a growing number of new solutions. Thus, with this work, we aim to address each of the two aspects through a twofold contribution: (i) implement a complete pipeline through which researchers can run extensive multimodal recommendation benchmarking from the feature extraction and processing up to the evaluation, thus allowing the access a wider spectrum of available multimodal datasets (even those without pre-processed features); (ii) extensively benchmark usually-untested multimodal feature extractors to investigate their effectiveness on the final recommendation performance of state-of-the-art multimodal recommendation models.

Table 1. Overview of multimodal recommendation datasets, detailing crucial features such as publication year, domain classification, incorporated modalities (visual, textual, audio), original and pre-processed data availability, and public accessibility.

Datasets	Year	Domain	Modalities			Data		Publicly available
			Visual	Textual	Audio	Original	Pre-processed	
UT Zappos50K [91, 92]	2014	Fashion	✓	✓		✓	✓	[link]
FashionVC [64]	2017	Fashion	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Polyvore [24]	2017	Fashion	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Taobao [69]	2018	Fashion	✓	✓		✓		[link]
POG [10]	2019	Fashion	✓	✓		✓		[link]
IQON3000 [65]	2019	Fashion	✓	✓		✓	✓	[link]
bodyFashion [20]	2019	Fashion	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Last.fm <sup>4</sup> [7]	2011	Music	✓	✓	✓	✓		[link]
MSD-A [55]	2017	Music		✓	✓	✓	✓	[link]
WeChat [63]	2020	Music	✓	✓	✓			✗
Amazon Review [54]	2013-2023	E-commerce	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Recipe1M+ [49, 60]	2017	Recipe	✓	✓		✓	✓	[link]
FoodRec [30]	2019	Recipe	✓	✓			✓	[link]
Allrecipes [21]	2020	Recipe	✓	✓		✓		[link]
MIND [82]	2020	News	✓	✓			✓	[link]
MM-Rec [81]	2022	News	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Pinterest [22]	2015	Social Media	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Kwai [66]	2020	Social Media	✓	✓			✓	[link]
MM-INS [85]	2020	Social Media	✓	✓		✓		[link]
Youtube [61]	2021	Social Media	✓	✓				✗
Sharee/Lemon8 [43]	2021	Social Media	✓	✓				✗
TikTok	2023	Social Media	✓	✓	✓		✓	[link]
Dianping [34–37]	2020	Restaurant	✓	✓				[link]
Yelp	2013-2023	Restaurant	✓	✓		✓		[link]
MovieLens	1997-2021	Movie		✓		✓		[link]
Netflix Prize data [5]	2007	Movie		✓				[link]
Netflix Crawled [78]	2023	Movie	✓	✓		✓	✓	[link]




Fig. 2. Frequency of multimodal datasets usage in multimodal recommender system papers published between 2017 and 2024.

Table 2. Overview of multimodal features extractors as employed in recent multimodal recommendation systems. We provide details regarding the year, domain, and the extractor models adopted for each modality.

Papers	Year	Domain	Modalities		
			Visual	Textual	Audio
Han et al. [23]	2017	Fashion	Custom	Custom	
Oramas et al. [55]	2017	Music		Custom	Custom
Zhang et al. [96]	2017	Social Media	Custom	Custom	
Ying et al. [90]	2018	E-commerce	VGG16	Word2Vec	
Wang et al. [72]	2018	E-commerce	AlexNet	Custom	
Liu et al. [38]	2019	E-commerce	AlexNet	PV-DM	
Chen et al. [11]	2019	Fashion	VGG19	Custom	
Wei et al. [80]	2019	Movie, Social Media	ResNet50	Sentence2Vec	VGGish
Cheng et al. [14]	2019	E-commerce, Restaurant	ResNet152	LDA	
Dong et al. [20]	2019	Fashion	VGG16	Bag-of-word scheme	
Chen et al. [10]	2019	Fashion	Inception ResNet V2	TextCNN	
Yu et al. [93]	2019	Fashion	ResNet50	CNN, GRU	
Cui et al. [16]	2020	E-commerce, Fashion	GoogLeNet	GloVe	
Wei et al. [79]	2020	Movie, Social Media	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sun et al. [67]	2020	Movie, Restaurant	ResNet50	Word2Vec, SIF	
Chen and Li [9]	2020	E-commerce	AlexNet	KimCNN	
Min et al. [51]	2020	Restaurant	Custom		
Shen et al. [63]	2020	E-commerce, Music	ResNet50	Custom	
Yang et al. [86]	2020	Fashion	VGG	Glove	
Tao et al. [68]	2020	Movie, Social Media	ResNet50	Sentence2Vec	VGGish
Yang et al. [85]	2020	Social Media	Inception V3, ResNet50	BiLSTM	
Sang et al. [61]	2021	Social Media	VGG, C3D	TextCNN	
Liu et al. [42]	2021	E-commerce, Movie	Inception-v4	BERT	VGGish
Zhang et al. [95]	2021	E-commerce	AlexNet	Sentence-BERT	
Vaswani et al. [71]	2021	Music		Sentence-BERT	Custom
Lei et al. [33]	2021	Restaurant	Custom	Custom	Custom
Wang et al. [74]	2021	Restaurant	VGG19	TextCNN	
Zhan et al. [94]	2022	Fashion	ResNet50	Custom	
Wu et al. [81]	2022	News	Mask RCNN, ResNet50, ViLBERT	ViLBERT	
Yi and Chen [87]	2022	E-commerce	ResNet50	Sentence2Vec	
Yi et al. [89]	2022	Movie, Social Media	N/A	N/A	N/A
Liu et al. [43]	2022	E-commerce	CLIP	N/A	
Mu et al. [52]	2022	E-commerce	AlexNet	Sentence-BERT	
Chen et al. [8]	2022	Movie, Social Media	ResNet50	Sentence2Vec	VGGish
Zhou and Shen [99]	2022	E-commerce	AlexNet	Sentence-BERT	
Wang et al. [73]	2023	Movie, Social Media	ResNet50	Sentence2Vec	VGGish
Wei et al. [77]	2023	E-commerce, Restaurant, Social Media	Custom	Sentence-BERT	
Zhou et al. [101]	2023	E-commerce	AlexNet	Sentence-BERT	

### 3 DUCHO: THE EXTRACTION FRAMEWORK

This section presents DUCHO [3, 47], our recent unified and standardized framework to extract multimodal features in recommendation. While we later incorporate it within our multimodal recommendation pipeline, in the following, we outline the rationales behind the framework and the main aspects regarding its architecture and implementation.




Fig. 3. Frequency of multimodal extractors usage in multimodal recommender system papers published between 2017 and 2024.

### 3.1 The need for a unified and standardized extraction framework

As anticipated in the previous sections, extracting meaningful features from multimodal data is crucial to empower recommendation models, enabling them to understand users’ preferences and make more personalized and accurate suggestions [17, 45]. However, the current practices for extracting multimodal features present several limitations.

Firstly, the lack of standardized multimodal extraction procedures across different recommendation frameworks obstructs interoperability and makes it challenging to compare the effectiveness of various approaches fairly [44–46]. Each framework may employ distinct feature extraction methods, making it difficult to assess the impact of specific modalities or compare the performance of different systems. Secondly, while there is no shortage of pre-trained deep learning models available in popular open-source libraries, the absence of shared interfaces for feature extraction across these models creates an additional complication for model designers.

To address these limitations, we proposed DUCHO [3, 47], a unified framework designed to streamline and standardize the extraction of multimodal features for recommendation systems. DUCHO aims to provide a flexible and interoperable solution by integrating widely adopted deep learning libraries and custom models. This shared interface enables users to extract and process audio, visual, and textual features from both items and user-item interactions. By abstracting the feature extraction process, DUCHO empowers researchers and developers to leverage the strengths of different backend libraries, ranging from the latest architectures from the community to seamlessly integrate their specialized models, enhancing reproducibility and reducing effort.

To facilitate the adoption of DUCHO, we released the code on a GitHub repository containing all the necessary resources and documentation<sup>5</sup>. Additionally, we provided different comprehensive demos that showcase the framework’s capabilities. Moreover, we developed a public Docker image with a pre-installed CUDA environment<sup>6</sup> to ensure a seamless setup experience.

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/sisinflab/ducho>.

<sup>6</sup><https://hub.docker.com/r/sisinflabpoliba/ducho>.

### 3.2 Framework architecture

The architecture of DUCHO (Figure 4) is designed with a modular and flexible approach, consisting of three primary modules: **Dataset**, **Extractor**, and **Runner**. In addition, an auxiliary **Configuration** component allows users to customise the framework’s behaviour.

The **Dataset** module is responsible for loading and processing the user-provided input data. It has three specialized implementations, each designed for a specific type of data: **audio**, **visual**, and **textual** datasets. A consistent schema is applied to every modality, making the module easier to use and manage. DUCHO uniquely handles each modality based on whether it describes **items** (e.g., product descriptions) or **interactions** between users and items (e.g., reviews [2]).

The **Extractor** module is a key part of the framework, utilizing either pre-trained or custom networks to extract multimodal features from input samples. It mirrors the Dataset module in offering distinct implementations per modality. For instance, when dealing with textual data, users can specify the task for which the pre-trained model should be optimized (e.g., sentiment analysis). This is essential since different networks are trained for different purposes. DUCHO supports feature extraction by letting users specify the layers of a pre-trained model for extraction along with image processors, tokenizer and the fusion method. Since extraction methods differ across models, the framework follows each model’s official guidelines. A clear understanding of the model’s structure and its naming conventions is necessary for users. For comprehensive instructions, users are directed to the README<sup>7</sup> file located in the `config/` folder on GitHub. This documentation provides detailed guidance on configuring and utilizing the framework’s features.

The **Runner** module orchestrates DUCHO, managing the instantiation and execution of all described modules. The Runner’s API allows it to activate the extraction pipeline for one or more modalities. Configuration is done via the **Configuration** component, which stores the relevant settings. While default parameters are offered, users can adjust them through an external YAML file or by passing options via the command line.

## 4 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

This section details the experimental setup used to evaluate our proposed approach. We describe the datasets, multimodal feature extraction models, and recommender systems employed in our experiments. We also outline the evaluation protocols used to ensure the reproducibility of our results.

### 4.1 Datasets

We selected five popular [11, 31, 95, 101] product categories from the Amazon catalog [26, 50]<sup>8</sup>, namely, **Office Products**, **Digital Music**, **Baby, Toys & Games**, and **Beauty**. Each dataset has user-item interactions and item metadata (images and descriptions) accounting for the visual and textual modalities. Unlike previous works from the multimodal recommendation literature, we retrieve and extract all multimodal features from scratch using our own pipeline. Dataset statistics are summarized in Table 3.

### 4.2 Multimodal feature extractors

For our benchmark, we selected several feature extraction models to handle image and text data in recommendation datasets. For visual feature extraction, we use **ResNet50** [25] (RNET50), a widely-used convolutional neural network designed for high-accuracy image classification through residual learning, and **MMFashion** [41] (MMF), which integrates multiple components for comprehensive fashion analysis tasks, including attribute prediction and landmark

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/sisinflab/ducho/blob/main/config/README.md>.

<sup>8</sup><https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~jmcauley/datasets/amazon/links.html>.






Fig. 4. DUCHO’s architecture for multimodal feature extraction, managed by the Dataset, Extractor, and Runner modules. Notably, the framework can be coupled with any multimodal recommendation suite (e.g., ELLIOT [1]) to run large-scale benchmarking analyses.

Table 3. Statistics of the tested datasets.

Datasets	# Users	# Items	# Interactions	Sparsity (%)
Office Products	4,471	1,703	20,608	99.73%
Digital Music	5,082	2,338	30,623	99.74%
Baby	19,100	6,283	80,931	99.93%
Toys & Games	19,241	11,101	89,558	99.96%
Beauty	21,752	11,145	100,834	99.96%

detection. For textual feature extraction, we employ **Sentence-BERT** [57] (SBERT), a variant of BERT [19] optimized for generating semantically meaningful sentence embeddings. For combined visual-textual feature extraction, we use models like **CLIP** [56] (CLIP), a multimodal model that learns to associate images and text through a dual-encoder architecture and contrastive loss; **Align** [29] (ALIGN), which aligns visual and textual information using EfficientNet and BERT encoders trained on noisy image-caption pairs; and **AltCLIP** [13] (ALIGNCLIP), an enhanced version of CLIP that incorporates a multilingual text encoder and modified training procedures for improved performance. The DUCHO framework also supports integrating additional models, ensuring adaptability to specific requirements.

### 4.3 Recommender systems

We select 12 recommender systems from the literature, including classical approaches such as **ItemKNN** [62], a neighbor-based recommendation model leveraging item similarities; **BPRMF**, which combines matrix factorization [32] with Bayesian-personalized ranking [58]; **NGCF** [75], a graph neural network model that exploits inter-dependencies among nodes; **DGCF** [76], a graph-based model representing node embeddings as a set of intents underlying each interaction in the graph; **LightGCN** [28], a simplified graph convolutional network, which removes feature transformation and non-linearity in message-passing; and **SGL** [83], which employs self-supervised contrastive learning to address data sparsity. We also consider multimodal-based models like **VBPR** [27, 95], which integrates visual features into the recommendation process; **NGCF-M** [48], an extension of NGCF that incorporates multimodal features; **GRCN** [79],

which refines user-item graphs with multimodal information; **LATTICE** [95], which builds similarity graphs for different modalities; **BM3** [101], a model that creates contrastive views of embeddings with a lightweight dropout; and **FREEDOM** [100], which improves recommendations by refining the multimodal similarity graph built by LATTICE.

#### 4.4 Reproducibility details

We split datasets using an 80%/20% train-test split and performed a grid search over 10 hyper-parameter configurations to fine-tune the models. To ensure fair comparison across models, following recent works [45], we search the learning rate in  $\{0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01\}$  and the regularization coefficient in  $\{1e-5, 1e-2\}$ , with batch size and number of epochs fixed to 1024 and 200, respectively. Then, all other hyper-parameters are set to the best values according to the original codes and papers. For each model, the best hyper-parameter configuration is selected based on Recall@20 on the validation set, obtained by retaining the 10% of the training set. As for the test set, we evaluated the models' performance on the Recall, nDCG, and HR by considering (again) the top-20 recommendation lists. Codes and datasets to fully reproduce the results are available at our GitHub repository<sup>9</sup>.

### 5 DUCHO MEETS ELLIOT: THE OVERALL EXTRACTION-RECOMMENDATION PIPELINE

This section demonstrates how we build a complete pipeline for multimodal recommendation by combining two recent frameworks, namely, DUCHO [3, 47] (for multimodal feature extraction) and ELLIOT [1, 45] (for multimodal recommendation). Again, the reader may refer to Figure 4 for a systematic overview of the pipeline. In the following, we enumerate the main steps of the pipeline. Indeed, the idea is to provide a customizable tool to be used by any practitioner or scholar to run multimodal recommendation benchmarks from scratch, starting from the dataset collection and processing up to the evaluation of the selected recommendation models.

- (1) **Dataset collection and filtering.** To begin with, we retrieve and download the multimodal datasets from the official repository available at this link<sup>10</sup>. As users, items, and the recorded interactions come with metadata, we select only the pieces of information we need for our benchmarking analysis. Thus, for items, we consider their image URLs (visual modality) and their descriptions (textual modality). Moreover, the recommendation data along with metadata regarding items may be extremely noisy. For this reason, we run a complete pre-filtering procedure involving the removal of items where: (i) no image URL is available or the link is broken/not valid anymore; (ii) the description is empty or not valid, such as a NaN value. Indeed, once each item is removed, all interactions involving that item are also dropped from the user-item interaction data.
- (2) **Multimodal feature extraction.** After the dataset collection and filtering stage, we exploit DUCHO to extract multimodal features from items' multimodal data (i.e., product images and descriptions). According to the benchmarking study designed for this work, we decide to perform five different multimodal extractions involving various multimodal extractors (see later for more details).
- (3) **Dataset splitting and indexing.** Then, we use ELLIOT's data processing module to run the dataset splitting of the user-item interaction data into train, validation, and test sets. At this phase, to ease the execution of the later pipeline steps, we need to provide consistent indexing to all users and items in the catalog, along with their metadata, depending on the users and items in the training set (the ones the models are shown during the training). Thus, we map the training, validation, and test sets obtained from the previous step to this indexing, and rename all multimodal features according to the same scheme.

<sup>9</sup><https://github.com/sisinflab/Ducho-meets-Elliot>.

<sup>10</sup><https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~jmcauley/datasets/amazon/links.html>.

- (4) **Recommendation model training and evaluation.** Finally, we are all set to perform the training and evaluation of the models, considering all the recommendation datasets and multimodal feature extractors involved. Once again, we use ELLIOT to run the complete experimental settings.

## 6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings from our comprehensive benchmark analysis. Our study is centered around addressing the following three research questions:

- **RQ1)** Can the integration of DUCHO and ELLIOT, forming a comprehensive **end-to-end** framework for multimodal recommendation, facilitate the benchmarking of state-of-the-art multimodal recommender systems?
- **RQ2)** How does the performance of multimodal recommender systems vary when different (i.e., recent but **usually-untested**) multimodal feature extractors are employed?
- **RQ3)** To what extent do the **hyper-parameters** of multimodal feature extractors influence the final recommendation performance?

In the following subsections, we provide detailed answers to each of these research questions, supported by the results of our experiments.

### 6.1 Can DUCHO and ELLIOT benchmark state-of-the-art multimodal recommendation? (RQ1)

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed DUCHO + ELLIOT experimental environment within **standard** experimental settings, we conducted an extensive benchmark study involving 12 recommendation algorithms (6 classical and 6 multimodal approaches). Following the analysis presented in Section 2.2, and as illustrated in Figure 3, we started by adopting the well-established combination of RNET50 [25] for visual feature extraction and SBERT [57] for textual feature extraction. These extractors were chosen based on their proven efficacy in previous research and their widespread adoption in the field. The recommendation algorithms were trained and tested on five distinct datasets: Office Products, Digital Music, Baby, Toys & Games, and Beauty, as discussed in detail in Section 2.1.

Table 4 presents the results obtained from our benchmarking experiments. These results are consistent with those reported in the literature, reinforcing the validity of our end-to-end pipeline. Our analysis shows that multimodal recommender systems significantly outperform classical recommender systems across all considered metrics. For instance, it is important to mention that LATTICE achieved the highest performance across all metrics on Office Products, while FREEDOM overcame other approaches on the remaining datasets, except for the HR on Digital Music.

### 6.2 How does the performance change with novel multimodal feature extractors? (RQ2)

While having tested the efficacy of our proposed DUCHO + ELLIOT experimental environment to benchmark multimodal recommender systems within **standard** settings, we contend that the potential of alternative feature extractors in the context of multimodal recommendation remains underexplored. Specifically, we note that few studies propose to adopt recent **multimodal-by-design** feature extractors [88]. To the best of our knowledge, no comprehensive assessments have been conducted to determine the impact of varying multimodal extractors on recommendation performance.

To address this gap, we conducted an additional extensive benchmark analysis, focusing on the performance variations introduced by different combinations of feature extractors. Leveraging the flexibility of DUCHO, we evaluated the selected multimodal recommender systems with five distinct feature extractor combinations, categorized as:

Table 4. Recommendation results measured on top-20 lists for all configurations of recommender systems and datasets. Multimodal recommender systems are trained in the original setting, with RNET50 + SBERT as feature extractors. **Boldface** and underlined stand for best and second-to-best values, respectively.

Models	Office Products			Digital Music			Baby			Toys & Games			Beauty		
	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR
ItemKNN	11.35	5.76	20.33	21.74	12.00	34.51	2.46	1.19	4.21	6.97	3.91	11.06	6.97	3.85	10.89
BPRMF	11.28	5.35	19.70	27.32	14.94	41.13	5.48	2.67	9.04	9.51	5.02	14.75	10.72	5.36	16.55
NGCF	11.05	5.45	19.62	26.46	14.58	40.14	5.09	2.39	8.59	9.24	4.87	14.44	10.42	5.27	16.21
DGCF	12.19	5.89	20.89	26.47	14.46	40.46	6.08	3.03	10.26	9.43	5.12	14.71	10.45	5.55	16.29
LightGCN	13.99	6.93	23.95	28.66	14.95	43.19	7.56	3.82	12.60	10.59	5.58	16.63	12.30	6.42	19.03
SGL	11.85	5.89	20.49	27.09	15.03	40.81	5.77	2.93	9.40	10.76	5.93	16.68	11.82	6.50	18.17
VBPR	12.83	6.18	22.01	28.37	15.22	<u>43.54</u>	6.21	2.99	10.18	10.83	5.70	16.54	11.54	6.08	17.64
NGCF-M	14.35	7.14	24.04	27.84	15.35	41.91	7.18	3.50	11.91	10.85	5.73	16.73	11.72	6.11	18.12
GRCN	12.31	6.08	21.20	22.88	12.17	36.25	5.29	2.48	8.81	9.67	5.07	15.00	9.57	4.83	14.89
LATTICE	<b>15.75</b>	<b>7.71</b>	<b>25.79</b>	<b>29.40</b>	<u>16.07</u>	<b>43.60</b>	<u>8.41</u>	<u>4.06</u>	<u>13.69</u>	<u>12.42</u>	<u>6.45</u>	<u>18.95</u>	<u>13.44</u>	<u>7.03</u>	<u>20.65</u>
BM3	13.13	6.42	22.50	27.07	14.34	41.42	8.05	3.91	13.29	9.94	5.14	15.56	11.28	5.83	17.65
FREEDOM	<u>15.58</u>	<u>7.57</u>	<u>25.59</u>	<u>29.05</u>	<b>16.15</b>	43.46	<b>8.81</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>14.28</b>	<b>13.67</b>	<b>7.04</b>	<b>20.64</b>	<b>13.85</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>21.11</b>

- (1) **Classical combination:** RNET50 [25] for visual features and SBERT [57] for textual features, serving as the baseline.
- (2) **Custom combination:** MMF [41] for visual features paired with SBERT for textual features, representing a tailored approach to feature extraction.
- (3) **Multimodal-by-design extractors:** we tested the performance of the selected recommendation algorithms with three multimodal-by-design feature extractors, namely CLIP [56], ALIGN [29], and ALTCLIP [13].

The benchmarking results are presented in Table 5. The analysis of the recommendation systems, grouped by multimodal recommendation system, reveals several insights, particularly highlighting the advantages of **multimodal-by-design** extractors.

For VBPR, the classical combination of RNET50 and SBERT initially shows strong performance, especially in the Office Products and Digital Music categories, where it achieves the highest Recall and HR. However, multimodal-by-design extractors like CLIP and ALTCLIP demonstrate the potential for further improvement. For instance, CLIP slightly outperforms the classical combination in terms of nDCG and HR for the Office Products dataset and consistently matches or exceeds other metrics across various categories. Concurrently, ALTCLIP is particularly competitive in the Beauty dataset, where it achieves the best Recall and HR.

Regarding NGCF-M, the recommendation model benefits even more significantly from multimodal-by-design extractors. CLIP consistently outperforms all other combinations across multiple datasets, achieving the highest Recall, nDCG, and HR for the Office Products and Digital Music categories. This highlights the clear advantage of integrating this extractor with NGCF-M. Additionally, ALIGN shows exceptional performance in the Baby and Toys & Games datasets, where it either leads or closely follows in key metrics, reinforcing the utility of multimodal extractors.

Similarly, GRCN shows noticeable improvements with multimodal-by-design extractors. CLIP achieves the highest performance in the Office Products and Digital Music datasets, particularly in Recall and HR, which suggests its effectiveness in capturing the multimodal characteristics of these domains. At the same time, ALIGN also demonstrates strong results, especially in the Toys & Games and Beauty datasets, where it consistently ranks among the best-performing extractors.

Table 5. Recommendation results measured on top-20 lists for all configurations of recommender systems, extractors, and datasets. **Boldface** and underlined stand for best and second-to-best values for each recommendation model.

Models	Extractors	Office Products			Digital Music			Baby			Toys & Games			Beauty		
		Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR	Recall	nDCG	HR
VBPR	RNET50 + SBERT	<b>12.83</b>	<u>6.18</u>	<u>22.01</u>	<b>28.37</b>	<u>15.22</u>	<b>43.54</b>	6.21	2.99	10.18	10.83	5.70	16.54	11.54	6.08	17.64
	MMF + SBERT	12.67	<u>6.17</u>	21.85	<u>28.21</u>	15.13	<u>42.46</u>	<b>6.42</b>	<u>3.12</u>	<b>10.39</b>	10.80	5.72	16.43	<u>11.80</u>	6.09	17.93
	CLIP	<u>12.78</u>	<b>6.23</b>	<b>22.10</b>	27.83	14.93	41.70	6.16	2.94	10.12	<u>10.98</u>	<u>5.83</u>	<b>16.80</b>	11.79	<u>6.14</u>	17.91
	ALIGN	12.17	5.91	21.20	27.96	15.17	42.03	<u>6.35</u>	<b>3.15</b>	<u>10.30</u>	<b>11.06</b>	<b>5.85</b>	<b>16.86</b>	11.77	6.01	<u>17.96</u>
	ALTCLIP	12.71	6.15	21.65	28.08	<b>15.34</b>	42.34	6.28	3.05	10.23	10.92	<u>5.83</u>	16.60	<b>11.94</b>	<b>6.15</b>	<b>18.19</b>
NGCF-M	RNET50 + SBERT	14.35	7.14	24.04	<u>27.84</u>	<u>15.35</u>	41.91	7.18	3.50	11.91	10.85	5.73	16.73	11.72	6.11	18.12
	MMF + SBERT	13.68	6.69	23.40	27.12	15.22	41.11	6.79	3.31	11.24	11.01	5.80	16.89	<b>11.93</b>	<b>6.21</b>	<b>18.22</b>
	CLIP	<b>14.99</b>	<b>7.43</b>	<b>24.85</b>	<b>28.27</b>	<b>15.54</b>	<b>42.60</b>	7.42	<u>3.61</u>	12.20	11.08	<b>5.89</b>	16.91	11.74	6.13	17.93
	ALIGN	<u>14.96</u>	<u>7.41</u>	<u>24.69</u>	27.83	15.30	<u>41.97</u>	<b>7.70</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>12.61</b>	<b>11.12</b>	5.80	<b>17.16</b>	11.74	6.20	17.92
	ALTCLIP	13.90	6.89	23.26	26.93	14.47	41.36	<u>7.47</u>	3.58	<u>12.36</u>	<u>11.10</u>	<u>5.83</u>	<u>16.99</u>	<u>11.85</u>	6.14	<u>18.21</u>
GRCN	RNET50 + SBERT	12.31	6.08	21.20	22.88	12.17	36.25	<b>5.29</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>8.81</b>	9.67	<b>5.07</b>	15.00	9.57	4.83	14.89
	MMF + SBERT	11.61	5.74	20.00	23.21	12.56	36.66	5.06	2.38	8.63	9.60	4.96	<u>15.23</u>	9.79	4.91	15.28
	CLIP	<b>13.10</b>	<b>6.47</b>	<b>22.32</b>	<b>24.20</b>	<b>13.09</b>	<b>37.96</b>	5.15	<u>2.44</u>	8.69	<u>9.84</u>	<u>5.06</u>	15.21	9.90	4.94	15.57
	ALIGN	<u>13.01</u>	<u>6.40</u>	<u>21.78</u>	<u>23.43</u>	12.41	<u>37.25</u>	5.21	2.43	<u>8.76</u>	<b>9.94</b>	<b>5.07</b>	<b>15.35</b>	<b>10.26</b>	<b>5.15</b>	<b>16.09</b>
	ALTCLIP	12.28	5.83	21.09	<u>24.03</u>	<u>12.97</u>	<u>37.66</u>	<u>5.21</u>	<u>2.44</u>	<u>8.62</u>	9.82	4.98	15.19	<u>10.11</u>	<u>5.07</u>	<u>15.86</u>
LATTICE	RNET50 + SBERT	<b>15.75</b>	<b>7.71</b>	<b>25.79</b>	29.40	16.07	43.60	<b>8.41</b>	4.06	<b>13.69</b>	12.42	6.45	18.95	13.44	7.03	20.65
	MMF + SBERT	15.58	7.61	25.30	29.48	16.22	43.78	<u>8.38</u>	<b>4.13</b>	<u>13.63</u>	12.49	6.46	18.92	13.35	6.93	20.39
	CLIP	14.92	7.43	24.76	29.82	<u>16.49</u>	<u>44.14</u>	8.19	3.95	13.36	<u>12.68</u>	6.49	<u>19.17</u>	13.61	7.10	20.86
	ALIGN	<u>15.71</u>	<u>7.63</u>	<u>25.65</u>	<u>29.85</u>	16.33	44.10	8.20	<u>4.07</u>	13.35	<b>12.73</b>	<b>6.64</b>	<b>19.27</b>	<b>13.93</b>	<u>7.21</u>	<b>21.31</b>
	ALTCLIP	15.39	7.48	25.48	<b>30.19</b>	<b>16.58</b>	<b>44.69</b>	8.22	4.06	13.51	<b>12.73</b>	<u>6.63</u>	19.16	<u>13.91</u>	<u>7.27</u>	<u>21.28</u>
BM3	RNET50 + SBERT	13.13	6.42	22.50	27.07	14.34	41.42	8.05	3.91	13.29	9.94	5.14	15.56	11.28	5.83	17.65
	MMF + SBERT	12.91	6.26	22.65	<b>27.47</b>	14.40	<b>41.73</b>	<b>8.08</b>	3.91	<b>13.38</b>	9.98	<u>5.21</u>	15.49	11.41	5.92	17.76
	CLIP	<u>13.20</u>	<u>6.52</u>	<u>22.68</u>	27.20	<b>14.50</b>	<b>41.73</b>	8.04	3.98	13.20	10.01	5.20	15.59	11.56	5.93	17.93
	ALIGN	<b>13.84</b>	<b>6.75</b>	<b>23.40</b>	<u>27.45</u>	<u>14.49</u>	<u>41.70</u>	8.06	3.92	13.31	<b>10.07</b>	<b>5.24</b>	<b>15.78</b>	<b>11.67</b>	<b>6.04</b>	<b>18.04</b>
	ALTCLIP	12.84	6.26	22.21	26.38	14.22	40.38	<b>8.15</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>13.53</b>	9.88	5.18	15.27	11.36	5.89	17.76
FREEDOM	RNET50 + SBERT	<u>15.58</u>	<u>7.57</u>	<u>25.59</u>	<u>29.05</u>	16.15	43.46	<u>8.81</u>	<u>4.31</u>	<u>14.28</u>	13.67	7.04	20.64	<u>13.85</u>	<b>7.24</b>	21.11
	MMF + SBERT	15.40	7.34	25.40	28.75	15.76	43.12	8.42	4.20	13.78	<b>13.73</b>	7.10	<u>20.70</u>	<b>13.87</b>	<u>7.17</u>	<u>21.18</u>
	CLIP	<b>15.64</b>	<b>7.66</b>	<b>25.88</b>	28.76	16.13	<u>43.56</u>	<b>8.95</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>14.45</b>	13.33	6.91	20.30	13.27	6.81	20.34
	ALIGN	15.10	7.20	24.96	28.84	<b>16.23</b>	43.34	8.73	<u>4.31</u>	14.11	<u>13.71</u>	<b>7.15</b>	<b>20.90</b>	13.82	7.14	21.14
	ALTCLIP	15.44	7.34	25.41	<b>29.20</b>	<u>16.19</u>	<b>44.08</b>	8.53	4.22	13.91	13.55	<u>7.11</u>	20.49	13.76	7.13	<b>21.23</b>

When considering LATTICE, the model presents mixed results with the inclusion of multimodal-by-design extractors. While the classical combination remains competitive, ALIGN emerges as the best performer in the Toys & Games and Beauty categories, leading in nDCG and HR; this indicates its capability to leverage multimodal information effectively. Additionally, ALTCLIP performs strongly, particularly in the Beauty dataset, nearly matching ALIGN in several metrics, demonstrating its utility in certain contexts.

For BM3, the use of multimodal-by-design extractors consistently improves performance. ALIGN achieves the highest overall performance in the Office Products and Toys & Games categories, particularly in nDCG and HR, indicating its strong multimodal capabilities. Moreover, CLIP competes well, delivering top results in the Digital Music and Beauty datasets, further solidifying the benefits of multimodal extractors in enhancing recommendation quality.

Then, FREEDOM also shows benefits from multimodal-by-design extractors. CLIP provides the best Recall, nDCG, and HR in the Office Products dataset, demonstrating its effectiveness in enhancing performance in this domain. ALTCLIP similarly shows robust results, particularly in the Beauty dataset, where it achieves the best Recall and HR, indicating its strong feature extraction capabilities in specific contexts.

As a final remark, it is important to underline the trend regarding the **custom combination** MMF + SBERT. Specifically, while it seems to provide generally comparable results (or even lower) to the classical combination, it is quite rare to see it outperforming other extraction settings. This observation might call for further analyses, as we would

expect that custom feature extractors (i.e., tuned on the specific dataset domain) should improve the recommendation performance overall.

### 6.3 Do the multimodal feature extractors’ parameters influence the performance? (RQ3)

In the previous investigation, we demonstrated the efficacy of employing **multimodal-by-design** extractors in improving recommendation performance. However, it is important to note that such extraction models, while effective, might be **computationally expensive**. Thus, we complement the conducted analysis with a further study regarding the computational complexity of the selected multimodal-by-design extractors. The idea is to bind these results with the previous performance to understand if and to what extent a trade-off is reachable between the two dimensions.

To this end, we leverage DUCHO’s customizable configurations to select varying hyper-parameters for the feature extractors on top of the trained multimodal recommendation algorithms. Our primary focus is on reducing the extraction time by increasing the batch size within the range {1, 4, 8, 16, 32}. Indeed, this adjustment may result in a substantial reduction in the time required for feature extraction, with improvements of up to an order of magnitude, as empirically evidenced in Table 6.

However, modifying the hyper-parameters of the extractors (i.e., the batch size) may potentially impact the performance of the downstream recommendation task. To assess this impact, we re-trained all multimodal recommendation models using the varying batch sizes. The results, presented in Figure 5, focus on VBPR, BM3, and FREEDOM across the Office, Music, and Baby datasets, employing five distinct feature extractors: RNET50 + SBERT, MMF + SBERT, CLIP, ALIGN, and ALTCLIP. Concretely, the figure represents, in the form of boxplots, the performance variation of each batch size in {4, 8, 16, 32} to the standard batch size set at 1. These results offer valuable insights into how batch size affects key performance metrics, including Recall, nDCG, and HR.

For VBPR, the results reveal that MMF + SBERT consistently achieve the highest Recall across all datasets, with minimal variance observed when batch size is altered. Similarly, the nDCG and HR metrics exhibit stable performance across different batch sizes, particularly in the Office dataset, where MMF + SBERT demonstrate a marked superiority over other extractors. This suggests that increasing the batch size does not result in a significant decline in model performance, thereby allowing for the adoption of larger batch sizes to enhance computational efficiency without compromising effectiveness. This pattern of stability is consistent across most of the other extractors, with the exception of ALIGN, which exhibits slight variations in all metrics within the Office dataset.

Regarding BM3, the model shows a more balanced performance across the metrics, particularly within the Music and Baby datasets, where the differences between extractors are less pronounced. Notably, CLIP and ALTCLIP demonstrate greater invariance to batch size variations regarding nDCG and HR in the Music dataset. The minimal impact of batch size on these metrics further reinforces the feasibility of using larger batch sizes to expedite the training process without significantly affecting model performance, especially when utilizing multimodal extractors.

In contrast, when considering FREEDOM, the model presents a more varied response to changes in batch size, particularly in the Baby dataset, where ALTCLIP outperforms other extractors in both Recall and HR, with noticeable improvements as batch size increases. Although the nDCG exhibits some fluctuations across different extractors, the general trend remains stable across varying batch sizes. This suggests that while batch size may have a more pronounced impact on the nDCG, the overall performance of the model remains largely consistent. Therefore, larger batch sizes can be effectively utilized to significantly reduce extraction time without incurring major losses in performance metrics.

Table 6. Extraction timings (expressed in seconds) for different models and batch sizes on Office Products, Digital Music, and Baby datasets. Batch sizes are explored in {1, 4, 8, 16, 32}. **Boldface** and underlined stand for best and second-to-best values where the lower, the better.

Dataset	Extractor	Batch Size				
		1	4	8	16	32
Office Products	RNET50	269.86	67.35	34.68	<u>19.21</u>	<b>11.19</b>
	MMF	271.84	67.64	34.72	<u>18.42</u>	<b>10.76</b>
	SBERT	45.74	13.57	<u>10.51</u>	<b>10.45</b>	10.71
	CLIP	82.63	22.80	12.53	<u>8.18</u>	<b>8.08</b>
	ALIGN	107.74	28.85	15.98	<u>10.90</u>	<b>10.80</b>
	ALTCLIP	155.52	66.79	61.89	<u>59.93</u>	<b>58.87</b>
Digital Music	RNET50	370.99	93.64	48.07	<u>25.70</u>	<b>14.81</b>
	MMF	374.27	93.69	48.10	<u>25.37</u>	<b>14.48</b>
	SBERT	62.24	18.15	<u>13.37</u>	13.73	<b>13.24</b>
	CLIP	114.88	31.75	17.52	<u>10.72</u>	<b>10.25</b>
	ALIGN	146.59	40.57	21.82	<u>14.09</u>	<b>13.94</b>
	ALTCLIP	218.78	91.15	84.10	<u>81.55</u>	<b>80.34</b>
Baby	RNET50	984.03	247.01	133.25	<u>67.89</u>	<b>37.55</b>
	MMF	1001.56	248.66	134.35	<u>68.22</u>	<b>36.97</b>
	SBERT	162.4	44.91	<u>31.85</u>	<b>31.77</b>	35.07
	CLIP	300.07	78.38	43.79	<u>26.81</u>	<b>25.61</b>
	ALIGN	382.75	102.26	56.89	<b>35.49</b>	<u>35.57</u>
	ALTCLIP	575.84	243.86	225.87	<u>219.26</u>	<b>214.82</b>

## 7 TAKE-HOME MESSAGES

The motivations for this work came from a careful investigation of the multimodal recommendation literature, where we acknowledged that among all the stages involved in the multimodal recommendation pipeline, the one regarding **feature extraction** and **processing** has not received enough attention so far. This is demonstrated by the following (Section 2): (i) the vast majority of available multimodal datasets come with original multimodal content (e.g., images, texts), but several works from the literature tend to disregard it while using **already-extracted** and **pre-processed** multimodal features from a **limited** subset of datasets; (ii) most of existing multimodal recommender system pipelines tend to use **limited** and **standardized** feature extraction methods.

Based on these observed aspects, we decided to extend the common experimental space for multimodal recommendation. Thus, we leveraged two existing frameworks, DUCHO [3, 47] (Section 3) and ELLIOT [1, 45], to create a **highly customizable**, **ready-to-use**, and **modular** pipeline for multimodal recommendation. We aimed to provide, to our knowledge, the **first large-scale benchmarking** analysis on **multimodal recommendation** (Section 4), by exploiting the DUCHO + ELLIOT end-to-end pipeline (Section 5).

To begin with, we demonstrated that the DUCHO + ELLIOT experimental environment **can benchmark** state-of-the-art multimodal recommender systems within their **standard** settings. To validate our approach, we conducted extensive experiments involving 12 different recommender models evaluated across 5 datasets (**RQ1**).

Then, to address the outlined issues in the related literature, we decided to explore the impact of **new** and **usually-untested** multimodal feature extractors to enhance the performance of multimodal recommender systems. Our findings




Fig. 5. Boxplots indicating the performance variation (Recall, nDCG, HR) for VBPR, BM3, and FREEDOM models with varying batch sizes in {4, 8, 16, 32} compared to baseline batch size 1 over three Amazon datasets, namely Office Products, Digital Music and Baby. Results are shown for different feature extractors (RNet50 + SBERT, MMF + SBERT, CLIP, ALIGN, and ALTCLIP). All results refer to the top-20 recommendation lists.



demonstrated that notable improvements can be achieved through the use of **multimodal-by-design** models, especially with models such as CLIP [56], ALIGN [29], and ALTCLIP [13] (RQ2). This performance trend was consistently observed across the various tested datasets, underscoring the potential of these advanced extractors in improving recommendation quality. Conversely, the obtained results also showed that **custom** multimodal feature extractors (e.g., MMF [41]) could not provide improved recommendation performance, as it might be expected.

Finally, we examined the impact of varying hyper-parameters of multimodal feature extractors on recommendation performance, with a specific focus on optimizing and reducing the **time complexity**. This aspect was particularly critical when dealing with **multimodal-by-design** extractors which, despite their effectiveness, might be **computationally expensive**. Our analysis revealed that increasing the batch size can positively affect the time required for feature extraction, offering the potential to substantially expedite the process. Concurrently, we demonstrated that these time speed-ups can be achieved without a commensurate loss in recommendation performance, as evidenced by the stable results across various models and datasets (RQ3).

## 8 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite the current work might be regarded as the first large-scale benchmarking analysis of multimodal recommendation, we believe there is still much room for further investigation. Indeed, our planned future directions will involve five main aspects: **datasets**, **modalities**, **feature extractors**, **recommendation models**, and **performance metrics**.

First, we plan to extend the conducted analysis to encompass other multimodal recommendation datasets from other domains. Indeed, for this initial benchmarking analysis, we decided to limit our investigation to popular and common solutions (i.e., the Amazon catalog). However, as outlined in the literature review (Section 2) many **other** available **datasets** could be exploited to further corroborate and enhance our findings.

Second, we aim to introduce the **audio** modality into the analysis, considering that is greatly underrepresented in the related literature. This plan will involve a preliminary collection of audio recommendation datasets, to be made available to the community as other more common datasets encompassing the **visual** and **textual** modalities.

Third, we seek to integrate more recent **large multimodal models** as extraction solutions in the DUCHO framework. Additionally, we further intend to extend the capabilities of the framework, by providing the users with the possibility of training **end-to-end** multimodal feature extractions on the custom recommendation datasets.

Then, on the **multimodal recommendation** side, we plan to replicate the code of other state-of-the-art multimodal recommendation models within ELLIOT. In this respect, our intention is also to conduct additional benchmarking analyses that, unlike the current one, will take into account other recommendation measures accounting for **novelty**, **diversity**, **bias**, and **fairness** [44–46].

Finally, and as already outlined in Section 1 and in Section 4.4, we make codes, datasets, and configuration settings available on our repository on **GitHub**<sup>11</sup>, and share our benchmarking results on **Papers With Code**<sup>12</sup>. In this respect, one of the main purposes of this work was to incentivize the **rigorous** and **open source** training, tuning, and evaluation of multimodal recommendation. To this end, we invite researchers, practitioners, and experienced scholars to contribute to our GitHub repository or our benchmarking analyses on Papers With Code. In the long term, we plan to host these (and future) benchmarking results to additional platforms, such as **Hugging Face**.

<sup>11</sup><https://github.com/sisinflab/Ducho-meets-Elliot>.

<sup>12</sup><https://paperswithcode.com/task/multimodal-recommendation>.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Vito Walter Anelli, Alejandro Bellogín, Antonio Ferrara, Daniele Malitesta, Felice Antonio Merra, Claudio Pomo, Francesco Maria Donini, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2021. Elliot: A Comprehensive and Rigorous Framework for Reproducible Recommender Systems Evaluation. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 2405–2414.
- [2] Vito Walter Anelli, Yashar Deldjoo, Tommaso Di Noia, Eugenio Di Sciascio, Antonio Ferrara, Daniele Malitesta, and Claudio Pomo. 2022. Reshaping Graph Recommendation with Edge Graph Collaborative Filtering and Customer Reviews. In *DL4SR@CIKM (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 3317)*. CEUR-WS.org.
- [3] Matteo Attimonelli, Danilo Danese, Daniele Malitesta, Claudio Pomo, Giuseppe Gassi, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2024. Ducho 2.0: Towards a More Up-to-Date Unified Framework for the Extraction of Multimodal Features in Recommendation. In *WWW (Companion Volume)*. ACM, 1075–1078.
- [4] Tadas Baltrusaitis, Chaitanya Ahuja, and Louis Philippe Morency. 2019. Multimodal Machine Learning: A Survey and Taxonomy. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 41, 2 (2019), 423–443.
- [5] James Bennett and Stan Lanning. 2007. The Netflix Prize. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:9528522>
- [6] Desheng Cai, Shengsheng Qian, Quan Fang, and Changsheng Xu. 2022. Heterogeneous Hierarchical Feature Aggregation Network for Personalized Micro-Video Recommendation. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 24 (2022), 805–818.
- [7] Iv’an Cantador, Peter Brusilovsky, and Tsvi Kuflik. 2011. 2nd Workshop on Information Heterogeneity and Fusion in Recommender Systems (HetRec 2011). In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM conference on Recommender systems (Chicago, IL, USA) (RecSys 2011)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- [8] Feiyu Chen, Junjie Wang, Yinwei Wei, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Jie Shao. 2022. Breaking Isolation: Multimodal Graph Fusion for Multimedia Recommendation by Edge-wise Modulation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 385–394.
- [9] Huiyuan Chen and Jing Li. 2020. Neural Tensor Model for Learning Multi-Aspect Factors in Recommender Systems. In *IJCAI*. ijcai.org, 2449–2455.
- [10] Wen Chen, Pipei Huang, Jiaming Xu, Xin Guo, Cheng Guo, Fei Sun, Chao Li, Andreas Pfadler, Huan Zhao, and Binqiang Zhao. 2019. POG: Personalized Outfit Generation for Fashion Recommendation at Alibaba iFashion. In *KDD*. ACM.
- [11] Xu Chen, Hanxiong Chen, Hongteng Xu, Yongfeng Zhang, Yixin Cao, Zheng Qin, and Hongyuan Zha. 2019. Personalized Fashion Recommendation with Visual Explanations based on Multimodal Attention Network: Towards Visually Explainable Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 765–774.
- [12] Xusong Chen, Dong Liu, Zhiwei Xiong, and Zheng-Jun Zha. 2021. Learning and Fusing Multiple User Interest Representations for Micro-Video and Movie Recommendations. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 23 (2021), 484–496.
- [13] Zhongzhi Chen, Guang Liu, Bo-Wen Zhang, Qinghong Yang, and Ledell Wu. 2023. AltCLIP: Altering the Language Encoder in CLIP for Extended Language Capabilities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 8666–8682. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.552>
- [14] Zhiyong Cheng, Xiaojun Chang, Lei Zhu, Rose Catherine Kanjirathinkal, and Mohan S. Kankanhalli. 2019. MMALFM: Explainable Recommendation by Leveraging Reviews and Images. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 37, 2 (2019), 16:1–16:28.
- [15] Zhiyong Cheng, Jialie Shen, and Steven C. H. Hoi. 2016. On Effective Personalized Music Retrieval by Exploring Online User Behaviors. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR 2016, Pisa, Italy, July 17-21, 2016*, Raffaele Perego, Fabrizio Sebastiani, Javed A. Aslam, Ian Ruthven, and Justin Zobel (Eds.). ACM, 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2911451.2911491>
- [16] Qiang Cui, Shu Wu, Qiang Liu, Wen Zhong, and Liang Wang. 2020. MV-RNN: A Multi-View Recurrent Neural Network for Sequential Recommendation. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 32, 2 (2020), 317–331.
- [17] Yashar Deldjoo, Tommaso Di Noia, Daniele Malitesta, and Felice Antonio Merra. 2021. A Study on the Relative Importance of Convolutional Neural Networks in Visually-Aware Recommender Systems. In *CVPR Workshops*. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 3961–3967.
- [18] Yashar Deldjoo, Tommaso Di Noia, Daniele Malitesta, and Felice Antonio Merra. 2022. Leveraging Content-Style Item Representation for Visual Recommendation. In *ECIR (2) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 13186)*. Springer, 84–92.
- [19] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186.
- [20] Xue Dong, Xuemeng Song, Fuli Feng, Peiguang Jing, Xin-Shun Xu, and Liqiang Nie. 2019. Personalized Capsule Wardrobe Creation with Garment and User Modeling. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 302–310.
- [21] Xiaoyan Gao, Fuli Feng, Xiangnan He, Heyan Huang, Xinyu Guan, Chong Feng, Zhaoyan Ming, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. Hierarchical Attention Network for Visually-Aware Food Recommendation. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 22, 6 (2020), 1647–1659. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMM.2019.2945180>
- [22] Xue Geng, Hanwang Zhang, Jingwen Bian, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2015. Learning Image and User Features for Recommendation in Social Networks. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015, Santiago, Chile, December 7-13, 2015*. IEEE Computer Society, 4274–4282. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2015.486>
- [23] Xintong Han, Zuxuan Wu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Larry S. Davis. 2017. Learning Fashion Compatibility with Bidirectional LSTMs. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM.
- [24] Xintong Han, Zuxuan Wu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Larry S Davis. 2017. Learning Fashion Compatibility with Bidirectional LSTMs. In *ACM Multimedia*.
- [25] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *CVPR*. IEEE Computer Society, 770–778.
- [26] Ruining He and Julian J. McAuley. 2016. Ups and Downs: Modeling the Visual Evolution of Fashion Trends with One-Class Collaborative Filtering. In *WWW*. ACM, 507–517.

- [27] Ruining He and Julian J. McAuley. 2016. VBPR: Visual Bayesian Personalized Ranking from Implicit Feedback. In *AAAI*. AAAI Press, 144–150.
- [28] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yong-Dong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. LightGCN: Simplifying and Powering Graph Convolution Network for Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 639–648.
- [29] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc V. Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling Up Visual and Vision-Language Representation Learning With Noisy Text Supervision. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18–24 July 2021, Virtual Event (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 139)*, Marina Meila and Tong Zhang (Eds.). PMLR, 4904–4916. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/jia21b.html>
- [30] Hao Jiang, Wenjie Wang, Meng Liu, Liqiang Nie, Ling-Yu Duan, and Changsheng Xu. 2019. Market2Dish: A Health-aware Food Recommendation System. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM 2019, Nice, France, October 21–25, 2019*, Laurent Amsaleg, Benoit Huet, Martha A. Larson, Guillaume Gravier, Hayley Hung, Chong-Wah Ngo, and Wei Tsang Ooi (Eds.). ACM, 2188–2190. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3343031.3350594>
- [31] Taeri Kim, Yeon-Chang Lee, Kijung Shin, and Sang-Wook Kim. 2022. MARIO: Modality-Aware Attention and Modality-Preserving Decoders for Multimedia Recommendation. In *CIKM*. ACM, 993–1002.
- [32] Yehuda Koren, Robert M. Bell, and Chris Volinsky. 2009. Matrix Factorization Techniques for Recommender Systems. *Computer* 42, 8 (2009), 30–37.
- [33] Zhenfeng Lei, Anwar Ul Haq, Adnan Zeb, Md Suzauddola, and Defu Zhang. 2021. Is the suggested food your desired?: Multi-modal recipe recommendation with demand-based knowledge graph. *Expert Syst. Appl.* 186 (2021), 115708.
- [34] Hui Li, Ye Liu, Nikos Mamoulis, and David S. Rosenblum. 2020. Translation-Based Sequential Recommendation for Complex Users on Sparse Data. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 32, 8 (2020), 1639–1651.
- [35] Hui Li, Yu Liu, Yuqiu Qian, Nikos Mamoulis, Wenting Tu, and David W. Cheung. 2019. HHMF: Hidden Hierarchical Matrix Factorization for Recommender Systems. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 33, 6 (2019), 1548–1582.
- [36] Hui Li, Dingming Wu, and Nikos Mamoulis. 2014. A revisit to social network-based recommender systems. In *SIGIR*. 1239–1242.
- [37] Hui Li, Dingming Wu, Wenbin Tang, and Nikos Mamoulis. 2015. Overlapping Community Regularization for Rating Prediction in Social Recommender Systems. In *RecSys*. 27–34.
- [38] Fan Liu, Zhiyong Cheng, Changchang Sun, Yinglong Wang, Liqiang Nie, and Mohan S. Kankanhalli. 2019. User Diverse Preference Modeling by Multimodal Attentive Metric Learning. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 1526–1534.
- [39] Qidong Liu, Jiayi Hu, Yutian Xiao, Jingtong Gao, and Xiangyu Zhao. 2023. Multimodal Recommender Systems: A Survey. *CoRR* abs/2302.03883 (2023).
- [40] Qijiong Liu, Jieming Zhu, Yanting Yang, Quanyu Dai, Zhaocheng Du, Xiao-Ming Wu, Zhou Zhao, Rui Zhang, and Zhenhua Dong. 2024. Multimodal Pretraining, Adaptation, and Generation for Recommendation: A Survey. In *KDD*. ACM, 6566–6576.
- [41] Xin Liu, Jiancheng Li, Jiaqi Wang, and Ziwei Liu. 2021. MMFashion: An Open-Source Toolbox for Visual Fashion Analysis. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 3755–3758.
- [42] Yong Liu, Susen Yang, Chenyi Lei, Guoxin Wang, Haihong Tang, Juyong Zhang, Aixin Sun, and Chunyan Miao. 2021. Pre-training Graph Transformer with Multimodal Side Information for Recommendation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 2853–2861.
- [43] Zhuang Liu, Yunpu Ma, Matthias Schubert, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Zhang Xiong. 2022. Multi-Modal Contrastive Pre-training for Recommendation. In *ICMR*. ACM, 99–108.
- [44] Daniele Malitesta, Giandomenico Cornacchia, Claudio Pomo, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2023. Disentangling the Performance Puzzle of Multimodal-aware Recommender Systems. In *EvalRS@KDD (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 3450)*. CEUR-WS.org.
- [45] Daniele Malitesta, Giandomenico Cornacchia, Claudio Pomo, Felice Antonio Merra, Tommaso Di Noia, and Eugenio Di Sciascio. 2024. Formalizing Multimedia Recommendation through Multimodal Deep Learning. *ACM Trans. Recomm. Syst.* (apr 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3662738> Just Accepted.
- [46] Daniele Malitesta, Giandomenico Cornacchia, Claudio Pomo, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2023. On Popularity Bias of Multimodal-aware Recommender Systems: A Modalities-driven Analysis. In *MMIR@MM*. ACM, 59–68.
- [47] Daniele Malitesta, Giuseppe Gassi, Claudio Pomo, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2023. Ducho: A Unified Framework for the Extraction of Multimodal Features in Recommendation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 9668–9671.
- [48] Daniele Malitesta, Emanuele Rossi, Claudio Pomo, Tommaso Di Noia, and Fragkiskos D. Malliaros. 2024. Do We Really Need to Drop Items with Missing Modalities in Multimodal Recommendation? *CoRR* abs/2408.11767 (2024).
- [49] Javier Marin, Aritro Biswas, Ferda Ofli, Nicholas Hynes, Amaia Salvador, Yusuf Aytar, Ingmar Weber, and Antonio Torralba. 2019. Recipe1M+: A Dataset for Learning Cross-Modal Embeddings for Cooking Recipes and Food Images. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* (2019).
- [50] Julian J. McAuley, Christopher Targett, Qinfeng Shi, and Anton van den Hengel. 2015. Image-Based Recommendations on Styles and Substitutes. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 43–52.
- [51] Weiqing Min, Shuqiang Jiang, and Ramesh C. Jain. 2020. Food Recommendation: Framework, Existing Solutions, and Challenges. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 22, 10 (2020), 2659–2671.
- [52] Zongshen Mu, Yueting Zhuang, Jie Tan, Jun Xiao, and Siliang Tang. 2022. Learning Hybrid Behavior Patterns for Multimedia Recommendation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 376–384.
- [53] Jiquan Ngiam, Aditya Khosla, Mingyu Kim, Juhan Nam, Honglak Lee, and Andrew Y. Ng. 2011. Multimodal Deep Learning. In *ICML*. Omnipress, 689–696.

- [54] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian J. McAuley. 2019. Justifying Recommendations using Distantly-Labeled Reviews and Fine-Grained Aspects. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 188–197.
- [55] Sergio Oramas, Oriol Nieto, Mohamed Sordo, and Xavier Serra. 2017. A Deep Multimodal Approach for Cold-start Music Recommendation. In *DLRS@RecSys*. ACM, 32–37.
- [56] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In *ICML (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 139)*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [57] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3980–3990.
- [58] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian Personalized Ranking from Implicit Feedback. In *UAI*.
- [59] Francesco Ricci, Lior Rokach, and Bracha Shapira (Eds.). 2015. *Recommender Systems Handbook*. Springer.
- [60] Amaia Salvador, Nicholas Hynes, Yusuf Aytar, Javier Marin, Ferda Ofli, Ingmar Weber, and Antonio Torralba. 2017. Learning Cross-modal Embeddings for Cooking Recipes and Food Images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [61] Lei Sang, Min Xu, Shengsheng Qian, Matt Martin, Peter Li, and Xindong Wu. 2021. Context-Dependent Propagating-Based Video Recommendation in Multimodal Heterogeneous Information Networks. *IEEE Trans. Multim.* 23 (2021), 2019–2032.
- [62] Badrul Munir Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph A. Konstan, and John Riedl. 2001. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *WWW*. ACM, 285–295.
- [63] Tiancheng Shen, Jia Jia, Yan Li, Hanjie Wang, and Bo Chen. 2020. Enhancing Music Recommendation with Social Media Content: an Attentive Multimodal Autoencoder Approach. In *IJCNN*. IEEE, 1–8.
- [64] Xuemeng Song, Fuli Feng, Jinhuan Liu, Zekun Li, Liqiang Nie, and Jun Ma. 2017. NeuroStylist: Neural Compatibility Modeling for Clothing Matching. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Multimedia Conference, MM 2017, Mountain View, CA, USA, October 23-27, 2017*, Qiong Liu, Rainer Lienhart, Haohong Wang, Sheng-Wei "Kuan-Ta" Chen, Susanne Boll, Yi-Ping Phoebe Chen, Gerald Friedland, Jia Li, and Shuicheng Yan (Eds.). ACM, 753–761. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3123266.3123314>
- [65] Xuemeng Song, Xianjing Han, Yunkai Li, Jingyuan Chen, Xin-Shun Xu, and Liqiang Nie. 2019. GP-BPR: Personalized Compatibility Modeling for Clothing Matching. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 320–328.
- [66] Runze Su, Fei Tao, Xudong Liu, Haoran Wei, Xiaorong Mei, Zhiyao Duan, Lei Yuan, Ji Liu, and Yuying Xie. 2020. Themes Inferred Audio-visual Correspondence Learning. *CoRR abs/2009.06573* (2020). arXiv:2009.06573 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.06573>
- [67] Rui Sun, Xuezhi Cao, Yan Zhao, Junchen Wan, Kun Zhou, Fuzheng Zhang, Zhongyuan Wang, and Kai Zheng. 2020. Multi-modal Knowledge Graphs for Recommender Systems. In *CIKM*. ACM, 1405–1414.
- [68] Zhulin Tao, Yinwei Wei, Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Xianglin Huang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. MGAT: Multimodal Graph Attention Network for Recommendation. *Inf. Process. Manag.* 57, 5 (2020), 102277.
- [69] Tianchi. 2018. Fashion Collocation Data on Taobao.com. <https://tianchi.aliyun.com/dataset/dataDetail?dataId=52>
- [70] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NIPS*. 5998–6008.
- [71] Kunal Vaswani, Yudhik Agrawal, and Vinoo Alluri. 2021. Multimodal Fusion Based Attentive Networks for Sequential Music Recommendation. In *BigMM*. IEEE, 25–32.
- [72] Cheng Wang, Mathias Niepert, and Hui Li. 2018. LRMM: Learning to Recommend with Missing Modalities. In *EMNLP*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [73] Qifan Wang, Yinwei Wei, Jianhua Yin, Jianlong Wu, Xuemeng Song, and Liqiang Nie. 2023. DualGNN: Dual Graph Neural Network for Multimedia Recommendation. *IEEE Trans. Multim.* 25 (2023), 1074–1084.
- [74] Wenjie Wang, Ling-Yu Duan, Hao Jiang, Peiguang Jing, Xuemeng Song, and Liqiang Nie. 2021. Market2Dish: Health-aware Food Recommendation. *ACM Trans. Multim. Comput. Commun. Appl.* 17, 1 (2021), 33:1–33:19.
- [75] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Neural Graph Collaborative Filtering. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 165–174.
- [76] Xiang Wang, Hongye Jin, An Zhang, Xiangnan He, Tong Xu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. Disentangled Graph Collaborative Filtering. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 1001–1010.
- [77] Wei Wei, Chao Huang, Lianghao Xia, and Chuxu Zhang. 2023. Multi-Modal Self-Supervised Learning for Recommendation. In *WWW*. ACM, 790–800.
- [78] 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.
- [79] Yinwei Wei, Xiang Wang, Liqiang Nie, Xiangnan He, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. Graph-Refined Convolutional Network for Multimedia Recommendation with Implicit Feedback. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 3541–3549.
- [80] 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 *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 1437–1445.
- [81] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Tao Qi, Chao Zhang, Yongfeng Huang, and Tong Xu. 2022. MM-Rec: Visiolinguistic Model Empowered Multimodal News Recommendation. In *SIGIR '22: The 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Madrid*,

- Spain, July 11 - 15, 2022. Enrique Amigó, Pablo Castells, Julio Gonzalo, Ben Carterette, J. Shane Culpepper, and Gabriella Kazai (Eds.). ACM, 2560–2564. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531896>
- [82] Fangzhao Wu, Ying Qiao, Jiun-Hung Chen, Chuhan Wu, Tao Qi, Jianxun Lian, Danyang Liu, Xing Xie, Jianfeng Gao, Winnie Wu, and Ming Zhou. 2020. MIND: A Large-scale Dataset for News Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel R. Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3597–3606. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.ACL-MAIN.331>
- [83] Jiancan Wu, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Xiangnan He, Liang Chen, Jianxun Lian, and Xing Xie. 2021. Self-supervised Graph Learning for Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 726–735.
- [84] Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, Hui Xiong, and Enhong Chen. 2024. A survey on large language models for recommendation. *World Wide Web (WWW)* 27, 5 (2024), 60.
- [85] Qi Yang, Gaosheng Wu, Yuhua Li, Ruixuan Li, Xiwu Gu, Huicai Deng, and Junzhuang Wu. 2020. AMNN: Attention-Based Multimodal Neural Network Model for Hashtag Recommendation. *IEEE Trans. Comput. Soc. Syst.* 7, 3 (2020), 768–779.
- [86] Xun Yang, Xiaoyu Du, and Meng Wang. 2020. Learning to Match on Graph for Fashion Compatibility Modeling. In *AAAI*. AAAI Press, 287–294.
- [87] Jing Yi and Zhenzhong Chen. 2022. Multi-Modal Variational Graph Auto-Encoder for Recommendation Systems. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 24 (2022), 1067–1079.
- [88] Zixuan Yi, Zijun Long, Iadh Ounis, Craig Macdonald, and Richard McCreadie. 2023. Large Multi-modal Encoders for Recommendation. *CoRR* abs/2310.20343 (2023).
- [89] Zixuan Yi, Xi Wang, Iadh Ounis, and Craig MacDonald. 2022. Multi-modal Graph Contrastive Learning for Micro-video Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 1807–1811.
- [90] Rex Ying, Ruining He, Kaifeng Chen, Pong Eksombatchai, William L. Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for Web-Scale Recommender Systems. In *KDD*. ACM, 974–983.
- [91] Aron Yu and Kristen Grauman. 2014. Fine-Grained Visual Comparisons with Local Learning. In *2014 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2014, Columbus, OH, USA, June 23-28, 2014*. IEEE Computer Society, 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2014.32>
- [92] Aron Yu and Kristen Grauman. 2017. Semantic Jitter: Dense Supervision for Visual Comparisons via Synthetic Images. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2017, Venice, Italy, October 22-29, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 5571–5580. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2017.594>
- [93] Tong Yu, Yilin Shen, Ruiyi Zhang, Xiangyu Zeng, and Hongxia Jin. 2019. Vision-Language Recommendation via Attribute Augmented Multimodal Reinforcement Learning. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 39–47.
- [94] Huijing Zhan, Jie Lin, Kenan Emir Ak, Boxin Shi, Ling-Yu Duan, and Alex C. Kot. 2022. \$A^3\$-FKG: Attentive Attribute-Aware Fashion Knowledge Graph for Outfit Preference Prediction. *IEEE Trans. Multimed.* 24 (2022), 819–831.
- [95] Jinghao Zhang, Yanqiao Zhu, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Shuhui Wang, and Liang Wang. 2021. Mining Latent Structures for Multimedia Recommendation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 3872–3880.
- [96] Qi Zhang, Jiawen Wang, Haoran Huang, Xuanjing Huang, and Yeyun Gong. 2017. Hashtag Recommendation for Multimodal Microblog Using Co-Attention Network. In *IJCAI*. ijcai.org, 3420–3426.
- [97] Shuai Zhang, Lina Yao, Aixin Sun, and Yi Tay. 2019. Deep Learning Based Recommender System: A Survey and New Perspectives. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 52, 1 (2019), 5:1–5:38.
- [98] Hongyu Zhou, Xin Zhou, Zhiwei Zeng, Lingzi Zhang, and Zhiqi Shen. 2023. A Comprehensive Survey on Multimodal Recommender Systems: Taxonomy, Evaluation, and Future Directions. *CoRR* abs/2302.04473 (2023).
- [99] Xin Zhou and Zhiqi Shen. 2022. A Tale of Two Graphs: Freezing and Denoising Graph Structures for Multimodal Recommendation. *CoRR* abs/2211.06924 (2022).
- [100] Xin Zhou and Zhiqi Shen. 2023. A Tale of Two Graphs: Freezing and Denoising Graph Structures for Multimodal Recommendation. In *ACM Multimedia*. ACM, 935–943.
- [101] 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 *WWW*. ACM, 845–854.
- [102] Jieming Zhu, Quanyu Dai, Liangcai Su, Rong Ma, Jinyang Liu, Guohao Cai, Xi Xiao, and Rui Zhang. 2022. BARS: Towards Open Benchmarking for Recommender Systems. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 2912–2923.