

L²CL: Embarrassingly Simple Layer-to-Layer Contrastive Learning for Graph Collaborative Filtering

Xinzhou Jin^{1†}, Jintang Li¹, Liang Chen^{1✉}, Chenyun Yu¹, Yuanzhen Xie²
Tao Xie², Chengxiang Zhuo², Zang Li², Zibin Zheng¹

¹Sun Yat-sen University, China

²Platform and Content Group, Tencent, China

jinxzh5@mail2.sysu.edu.cn, chenliang6@mail.sysu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have recently emerged as an effective approach to model neighborhood signals in collaborative filtering. Towards this research line, graph contrastive learning (GCL) demonstrates robust capabilities to address the supervision label shortage issue through generating massive self-supervised signals. Despite its effectiveness, GCL for recommendation suffers seriously from two main challenges: i) GCL relies on graph augmentation to generate semantically different views for contrasting, which could potentially disrupt key information and introduce unwanted noise; ii) current works for GCL primarily focus on contrasting representations using sophisticated networks architecture (usually deep) to capture high-order interactions, which leads to increased computational complexity and suboptimal training efficiency. To this end, we propose L²CL, a principled **L**ayer-to-**L**ayer **C**ontrastive **L**earning framework that contrasts representations from different layers. By aligning the semantic similarities between different layers, L²CL enables the learning of complex structural relationships and gets rid of the noise perturbation in stochastic data augmentation. Surprisingly, we find that L²CL, using only *one-hop* contrastive learning paradigm, is able to capture intrinsic semantic structures and improve the quality of node representation, leading to a simple yet effective architecture. We also provide theoretical guarantees for L²CL in minimizing task-irrelevant information. Extensive experiments on five real-world datasets demonstrate the superiority of our model over various state-of-the-art collaborative filtering methods. Our code is available at <https://github.com/downeykking/L2CL>.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems;

KEYWORDS

Collaborative Filtering, Contrastive Learning, Graph Neural Networks

[†] Work done during an intern at Tencent.

[✉] Corresponding author.

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

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Xinzhou Jin, Jintang Li, Liang Chen, Chenyun Yu, Yuanzhen Xie, Tao Xie, Chengxiang Zhuo, Zang Li, Zibin Zheng. 2018. L²CL: Embarrassingly Simple Layer-to-Layer Contrastive Learning for Graph Collaborative Filtering. In *Woodstock '18: ACM Symposium on Neural Gaze Detection, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems are widely used to cope with the problem of information overload, and play a vital role in many online information systems, such as e-commerce platforms [29], video websites [5], social media [8]. Collaborative filtering (CF) is the core algorithm behind recommender systems, which is based on the assumption that similar users tend to have similar preferences [27]. It captures user preferences through implicit feedback records (such as click and view). Traditional CF methods map users' and items' IDs into latent embeddings and utilize matrix factorization [20, 24] to optimize the representation of users and items.

With the recent advancements in graph representation learning [18, 43], several works [13, 31, 33, 41, 48] introduce graph neural networks (GNNs) to extract local collaborative signals and achieve significant improvements. The GNN-based collaborative filtering method captures rich multi-hop neighborhood information through message passing in the user-item interaction graph. Despite the popularity and effectiveness of applying GNNs to CF, the learning of high-quality user and item representations is hindered by various challenges, including data sparsity, noisy interactions, and the heavy reliance on sufficient supervision signals.

To address the aforementioned challenges, researchers have shifted their attention to contrastive learning (CL), a promising learning paradigm that enables training on vast amounts of unlabeled data in a self-supervised manner [6, 25, 30, 36]. The primary concept underlying contrastive learning in recommendation is to maximize the alignment between the generated embedding views by contrasting positively defined pairs with their corresponding negative instances. Therefore, how to design contrastive views to promote representation learning has become the core of CL design.

Early works [44, 47] apply random augmentation to the interaction graph or perform feature masking on node representations to build contrastive views. Following [6], subsequent efforts [49, 50] create contrastive pairs through perturbing the learned node representations. Additionally, some methods [10, 15] generate self-supervised signals through heuristic-guided view construction or fine-grained hypergraph [45] definition.

While the above-mentioned GCL-based CF models have advanced state-of-the-art performance for recommendation, there

are two key issues to be addressed: (1) Modifying the original graph structure or node features may potentially harm critical structural information and introduce unexpected noise. The success of heuristic-guided representation-contrast schemes heavily relies on the additional augmentation for generating semantic views (e.g., user clustering, embedding perturbing, hypergraph generating), but in various recommendation scenarios, achieving accurate generation of contrastive views is very challenging, and manual augmentation may unavoidably introduce noisy and irrelevant information for self-supervised learning. (2) Existing works for GCL in recommendation primarily focus on contrasting representations using sophisticated deep networks architecture to model high-order interactions, which overlooks the noisy information may be amplified by the stacking of multiple convolutional layers in deep GCL architectures, which raises the risk of incorporating misleading self-supervised signals and results in a higher computation burden.

In light of the above challenges, we revisit the GCL paradigm for recommendation and propose a novel **layer-level** (layer-to-layer in detail) graph contrastive learning framework, L^2CL , in place of the predominant **view-level** paradigm. In particular, following [22], given an L -layer GNN, we employ the output from the l -th layer as the representations of l -hop neighbors for a node and devise a structure-aware contrastive learning objective, which aims at aligning the semantic similarities between a node and its structural neighbors in different layers. The layer-to-layer contrasts eliminate the necessity for manually crafted view generate techniques and mitigate the potential noise introduced by random augmentation.

By treating all meaningful structural neighbors as positive instances, we systematically unify L^2CL with various contrastive learning schemes through different layer contrasts. In this framework, the learned node representations from different layers include different interactive collaborative signals, thus employing these strengthened relationships for constructing contrastive pairs possesses robust structure-awareness capabilities.

Furthermore, motivated by the theory of relevant information maximization and irrelevant information minimization, we perform L^2CL in only utilizing a 1-layer GNN and 1-hop structural neighbors. Instead of utilizing high-order information, intrinsic characteristics of the representations towards downstream tasks can be well preserved in our 1-hop L^2CL . This enables robustness against noisy information which may be propagated and stored in deep graph convolution.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We propose and unify a layer-to-layer contrastive learning paradigm, which heavily exploits the graph structure information and is capable of mining implicit collaboration signals of neighbors from different hierarchical layers without requiring graph-level augmentation and hand-crafted view generation.
- We further simplify L^2CL by only considering one-hop structural neighbors as enhanced positive pair neighbors. Utilizing a single-layer GNN enhances the model's efficiency and mitigates the suboptimal performance caused by excessive smoothing of node representations.
- We provide a theoretical explanation for the effectiveness of L^2CL , which may offer new insights for contrastive learning in recommendation.

- Extensive experimental results on five real-world datasets demonstrate the superiority of our proposed method over the existing CF methods in both effectiveness and efficiency.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Notation and Problem Definition

In this section, we present some useful notations and definitions. Given the user set $\mathcal{U} (|\mathcal{U}| = M)$ and item set $\mathcal{I} (|\mathcal{I}| = N)$, we focus on the implicit feedback problem within the context of recommender systems. The implicit feedback matrix is denoted as $R \in \{0, 1\}^{M \times N}$. Specifically, each entry $R_{u,i}$ indicates whether the user u is connected to item i , with a value of 1 representing a connection and 0 otherwise.

Graph collaborative filtering methods typically organize the interaction data R into the pattern of an user-item bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{I}\}$ denotes the set of nodes, and $\mathcal{E} = \{(u, i) \mid u \in \mathcal{U}, i \in \mathcal{I}, R_{u,i} = 1\}$ denotes the set of edges. The adjacent matrix A is defined as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0^{M \times M} & \mathbf{R} \\ \mathbf{R}^T & 0^{N \times N} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Given the initialized node embeddings $E^{(0)}$, GNNs update node representation through aggregating messages of its neighbors. As such, the core of the graph-based CF paradigm consists of two steps: (1) message propagation; and (2) node representation aggregation. Thus, the layer of GNNs can be defined as:

$$E_u^{(l)} = \text{COMBINE}(\{E_u^{(l-1)}\}, \text{AGGREGATE}^{(l)}(\{E_i^{(l-1)} : i \in \mathcal{N}_u\})), \quad (2)$$

$$E_u = \text{READOUT}([E_u^{(0)}, E_u^{(1)}, \dots, E_u^{(L)}]), \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{N}_u denotes the neighborhood set of node u , and L denotes the number layers of graph convolution.

Subsequently, we derive scores for all unobserved user-item pairs using the inner product of the final representations of the user and item, denoted as $y_{ui} = e_u^T e_i$, where e_u and e_i represent the representations of user u and item i , respectively. The item with the highest score is recommended to the user.

To optimize, we use the Bayesian personalized ranking (BPR) loss [27] as follow:

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec} = - \sum_{u=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \sum_{j \notin \mathcal{N}_u} \log \sigma(e_u^T e_i - e_u^T e_j), \quad (4)$$

where j represents a randomly selected negative item that the user has not previously interacted with.

2.2 GCL for Recommendation

The core idea of contrastive learning [3] is to pull different variants of the same instance (e.g., user, item) closer together in the embedding space while pushing variants of different instances further apart. In recommendation, these instances are generated based on the various augmentation methods to offer semantically different views for contrasting, which can be seen as **view-level** GCL.

In GCL, the efficient graph encoder, LightGCN [13] is widely used as the backbone. It achieves superior performance by removing

redundant operations, including transformation matrices and activation functions. Its formulas for message passing and embedding propagation with initialized $e_u^{(0)}, e_i^{(0)}$ are as follows:

$$e_u^{(l)} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_u} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u| |\mathcal{N}_i|}} e_i^{(l-1)}, \quad (5)$$

$$e_i^{(l)} = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_i| |\mathcal{N}_e|}} e_u^{(l-1)}. \quad (6)$$

Specifically, each data point $e_u^{(0)}$ is augmented using a random transformation to obtain $e_u^{(0)'}$. These original and augmented data points are processed through LightGCN to generate node representations at each layer and subsequently, a weighted sum is performed to obtain the final output:

$$e_u = \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{l=0}^L e_u^{(l)}, \quad e_i = \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{l=0}^L e_i^{(l)}. \quad (7)$$

By maximizing the consistency among positive samples and minimizing the consistency among negative samples, the contrastive loss based on InfoNCE [25] can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}^U = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} -\log \frac{\exp(s(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_u'))/\tau}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} \exp(s(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_k')/\tau)}, \quad (8)$$

where $s(\cdot)$ represents cosine similarity and τ is the temperature. Similarly, item-side contrastive learning is performed analogously.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 L²CL: Unifying Layer-to-Layer Contrast in Graph Collaborative Filtering

The view-level contrastive learning relies on generating accurate and semantic contrastive views, but it is challenging for such view generation because additional augmentation may introduce irrelevant information and noise. Revisiting the message-passing mechanism in GNNs, the origin collaborative signals (e.g. observed interactions) are propagated to different layers through extended high-order paths, which inspires us that different hop nodes may be potential structural neighbors and the outputs of the different layers may share the similarity in embedding space. To this end, we propose the layer-to-layer contrastive learning paradigm that contrasts representations from different layers.

We utilize LightGCN as graph convolution backbone and obtain node embeddings $e_u^{(0)}, e_u^{(1)}, \dots, e_u^{(L)}$ at each layer like Eq. (5, 6).

Considering the output of different layers as node representations and using them to construct positive contrasting pairs, the layer-to-layer contrasts can be further categorized into homogeneous and heterogeneous. Homogeneous indicates contrasting nodes from the same type (e.g., user-user) with different layers. The generic contrastive learning loss for the user side is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}^U = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} -\log \frac{\exp(s(\mathbf{e}_u^{(m)}, \mathbf{e}_u^{(n)})/\tau)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} \exp(s(\mathbf{e}_u^{(m)}, \mathbf{e}_k^{(n)})/\tau)}, \quad (9)$$

where $0 \leq m, n \leq L$, the same for the item side.

Besides, for users, their updated representation is aggregated through directly connected items. Therefore, despite users and items belonging to different classes of heterogeneous node types,

their representation spaces may still be similar. so the contrastive learning loss for heterogeneous nodes is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}^U = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, R_{u,i}=1} -\log \frac{\exp(s(\mathbf{e}_i^{(m)}, \mathbf{e}_u^{(n)})/\tau)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} \exp(s(\mathbf{e}_i^{(m)}, \mathbf{e}_k^{(n)})/\tau)}, \quad (10)$$

To reduce the excessive number of contrastive pair combinations, we step forward and unify five instances in layer-to-layer contrast. We denote $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$ as performing contrastive learning in heterogeneous nodes while the embedding of user u at layer 0 is anchor, and the embedding of directly connected item i at layer 0 is a positive instance. Given a two-layer LightGCN, Figure 1 illustrates the detail for different layer contrast.




Figure 1: Different layer-to-layer contrast.

The contrasts $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$ and $e_u^{(1)} - e_i^{(1)}$ are intuitive since the contrasting pairs have explicit interaction information in the original bipartite graph. $e_u^{(2)}$ is obtained through embedding propagation of $e_u^{(0)}$, which can be seen as the aggregation of potential structural neighbors similar to [22]. The contrast $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$ utilizes one-hop neighbor information from explicit interactions, for $e_i^{(1)}$ is the direct aggregation of $e_u^{(0)}$ and other user nodes. The contrast $e_u^{(0)} - \sum_{u=1}^3 e_u^{(i)}$ implicitly captures collaborative signals from different layers through weighted aggregation. In summary, L²CL brings new insight into generating meaningful positive samples. However, under the unifying framework, seeking effective layer contrast with sufficient collaborative signals is supposed to be explored further, for different layer-to-layer contrasts will bring different collaborative signals. Therefore, a natural question arises:

What is the best layer-to-layer paradigm for recommendation?

3.2 One-Hop Contrastive Learning

To answer the question, We conduct the above layer-to-layer contrast experiments on two public benchmarks, Yelp and Books [13]. the results¹ is shown in Table 1.

¹For the sake of brevity, we omit the item side here for presentation purposes. We also contrast $e_i^{(0)} - e_u^{(1)}$ while performing the contrast of $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$. More experimental details see Section 4.

Table 1: Performance comparison of different L²CL variants.

Method	Yelp		Books	
	Recall@10	NDCG@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10
LightGCN	0.0730	0.0520	0.0797	0.0565
$e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$	0.0975	0.0761	0.0928	0.0671
$e_u^{(1)} - e_i^{(1)}$	0.0932	0.0702	0.1074	0.0778
$e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$	0.0995	0.0745	0.1067	0.0767
$e_u^{(0)} - e_u^{(2)}$	0.0814	0.0606	0.0819	0.0586
$e_u^{(0)} - \sum_{i=1}^3 e_u^{(i)}$	0.0809	0.0615	0.0831	0.0598

In Table 1, the gains from contrasting using 1-hop structural information, such as $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$ and $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$, far outweigh the benefits from implicit high-order information like $e_u^{(0)} - e_u^{(2)}$. This insight inspires us that in GCL-based models, the information derived from direct observation interactions has not been fully exploited and still holds significant utility.

The fundamental assumption of collaborative filtering is that similar users tend to have similar preferences. In detail, When user u directly connects item i , it may share similar interests with those users who have historically interacted with the same item i . Let $e_u^{(0)}, e_i^{(0)}$ denote the initialized user u and its connected item i respectively, after one-layer graph convolution, $e_i^{(1)}$ aggregates users' embeddings (e.g., $e_u^{(0)}$) who have consumed it, which can be seen as the fusion information of user u . This indicates that $e_u^{(0)}$ and $e_i^{(1)}$ should be similar in the embedding space, which aligns intending to contrast $e_u^{(0)}$ and $e_i^{(1)}$.

Therefore, we utilize $e_u^{(0)}$ and $e_i^{(1)}$, as well as $e_i^{(0)}$ and $e_u^{(1)}$, to construct our contrastive learning loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}^U = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}, R_{u,i}=1} -\log \frac{\exp(s(e_i^{(1)}, e_u^{(0)})/\tau)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{U}} \exp(s(e_i^{(1)}, e_k^{(0)})/\tau)}, \quad (11)$$

where $e_i^{(1)}$ is output of GNN at layer 1. In one batch, item i is the direct **one-hop neighbors** of user u in a bipartite graph, whose representation can be obtained like:

$$e_i^{(1)} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_u|} \sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_i|}} e_u^{(0)}. \quad (12)$$

In a similar way, the one-hop structural contrastive learning loss of the item side can be obtained as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}^I = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, R_{u,i}=1} -\log \frac{\exp(s(e_u^{(1)}, e_i^{(0)})/\tau)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \exp(s(e_u^{(1)}, e_k^{(0)})/\tau)}. \quad (13)$$

Overall, the final contrastive loss is the weighted sum of the user-side loss and item-side loss with the coefficient α to balance two contrastive losses:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{cl}^U + (1 - \alpha) \mathcal{L}_{cl}^I. \quad (14)$$

3.3 Theoretical Guarantees

To illustrate the effectiveness of one-hop layer-to-layer contrast, we shift our focus back to the self-supervised learning objective




Figure 2: The left is an illustration of information in self-supervised learning. L_1, L_2 , and \mathcal{Y} represent the information of two layers and downstream tasks, respectively. The right is the asymmetric layer contrast strategy, which can alleviate the task-irrelevant noises in GCL (area C).

driven by information theories. As shown in Figure 2, where the scale of each area reflects the amount of information, the learned representations through CL include both task-relevant information (area D) and task-irrelevant noises (area C). The information-theoretic characterizations [32, 39] indicate that a well-adapted self-supervised learning method for the downstream task should *extract task-relevant information* in the latent representation and *discard task-irrelevant information*, so the purpose of L²CL is to expand information in area D and limit information in area C.

Maximizing task-relevant information. Considering one-layer LightGCN, the calculation of the similarity s_{ij} between any user u_i and item i_j is expanded [1] by introducing three additional similarity terms as inductive biases: the similarity between users who purchase the same item (e.g., $(\mathbf{u}_i^T \cdot \mathbf{u}_k)$), the similarity between items purchased by the same user (e.g., $(\mathbf{i}_k^T \cdot \mathbf{i}_j)$), and the similarity between neighbors observed in interactions (e.g., $(\mathbf{i}_k^T \cdot \mathbf{u}_k)$). In the collaborative filtering scenario, the downstream task aims to recommend items to users they are most likely to interact with, and the BPR is used to update the similarity between directly connected user-item pairs. Considering the results in Table 1, building contrastive loss for direct 1-hop user-item nodes leads to greater improvements, suggesting that the value of first-order interaction information in the recommendation task has not been fully exploited. Therefore, modeling these three inductive biases into the contrastive learning can better align with downstream tasks and result in expanded area D. The contrasting pairs modeling these three inductive biases correspond to $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$, $e_i^{(0)} - e_u^{(1)}$, and $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$. The first two are the objects used in one-hop L²CL.

Minimizing task-irrelevant information. The layer-wise message passing in GNN introduces a lot of redundancy, and these redundancies are preserved in the deep latent representations of adjacent nodes in the form of task-irrelevant information. After k -layer message passing of GNN, the output latent representation contains aggregated information from k -hop subgraphs. For two adjacent nodes, their k -hop subgraphs have a significant overlap, resulting in a substantial correlation between the representations.

Let N_{uv}^k denote the overlap size of the subgraphs X and Y , N_k represent the maximum size of all overlapping subgraphs. T denote downstream task. Suppose the features of each node in the graph are independently and identically sampled from a Gaussian

distribution $G(0, \gamma)$, where γ lies in the range $[-1, 1]$. Proposition 1 in [21] provides a lower bound for task-irrelevant information:

$$I(X; Y|T) \geq \frac{\left(\mathbb{E}\left[N_{uv}^k\right]\right)^2}{N_k} \gamma^2. \quad (15)$$

This lower bound indicates that the task-irrelevant information scales almost linearly with the size of overlapping subgraphs. Compared to deep graph convolution, shallow GNN always has a lower subgraph overlapping size [21], which is consistent with our target to only utilize 1-hop structural neighbors to keep lower task-irrelevant information. Besides, Figure 2 indicates that employing an asymmetric layer contrast strategy is better for decreasing the scale of area C, which alleviates the task-irrelevant noises in GCL. Therefore, $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(1)}$ can reduce more redundancy in the self-supervised signal compared with $e_u^{(0)} - e_i^{(0)}$ and $e_u^{(1)} - e_i^{(1)}$.

3.4 Model Training

To learn more meaningful node representations for L²CL, we use a multi-task training strategy to jointly optimize the traditional recommendation task (Eq. (4)) and the contrastive learning task² (Eq. (14)):

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{rec} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{cl} + \lambda_2 \|E^{(0)}\|^2, \quad (16)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are hyperparameters that control the strength of contrastive learning and L_2 regularization respectively. The whole workflow of one-hop L²CL is shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The illustration of our proposed L²CL, which jointly optimize one-hop contrastive learning loss and BPR loss.

4 EXPERIMENTS

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed L²CL in recommendation tasks, we perform comprehensive experiments and present detailed results and analysis. We aim to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1: How does L²CL perform as compared with state-of-the-art CF methods?**
- **RQ2: Does L²CL exhibit any other positive effects and how does it facilitate work?**
- **RQ3: How do different hyper-parameter settings affect L²CL?**

Table 2: Statistics of the datasets.

Datasets	#Users	#Items	#Interactions	Density
Kindle	60,468	57,212	880,859	0.00025
Yelp	45,477	30,708	1,777,765	0.00127
Books	58,144	58,051	2,517,437	0.00075
QB-video	30,323	25,730	1,581,136	0.00203

4.1 Experimental Setup

4.1.1 Datasets. We conduct experiments on five public and real-world datasets, namely Yelp³, Books, Kindle[11] (*i.e.*, Amazon-books and Amazon-kindle-store), QB-video from Tencent recommendation datasets [51]. These datasets originate from diverse domains, exhibiting variances in both scale and sparsity. For the Books and Kindle datasets, we consider interactions with ratings greater than or equal to 3 as positive feedback to transform numerical ratings into implicit feedback. To ensure the quality of the data, we employ the 15-core setting [12] for Yelp and Books, which ensures a minimum of 15 interactions between users and items. For the Kindle and QB-video datasets, users and items with less than 5 interactions are filtered out. Detailed statistical information about the datasets is summarized in Table 2. We use the user-based split approach to divide the data for experimentation. Specifically, we divide training, validation, and test sets into a ratio of 8:1:1, respectively. In addition, we employ pairwise sampling, where for each interaction in the training set, a negative interaction is randomly chosen to construct the training sample (u, i^+, i^-) .

4.1.2 Evaluation Metrics. Two widely used metrics Recall@K and NDCG@K are adopted to quantitatively measure the recommendation performance and the values of K are set to {10, 20, 50}. Following [22], we adopt the all-rank protocol which ranks all candidate items that users have not interacted during evaluation.

4.1.3 Implementation Details. The proposed L²CL, along with all baseline models, are implemented using RecBole⁴ and RecBole-GNN [52]. RecBole is a unified and comprehensive framework for recommendation systems while RecBole-GNN implements various GNN-based recommendation algorithms. To ensure a fair comparison, we employ the same Adam [7] optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001 and conduct a detailed hyperparameter search for all baseline models. The batch size is set to 4096, and the L_2 regularization of parameters λ_2 is chosen as 10^{-4} . The Xavier initialization [17] is utilized as the default parameter initialization method across all methods. The embedding size is set to 64. In L²CL, early stopping with the patience of 10 epochs is utilized to prevent overfitting

²Unless stated otherwise, the contrastive objective for L²CL in the following section is the one-hop neighbors in Section 3.2.

³www.yelp.com/dataset

⁴<https://recbole.io>

Table 3: Performance comparison of different recommendation models.

Dataset	Metric	BPRMF	NeuMF	NGCF	LightGCN	SGL	NCL	LightGCL	SimGCL	DCCF	L ² CL	Improv.
Kindle	Recall@10	0.1296	0.1185	0.1306	0.1570	<u>0.1693</u>	0.1624	0.1610	0.1673	0.1450	0.1793*	+5.91 %
	Recall@20	0.1709	0.1583	0.1770	0.2080	<u>0.2192</u>	0.2119	0.2109	0.2162	0.1956	0.2317*	+5.70 %
	Recall@50	0.2399	0.2232	0.2340	0.2888	<u>0.2931</u>	0.2870	0.2887	0.2908	0.2770	0.3081*	+5.12 %
	NDCG@10	0.0815	0.0744	0.0796	0.0981	<u>0.1077</u>	0.1026	0.1009	0.1067	0.0889	0.1146*	+6.41 %
	NDCG@20	0.0926	0.0850	0.0919	0.1117	<u>0.1210</u>	0.1158	0.1142	0.1197	0.1023	0.1286*	+6.28 %
	NDCG@50	0.1073	0.0989	0.1086	0.1290	<u>0.1370</u>	0.1320	0.1310	0.1358	0.1197	0.1451*	+5.91 %
Yelp	Recall@10	0.0643	0.0531	0.0630	0.0730	0.0833	0.0920	0.0743	<u>0.0924</u>	0.0821	0.0995*	+7.68 %
	Recall@20	0.1043	0.0885	0.1026	0.1163	0.1288	0.1377	0.1160	<u>0.1385</u>	0.1279	0.1458*	+5.27 %
	Recall@50	0.1862	0.1654	0.1864	0.2016	0.2140	0.2247	0.1995	<u>0.2264</u>	0.2179	0.2338*	+3.27 %
	NDCG@10	0.0458	0.0377	0.0446	0.0520	0.0601	0.0678	0.0543	<u>0.0695</u>	0.0595	0.0745*	+7.19 %
	NDCG@20	0.0580	0.0486	0.0567	0.0652	0.0739	0.0817	0.0670	<u>0.0834</u>	0.0736	0.0888*	+6.47 %
	NDCG@50	0.0793	0.0685	0.0784	0.0875	0.0964	0.1046	0.0887	<u>0.1063</u>	0.0970	0.1121*	+5.46 %
Books	Recall@10	0.0607	0.0507	0.0617	0.0797	0.0898	0.0933	0.0842	<u>0.0995</u>	0.0911	0.1067*	+7.24 %
	Recall@20	0.0956	0.0823	0.0978	0.1206	0.1331	0.1381	0.1292	<u>0.1473</u>	0.1332	0.1552*	+5.36 %
	Recall@50	0.1681	0.0447	0.1699	0.2012	0.2157	0.2175	0.2133	<u>0.2315</u>	0.2095	0.2419*	+4.49 %
	NDCG@10	0.0430	0.0351	0.0427	0.0565	0.0645	0.0679	0.0595	<u>0.0725</u>	0.0663	0.0767*	+5.79 %
	NDCG@20	0.0537	0.0447	0.0537	0.0689	0.0777	0.0815	0.0731	<u>0.0870</u>	0.0790	0.0915*	+5.17 %
	NDCG@50	0.0726	0.0610	0.0725	0.0899	0.0992	0.1024	0.0950	<u>0.1092</u>	0.0990	0.1144*	+4.76 %
QB-video	Recall@10	0.1126	0.1031	0.1250	0.1264	0.1351	<u>0.1431</u>	0.1224	0.1402	0.1417	0.1485*	+3.77 %
	Recall@20	0.1762	0.1659	0.1948	0.1966	0.2044	<u>0.2164</u>	0.1900	0.2141	0.2145	0.2261*	+4.48 %
	Recall@50	0.2989	0.2851	0.3240	0.3235	0.3367	<u>0.3515</u>	0.3157	0.3479	0.3486	0.3638*	+3.50 %
	NDCG@10	0.0790	0.0709	0.0886	0.0888	0.0946	<u>0.1006</u>	0.0870	0.0994	0.0996	0.1046*	+3.98 %
	NDCG@20	0.0981	0.0896	0.1094	0.1098	0.1155	<u>0.1225</u>	0.1073	0.1215	0.1216	0.1281*	+4.57 %
	NDCG@50	0.1305	0.1209	0.1435	0.1436	0.1504	<u>0.1584</u>	0.1404	0.1567	0.1571	0.1646*	+3.91 %

The best result is **boldfaced** and the runner-up is underlined. * indicates the statistical significance for $p < 0.01$ compared to the best baseline.

with the indicator of NDCG@10. The hyper-parameter tuning for λ_1 is performed within the range of $\{5e^{-6}, 1e^{-6}, 5e^{-5}, 1e^{-5}\}$ and τ within the range of $\{0.05, 0.075, 0.1, 0.125, 0.15\}$. As for the models that are already implemented, we reuse the reported results from the previous work [22].

4.1.4 Compared Methods. To demonstrate the effectiveness, we compare the proposed L²CL with the state-of-the-art baselines with different learning paradigms: i) **MF**-based (BPRMF [27], NeuMF [14]). ii) **GNN**-based (NGCF [41], LightGCN [13]). iii) **SSL**-based (SGL [44], NCL [22], LightGCL [2], SimGCL [50], DCCF [26]).

4.2 Overall Performance (RQ1)

Table 3 lists the overall performance of all compared methods on five datasets. From evaluation results, we summarize the following observations:

- Our proposed L²CL consistently outperforms all baselines across different datasets. On the Yelp and Books datasets, L²CL exhibits improvement over the strongest baseline SimGCL, with an average increase of 7.46% in Recall@10 and 6.19% in NDCG@10. Compared to the robust baseline LightGCN, L²CL shows an average improvement of 39.79% in Recall@10 and 27.68% in NDCG@10. These results suggest that modeling interactive collaborative signals through layer contrast in 1-hop structural neighbors can yield

more informative representations and lead to enhanced performance. Furthermore, we observe that L²CL performs better on sparse datasets, making it well-suited for real-world data scenarios. In dense datasets where interaction information is more abundant, other models may also optimize effectively.

- In the comparison of baseline models, NeuMF replaces the dot product in BPRMF with a neural network but leads to a performance decline. This may be attributed to our scenario where node representations are optimized solely based on interaction information. Consequently, more complex modeling could result in suboptimal representations. Furthermore, GNN-based models, in contrast to MF-based collaborative filtering methods, demonstrate superior performance, emphasizing the importance of utilizing graph structures to capture high-order user-item interaction signals for modeling user preferences.

- Across five datasets, all GCL methods significantly improve the performance of LightGCN (these GCL methods utilize multiple layers of LightGCN as the backbone). This underscores the effectiveness of integrating contrastive learning methods with collaborative filtering. Among these methods, SimGCL stands out. It maximizes the mutual information between two noise views while utilizing contrastive loss as part of the optimization objective, resulting in excellent performance. On the other hand, our L²CL method simplifies the construction of contrasting pairs, innovatively introducing

Table 4: The comparison of time complexity.

Computation	LightGCN	SGL-ED	NCL	LightGCL	SimGCL	DCCF	L ² CL
Normalization	$O(2 E)$	$O((2 + 4\rho) E)$	$O(2 E)$	$O(2 E)$	$O(2 E)$	$O(2 E)$	$O(2 E)$
SVD/Cluster	-	-	$O(2 E Kd)$	$O(2q E)$	-	-	-
Augmentation	-	$O(4\rho E)$	-	-	-	$O(2 E Ld)$	-
Graph Convolution	$O(2 E Ld)$	$O((2 + 4\rho) E Ld)$	$O(2 E Ld)$	$O(2(E + 2qN)Ld)$	$O(6 E Ld)$	$O(2(E + Nk)Ld)$	$O(2 E d)$
BPR Loss	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$	$O(2Bd)$
CL Loss	-	$O(2(Bd + BMd))$	$O(4(Bd + BMd))$	$O(2L(Bd + BMd))$	$O(2(Bd + BMd))$	$O(6L(Bd + BMd))$	$O(2(Bd + BMd))$

that we only need to perform simple layer-to-layer contrast on heterogeneous 0-th and 1-st layers, which can achieve superior performance compared to those state-of-the-art methods.

4.3 Complexity and Efficiency Study (RQ2)

GCL-based collaborative filtering methods often suffer from high computational costs due to the need for constructing additional contrasting views and performing multiple graph convolutions. However, our proposed approach requires only a single execution of graph convolution and self-generated contrasting views. This significantly simplifies the computation in the training phase, making it more efficient. In this section, we give a systematic study of complexity and efficiency.

Let $|E|$ denote the cardinality of the set of edges in the graph, d represent the embedding dimension, B indicate the batch size, L denote the layer number of graph convolution, M denote the number of nodes in a batch, N represents the total number of users and items, respectively. ρ is the edge keep rate in SGL-ED (-ED is short for edge dropout) [44]. K is the number of prototype in NCL [22] while q is the required rank in LightGCL [2].

We compare the complexity of L²CL with other competitive CL baselines. Given that none of the CL baselines introduce additional trainable parameters, they exhibit consistency in space complexity. Consequently, our emphasis shifts towards evaluating time complexity during the model training phase, as summarized in Table 4.

- Some methods require pre-processing operations, for instance, SGL necessitates random augmentation on the graph, LightGCL involves singular value decomposition, and NCL requires clustering on node representations, which brings additional time costs.

- All GCN-based contrastive learning methods, to achieve optimal performance, typically entail multiple graph convolution computations, resulting in significant time overhead. In contrast, our method conducts contrastive learning solely on one-hop neighbors, requiring just a one-layer graph convolution, which significantly enhances model efficiency.

- Concerning contrastive loss computation, NCL employs two contrastive loss objectives, while LightGCL needs to calculate contrastive loss at each layer, both bringing burdens to the model’s computations. In contrast, our method involves only one contrastive learning loss computation,

In summary, L²CL excels in terms of time complexity, greatly simplifying the complexity of graph-based CF models and enhancing the model’s applicability to large graphs and industrial scenarios.

In addition, we compare the training efficiency of L²CL with the aforementioned models. In Table 5, we present the average

Table 5: Efficiency comparison of different methods on QB-video, including average training time per epoch, number of epochs to converge, total training time (s: second, m: minute, h: hour).

Method	Time/Epoch↓	#Epoch↓	Total Time↓	NDCG@10↑
LightGCN	8.8s	297	44m	0.0888
SGL	25.2s	53	22m	0.0946
NCL	13.9s	81	19m	0.1006
LightGCL	12.2s	55	11m	0.0870
SimGCL	26.1s	199	1h27m	0.0994
DCCF	101.0s	29	1h11m	0.0996
L ² CL	4.8s	49	4m	0.1046

training time per epoch, the number of epochs to converge, and the total training time on the dataset QB-video. Indeed, consistent with the time complexity analysis, L²CL outperforms others in a single training iteration and achieves the fastest convergence speed in practice (achieving more than 22x speedup over strong baseline SimGCL in training efficiency and convergence), which excels in superior performance while embodying simplicity and efficiency.

4.4 Integration with Other GNN Encoders (RQ2)

In the main experiments (Table 3), we optimize L²CL with a simple one-layer LightGCN encoder. This raises the question of whether our contrastive learning object is also beneficial for other GNN-based CF encoders. Therefore, we integrate L²CL with various GNN backbones (GCN [18], GAT [35], NGCF [41]) to validate its compatibility. We obtain experimental results in Table 6.

We can see that L²CL consistently brings remarkable performance improvements compared with vanilla encoders, validating the superiority and adaptability of our proposed contrastive objectives. Additionally, L²CL with NGCF and LightGCN as a backbone demonstrate better performance, possibly because NGCF is tailored for recommendation system scenarios. At the same time, LightGCN eliminates complex feature transformations and activation functions, ensuring more consistent representation spaces across different layers and thereby ensuring the stability of structural contrastive learning.

4.5 Resistance Against Data Sparsity (RQ2)


To further validate the resistance of L²CL in mitigating data sparsity, we divide all users into five groups based on their interaction frequencies while keeping the same total interaction count in each

Table 6: Performance comparison of different encoders when applied L²CL.

Method	Yelp		Books	
	Recall@10	NDCG@10	Recall@10	NDCG@10
GCN	0.0573	0.0410	0.0490	0.0350
+L ² CL	0.0827	0.0599	0.0829	0.0584
GAT	0.0549	0.0389	0.0503	0.0352
+L ² CL	0.0890	0.0686	0.0959	0.0695
NGCF	0.0630	0.0446	0.0617	0.0427
+L ² CL	0.0917	0.0716	0.0987	0.0709
LightGCN	0.0730	0.0520	0.0797	0.0565
+L ² CL	0.0995	0.0745	0.1067	0.0767
Avg Improv.	47.07%	56.56%	63.42%	66.52%

group. We then calculate Recall@10 for LightGCN and L²CL on these five user groups.


The results, as shown in Figure 4, indicate that the performance of L²CL consistently surpasses LightGCN. Additionally, as the interaction frequency decreases, the performance gain from L²CL increases, which implies the robustness of L²CL to effectively alleviate the sparsity of interaction data. L²CL performs best on the most sparse user group (G1), which can be attributed to our explicit utilization of 1-hop neighbors in contrastive learning, bringing more powerful structure-awareness ability.

**Figure 4: Performance on users of different sparsity degrees in terms of Recall@10. G1 denotes the group of users with the lowest average number of interactions.**

4.6 Visualization Analysis (RQ2)

In this section, we demonstrate the effectiveness of L²CL in learning a moderately dispersed representation distribution by introducing informative variance to maximize the benefits derived from CL. Specifically, we randomly sample 2,000 users from Kindle, Books respectively, and map the learned embeddings (when the methods reach their best performance) to 2-dimensional normalized vectors on the unit hypersphere with t-SNE [34]. Then we plot the feature distributions and density estimations on angles for each point with Gaussian kernel density estimation (KDE) [4] in Figure 5.

From Figure 5, we can see that the representations learned by LightGCN are clustered on several clusters, while the representations learned by L²CL are more uniform. As mentioned in previous works [37, 40, 50], a more uniform distribution allows the learned


**Figure 5: User distributions with Gaussian kernel density estimation (KDE) in \mathcal{R}^2 (the darker the color is, the more points fall in that area.) and KDE on angles (i.e., $\arctan2(y, x)$) for each point $(x, y) \in S^1$.**

representation to have better intrinsic characteristics while preferring to keep as much information as possible, leading to a better ability for preserving unique user preference.

4.7 Hyperparameter Sensitivity Analysis (RQ3)

This section investigates the sensitivity of several key hyperparameters on the recommendation performance of L²CL. The evaluation results in terms of Recall@10 are presented in Figure 6, 7, 8.

4.7.1 Performance Comparison w.r.t. τ . τ denotes the tunable temperature hyperparameter to adjust the scale for softmax in InfoNCE [25], which determines the level of attention the contrastive loss pays to hard negative samples [38]. From Figure 6, both excessively small and large values of τ will decrease the model's performance, which is associated with previous study [38]. Specifically, a too-lower temperature setting (e.g., $\tau = 0.05$) will over-emphasize the gradient contributions of hard negative samples which are usually false negatives, making it challenging to align the anchor with its positive neighborhood nodes used in our 1-hop contrastive learning in embedding space. In practice, setting $\tau = 0.1$ tends to lead to optimal model performance under typical circumstances.

**Figure 6: Performance analysis (Recall@10) for different τ on LightGCN and L²CL.**

4.7.2 Performance Comparison w.r.t. α . The coefficient α balances the two types of contrastive learning losses in Eq. (14). As shown in Figure 7, L²CL is consistently outperforming LightGCN, demonstrating the robustness of our method to parameter α . Specifically, for the Kindle dataset, the model performs better when user-side representation learning is emphasized. This observation might be attributed to that Kindle is more sparse, where the limited interactions may not be sufficient to fully capture user preferences

for items. Therefore, the model advocates assigning greater weight to user-side representation learning to capture this missing information. Overall, utilizing a value of 0.5 to α is able to achieve competitive recommendation performance, which indicates the importance of learning both enhanced user and item representation.




Figure 7: Performance analysis (Recall@10) for different α on LightGCN and L²CL.

4.7.3 Performance Comparison w.r.t. λ_1 . λ_1 controls the strength of contrastive learning. Specifically, the weight λ_1 is searched in the range of $\{5e^{-6}, 1e^{-6}, 5e^{-5}, 1e^{-5}\}$ to explore its impact on the model’s performance. The results are presented in Figure 8. It is observed that the best performance is achieved nearly $1e^{-5}$, which suggests that a reasonable λ_1 could balance contrastive learning loss and recommendation loss, leading to better optimization.




Figure 8: Performance analysis (Recall@10) for different λ_1 on LightGCN and L²CL.

5 RELATED WORK

5.1 Graph-based Collaborative Filtering

Collaborative filtering (CF) is a widely used algorithm in recommendation systems. The key is to learn the representation of users/items through capturing collaborative signals on historical interactions [19, 28]. Early CF algorithms leverage matrix factorization [20, 24] to map user’s and item’s IDs to latent embeddings and use inner product or neural networks [14, 27] to estimate the preferences.

Recently, there have been many research efforts focused on deploying graph representation learning to capture high-order connectivity between users and items and modeling complex pairwise relationships. Early studies [9, 46] utilize label propagation and random walk to capture graph structure information. Most recent works directly use graph neural networks (GNNs) [18, 43] to enhance collaborative filtering. Pinsage [48] and NGCF [41] introduce graph convolution in recommender to exploit higher-order connectivity for improved performance. DGCF [42] constructs disentangled representations for users and items. Additionally, certain methods [13, 16, 23] aim to enhance the efficiency and performance of GNNs by streamlining the architecture and altering the way of

embedding propagation. Notably, by eliminating redundant operations, such as the transformation matrix and activation function, LightGCN [13] has emerged as the most popular GNN collaborative filtering method due to its simplicity and robust performance.

5.2 Contrastive Learning for Recommendation

As a prevalent self-supervised learning paradigm, contrastive learning (CL) has demonstrated impressive representation learning capabilities with limited labeled data in vision and language research [6, 25, 32]. In essence, CL generates diverse views and subsequently maximizes the consistency among two contrastive views to preserve invariant representations. Recent studies [2, 15, 22, 44, 47, 49, 50] have successfully deployed contrastive learning to graph collaborative filtering scenarios to tackle challenges such as data sparsity and noise. For instance, SGL [44] generates contrasting views of the user-item interaction graph by employing graph augmentations like edge-dropout operations. NCL [22] promotes representation learning by jointly contrasting neighbors from the graph structure and semantic distribution. LightGCL [2] employs singular value decomposition to extract local-global collaborative filtering signals. In addition, SimGCL [50] and XSimGCL [49] introduce uniform distribution noise to the representations and enhance the consistency of embedding learning across two contrastive views.

However, current works rely on the graph augmentation strategies, which are primarily designed based on empirical intuition, heuristics, and experimental trial-and-error. This lack of generalizability makes it challenging to remain robust against noise perturbations across different datasets and downstream tasks. In this work, we propose to unify structural contrastive learning to a layer-to-layer framework, which provides guidance for simplifying and efficiently improving representation quality for recommendation.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we revisit GCL-based recommendation methods from the perspective of layer-to-layer contrasting. Firstly, we demonstrate that current GCL-based methods generally follow a layer-to-layer contrasting paradigm, where representations learned from different layers (hops) naturally form two contrastive views without additional augmentations. Based on our understanding, we propose L²CL, an augmentation-free layer-to-layer contrastive learning framework to unify the GCL learning paradigm for recommendations. We then conduct empirical studies on L²CL and discover that contrastive representations from shallow layers can achieve better performance. We analyze possible reasons to explain these findings and provide theoretical results that support our observations. Our analysis further motivates us to simplify L²CL with an embarrassingly simple one-hop layer-to-layer contrasting scheme. In our experiments, L²CL exhibits significantly improved performance over various state-of-the-art methods and performs better in efficiency and robustness against data sparsity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anonymous. 2023. How Does Message Passing Improve Collaborative Filtering?. In *Submitted to ICLR*.
- [2] Xuheng Cai, Chao Huang, Lianghao Xia, and Xubin Ren. 2023. LightGCL: Simple Yet Effective Graph Contrastive Learning for Recommendation. In *ICLR*.
- [3] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *ICML*.

- [4] Yen-Chi Chen. 2017. A Tutorial on Kernel Density Estimation and Recent Advances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03924* (2017).
- [5] Paul Covington, Jay Adams, and Emre Sargin. 2016. Deep neural networks for youtube recommendations. In *RecSys*.
- [6] Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. SimCSE: Simple Contrastive Learning of Sentence Embeddings. In *ACL*.
- [7] Xavier Glorot and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *AISTATS*.
- [8] Frédéric Godin, Viktor Slavkovikj, Wesley De Neve, Benjamin Schrauwen, and Rik Van de Walle. 2013. Using topic models for twitter hashtag recommendation. In *WWW*.
- [9] Marco Gori, Augusto Pucci, V Roma, and I Siena. 2007. Itemrank: A random-walk based scoring algorithm for recommender engines.. In *IJCAI*.
- [10] Kaveh Hassani and Amir Hosein Khasahmadi. 2020. Contrastive multi-view representation learning on graphs. In *ICML*.
- [11] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering. In *WWW*.
- [12] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. VBPR: visual bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *AAAI*.
- [13] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. LightGCN: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *SIGIR*.
- [14] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *WWW*.
- [15] Yangqin Jiang, Chao Huang, and Lianghao Huang. 2023. Adaptive graph contrastive learning for recommendation. In *SIGKDD*.
- [16] Xinzhou Jin, Jintang Li, Yuanzhen Xie, Liang Chen, Beibei Kong, Lei Cheng, Bo Hu, Zang Li, and Zibin Zheng. 2023. Enhancing Graph Collaborative Filtering via Neighborhood Structure Embedding. In *ICDM*.
- [17] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *ICLR*.
- [18] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ICLR*.
- [19] Yehuda Koren. 2008. Factorization meets the neighborhood: a multifaceted collaborative filtering model. In *SIGKDD*.
- [20] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. 2009. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer* (2009).
- [21] Jintang Li, Ruofan Wu, Wangbin Sun, Liang Chen, Sheng Tian, Liang Zhu, Changhua Meng, Zibin Zheng, and Weiqiang Wang. 2023. What's Behind the Mask: Understanding Masked Graph Modeling for Graph Autoencoders. In *SIGKDD*.
- [22] Zihan Lin, Changxin Tian, Yupeng Hou, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2022. Improving Graph Collaborative Filtering with Neighborhood-enriched Contrastive Learning. In *WWW*.
- [23] Kelong Mao, Jieming Zhu, Xi Xiao, Biao Lu, Zhaowei Wang, and Xiuqiang He. 2021. UltraGCN: ultra simplification of graph convolutional networks for recommendation. In *CIKM*.
- [24] Andriy Mnih and Russ R Salakhutdinov. 2007. Probabilistic matrix factorization. In *NeurIPS*.
- [25] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2018. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748* (2018).
- [26] Xubin Ren, Lianghao Xia, Jiashu Zhao, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2023. Disentangled contrastive collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*.
- [27] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *UAI*.
- [28] Badrul Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph Konstan, and John Riedl. 2001. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *WWW*.
- [29] Brent Smith and Greg Linden. 2017. Two decades of recommender systems at Amazon. com. *IEEE internet computing* (2017).
- [30] Fan-Yun Sun, Jordan Hoffmann, Vikas Verma, and Jian Tang. 2020. Infograph: Un-supervised and semi-supervised graph-level representation learning via mutual information maximization. In *ICLR*.
- [31] Jianing Sun, Yingxue Zhang, Chen Ma, Mark Coates, Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang, and Xiuqiang He. 2019. Multi-graph convolution collaborative filtering. In *ICDM*.
- [32] Yonglong Tian, Chen Sun, Ben Poole, Dilip Krishnan, Cordelia Schmid, and Phillip Isola. 2020. What makes for good views for contrastive learning?. In *NeurIPS*.
- [33] Rianne van den Berg, Thomas N Kipf, and Max Welling. 2017. Graph Convolutional Matrix Completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02263* (2017).
- [34] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *JMLR* (2008).
- [35] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph attention networks. In *ICLR*.
- [36] Petar Veličković, William Fedus, William L Hamilton, Pietro Liò, Yoshua Bengio, and R Devon Hjelm. 2019. Deep graph infomax. In *ICLR*.
- [37] Chenyang Wang, Yuanqing Yu, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Chong Chen, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2022. Towards representation alignment and uniformity in collaborative filtering. In *SIGKDD*.
- [38] Feng Wang and Huaping Liu. 2021. Understanding the behaviour of contrastive loss. In *CVPR*.
- [39] Haoqing Wang, Xun Guo, Zhi-Hong Deng, and Yan Lu. 2022. Rethinking Minimal Sufficient Representation in Contrastive Learning. In *CVPR*.
- [40] Tongzhou Wang and Phillip Isola. 2020. Understanding contrastive representation learning through alignment and uniformity on the hypersphere. In *ICML*.
- [41] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*.
- [42] Xiang Wang, Hongye Jin, An Zhang, Xiangnan He, Tong Xu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. Disentangled graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*.
- [43] Felix Wu, Amauri Souza, Tianyi Zhang, Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Weinberger. 2019. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*.
- [44] Jiancan Wu, Xiang Wang, Fuli Feng, Xiangnan He, Liang Chen, Jianxun Lian, and Xing Xie. 2021. Self-supervised graph learning for recommendation. In *SIGIR*.
- [45] Lianghao Xia, Chao Huang, Yong Xu, Jiashu Zhao, Dawei Yin, and Jimmy Xiangji Huang. 2022. Hypergraph Contrastive Collaborative Filtering. In *SIGIR*.
- [46] Jheng-Hong Yang, Chih-Ming Chen, Chuan-Ju Wang, and Ming-Feng Tsai. 2018. HOP-rec: high-order proximity for implicit recommendation. In *RecSys*.
- [47] Tiansheng Yao, Xinyang Yi, Derek Zhiyuan Cheng, Felix Yu, Ting Chen, Aditya Menon, Lichan Hong, Ed H. Chi, Steve Tjoa, Jieqi (Jay) Kang, and Evan Ettinger. 2021. Self-Supervised Learning for Large-Scale Item Recommendations. In *CIKM*.
- [48] 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 *SIGKDD*.
- [49] Junliang Yu, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Lizhen Cui, Nguyen Quoc Viet Hung, and Hongzhi Yin. 2023. XSimGCL: Towards extremely simple graph contrastive learning for recommendation. *IEEE TKDE* (2023).
- [50] Junliang Yu, Hongzhi Yin, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Lizhen Cui, and Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen. 2022. Are graph augmentations necessary? simple graph contrastive learning for recommendation. In *SIGIR*.
- [51] Guanghu Yuan, Fajie Yuan, Yudong Li, Beibei Kong, Shujie Li, Lei Chen, Min Yang, Chenyun Yu, Bo Hu, Zang Li, Yu Xu, and Xiaohu Qie. 2022. Tenrec: A Large-scale Multipurpose Benchmark Dataset for Recommender Systems. In *NeurIPS*.
- [52] Wayne Xin Zhao, Yupeng Hou, Xingyu Pan, Chen Yang, Zeyu Zhang, Zihan Lin, Jingsen Zhang, Shuqing Bian, Jiakai Tang, Wenqi Sun, Yushuo Chen, Lanling Xu, Gaowei Zhang, Zhen Tian, Changxin Tian, Shanlei Mu, Xinyan Fan, Xu Chen, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. RecBole 2.0: Towards a More Up-to-Date Recommendation Library. In *CIKM*.