

A Decoding Acceleration Framework for Industrial Deployable LLM-based Recommender Systems

Yunjia Xi*

xiyunjia@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Jianghao Lin

chiangel@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Ruiming Tang

tangruiming@huawei.com
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China

Hangyu Wang*

hangyuwang@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Menghui Zhu

zhumenghui1@huawei.com
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shanghai, China

Weinan Zhang

wnzhang@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Bo Chen

chenbo116@huawei.com
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shanghai, China

Weiwen Liu

liuweiwen8@huawei.com
Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China

Yong Yu

yyu@sjtu.edu.cn
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

ABSTRACT

Recently, increasing attention has been paid to LLM-based recommender systems, but their deployment is still under exploration in the industry. Most deployments utilize LLMs as feature enhancers, generating augmentation knowledge in the offline stage. However, in recommendation scenarios, involving numerous users and items, even offline generation with LLMs consumes considerable time and resources. This generation inefficiency stems from the autoregressive nature of LLMs, and a promising direction for acceleration is speculative decoding, a Draft-then-Verify paradigm that increases the number of generated tokens per decoding step. In this paper, we first identify that recommendation knowledge generation is suitable for retrieval-based speculative decoding. Then, we discern two characteristics: (1) extensive items and users in RSs bring **retrieval inefficiency**, and (2) RSs exhibit high **diversity tolerance** for text generated by LLMs. Based on the above insights, we propose a **Decoding Acceleration Framework for LLM-based Recommendation** (dubbed *DARE*), with **Customized Retrieval Pool** to improve retrieval efficiency, and **Relaxed Verification** to increase the acceptance rate of draft tokens, respectively. Extensive experiments demonstrate that *DARE* achieves a 3-5x speedup and is compatible with various frameworks and backbone LLMs. *DARE* has also been deployed to online advertising scenarios within a large-scale commercial environment, achieving a 3.45x speedup while maintaining the downstream performance.

1 INTRODUCTION

With the rapid evolution since 2020, large language models (LLMs) are revolutionizing numerous domains through their extensive open knowledge and powerful reasoning capabilities [4, 31, 47, 53]. In the realm of recommender systems (RSs), the integration of LLMs and RSs has emerged as a prominent research focus [10, 20, 23, 38, 45]. Commercial recommender systems typically need to process data pertaining to billions of users and items, necessitating low response

latency, often within 100 milliseconds [41]. However, LLMs' enormous parameters and considerable inference latency hinder their deployment into the pipeline of commercial RSs that demand rapid response. To handle this challenge, industrial solutions commonly involve deploying LLMs offline as feature enhancers [26, 27, 32, 39]. First, LLMs leverage their reasoning capabilities and extensive knowledge to generate augmented knowledge for recommendations – such as user profiles or tags [19] and supplementary knowledge or summaries for items [29]. This newly generated knowledge is subsequently incorporated as additional features into traditional recommendation models via text encoder [28, 39] or converting to categorical features [3, 11]. This strategy capitalizes on the extensive knowledge and sophisticated reasoning capabilities of LLMs while satisfying the response latency demands of commercial RSs.

Even when leveraging LLMs offline for knowledge generation, the recommendation scenarios, characterized by a vast number of users and items, still face significant time and resource constraints. LLMs inherently have low inference efficiency coupled with substantial resource demands. The numerous items and users in RSs require frequent invocations of LLMs, leading to considerable resource and time consumption. Taking Qwen-7B-Chat [1] as an example, it requires 4.88s to generate a piece of user preference knowledge of 250 tokens on an NVIDIA V100, and generating knowledge for an industrial-scale quantity of users, say 10 million, would take roughly 565 GPU days. Furthermore, this knowledge generation is a continual process since user preferences may vary with their behaviors, necessitating knowledge updates. Moreover, prolonged overall generation times can lead to delays in generating knowledge for new items and user behaviors, thereby impairing recommendation effectiveness. High resource consumption and low inference efficiency have emerged as significant obstacles to deploying LLMs in RSs. Thus, improving inference efficiency has become critical for the effective deployment of LLMs in RSs.

One of the bottlenecks in LLM inference stems from autoregressive decoding, which demands forwarding through a billion-parameter LLM to produce just a single token at each decoding

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.




Figure 1: Pipeline of retrieval-based speculative decoding for RSs and speedup of autoregressive decoding (Vanilla), naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (ReSD), and DARE.

step, and these steps cannot be parallelized. Recently, a promising direction for accelerating LLMs is **speculative decoding**, a *Draft-then-Verify* paradigm that increases the number of generated tokens per decoding step [15, 43]. At each decoding step, it first efficiently drafts multiple future tokens via auxiliary models or database retrieval and then verifies all these draft tokens in parallel with target LLMs to speed up inference [43]. By allowing multiple tokens to be generated in a single decoding step, speculative decoding diminishes the total number of decoding steps, thus improving inference efficiency with lossless generation accuracy.

The knowledge generation based on LLMs in RSs exhibits specific properties that make it suitable for retrieval-based speculative decoding. *Firstly, recommendation knowledge generation is a continual process.* As user behaviors evolve and new items are introduced, we need to continuously generate new knowledge for new items and users’ new behaviors, while we also possess much old knowledge about users’ past behaviors and existing items. *Secondly, there is often reusable content between new and old knowledge.* For instance, old and new user profiles may overlap due to user preference continuity. Therefore, we can utilize old knowledge as a retrieval pool to extract draft texts and then use LLMs to verify, thereby accelerating the generation of new knowledge, as shown in Figure 1(a).

However, in practice, we find that this straightforward application overlooks some traits of RSs, leading to sub-optimal acceleration performance. Firstly, extensive items and users in RSs result in **retrieval inefficiency**, which impairs acceleration. A retrieval pool constructed with existing knowledge from all the users and items would be exceedingly large, which would significantly extend retrieval times. Therefore, it is essential to maintain smaller retrieval pools with similar knowledge, ensuring both low retrieval time and a high acceptance rate of draft tokens. Secondly, RSs exhibit high **diversity tolerance** for text generated by LLMs. Downstream recommendation tasks can achieve similar outcomes with texts that are not identical but have semantic proximity. In other words, RSs do not require perfectly consistent texts, which provides speculative decoding with further room for acceleration.

Based on the aforementioned insights, in this paper, we propose a Decoding Acceleration Framework for LLM-based Recommendation (dubbed *DARE*). We introduce two key enhancements to the retrieval-based speculative decoding for recommendation. *Firstly, Customized*

Retrieval Pool is designed to enhance retrieval efficiency. We introduce collaborative-based and attribute-based retrieval pool construction schemes, with a binary router to assign the appropriate retrieval pool to users and items. These personalized, compact retrieval pools maintain knowledge similarity, thereby guaranteeing low retrieval time and high acceptance rates of draft tokens. *Next, Relaxed Verification* is devised to further enhance the acceptance rate of draft tokens. Traditional speculative decoding only accepts the token with the highest probability. We relax this restriction to top- k probable tokens, increasing the number of accepted tokens while maintaining semantic proximity. Additionally, a probability threshold is imposed to prevent divergence during generation. The contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We identify the inefficiency of knowledge generation during deploying LLM-based recommendations and propose DARE. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to introduce **speculative decoding** into **LLM-based recommendations**, further promoting the deployment of LLMs in RSs.
- We discover two key traits of speculative decoding in recommendations and implement two enhancements: **Customized Retrieval Pool** to improve retrieval efficiency and **Relaxed Verification** to increase the number of accepted draft tokens.
- Experiments on public datasets demonstrate that DARE achieves **3-5x speedup** and is compatible with various frameworks and backbone LLMs. It has been deployed to online advertising scenarios within a large-scale commercial environment, achieving a **3.45x** speedup with similar downstream performance.

2 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

2.1 Speculative Decoding for Recommendation

The mainstream Transformer-based LLMs typically adopt *autoregressive decoding*. With the input token sequence $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, the language model \mathcal{M} generate next token following:

$$x_{t+1} \sim q_{t+1} = \mathcal{M}(x|x_{\leq t}), \quad (1)$$

where q_{t+1} denotes the conditional probability distribution from \mathcal{M} and x_{t+1} is the next token sampled from q_{t+1} . After this, \mathcal{M} follows the same process to generate the next token. Despite desirable generation quality, autoregressive decoding only produces a single token per decoding step, making it inefficient and time-consuming.

To this end, *speculative decoding* [5, 15, 48] have been proposed to generate a sequence of tokens at each decoding step. It is a *Draft-then-Verify* decoding paradigm in which, at each decoding step, it first efficiently drafts multiple future tokens and then verifies all these tokens in parallel with the target LLM [43]. There are many strategy for draft generation, *e.g.*, employing a small LM [18], retrieving from database [15, 48]. Our work mainly focuses on retrieval-based draft models, which retrieve drafts from a given retrieval pool, since small LMs might lack recommendation knowledge and recommendation knowledge generation can provide appropriate retrieval pools naturally. Here, we take it as an example and delve into its two substeps – drafting and verification.

Drafting phase is responsible for efficiently drafting multiple future tokens. Formally, given an input sequence $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, a draft model $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is employed, (*e.g.*, a retriever that retrieves relevant

text from the database) to generate the next K draft tokens:

$$\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_K = \text{Draft}(x_{\leq t}, \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}), \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{x}_i, i = 1, \dots, K$ denotes the drafted token generated by $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\text{Draft}(\cdot)$ represents draft generation strategies.

Verification phase utilizes the target LLM to verify all these draft tokens in parallel. With the input sequence $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$ and the draft sequence $\{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_K\}$, the target LLM \mathcal{M} calculates $K + 1$ probability distributions simultaneously,

$$q_i = \mathcal{M}(x_{\leq t}, \tilde{x}_{< i}), i = 1, \dots, K + 1. \quad (3)$$

Then, each draft token \tilde{x}_i is sequentially verified by a specific criterion $\text{Verify}(\tilde{x}_i, q_i)$. Typically, *greedy verification* is adopted for retrieval-based speculative decoding via

$$\tilde{x}_i = \arg \max q_i. \quad (4)$$

Only \tilde{x}_i that meets the criterion in Eq (4) is selected as final output, i.e., $x_{t+i} = \tilde{x}_i$. If a drafted token \tilde{x}_c at position c fails the verification, it will be corrected by distribution q_c from target LLM, i.e., $x_{t+c} \leftarrow \arg \max q_c$. All drafted tokens after position c will be discarded, ensuring quality consistent with the target LLM's standards.

The characteristics of recommendation knowledge generation make it highly suitable for applying retrieval-based speculative decoding. Retrieval-based speculative decoding requires a retrieval pool that overlaps with the currently generated text. As user behaviors evolve and new items are introduced, we need to continuously generate new knowledge for new items and users' new behaviors, resulting in a constant stream of old knowledge about users' past behaviors and existing items. Furthermore, there are notable similarities between this old knowledge and new knowledge. For instance, parts of old and new user profiles may overlap. Consequently, we can leverage old knowledge to construct retrieval pools and utilize retrieval-based speculative decoding to accelerate the generation of new knowledge.

2.2 Finding 1: Retrieval Inefficiency

According to the above approach, we conduct preliminary experiments on the MovieLens-10M dataset, following the setting of KAR [39], which first employs LLMs to generate recommendation knowledge and then adapts the knowledge to the downstream tasks. Here, vicuna-7b-v1.3¹ is leveraged to generate fine-grained user preferences based on user behaviors. To implement retrieval-based speculative decoding, we simulate users' streaming behaviors and divide the behaviors into multiple segments. For simplicity, the user's historical behavior $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is divided into two segments: old history x_1, \dots, x_m and new history x_{n-m}, \dots, x_n , where $(\frac{n}{2} < m < n)$. Then, vicuna-7b-v1.3 generates knowledge for all the old history with autoregressive decoding, based on which a retrieval pool is constructed. During knowledge generation for new history, we adopt speculative decoding, which retrieves drafts from the retrieval pool and uses vicuna-7b-v1.3 to validate.

Under the above conditions, we explore how the token generation speed (Gen. Speed) and the proportion of time spent retrieving relevant text to the total time (Retrieval Time Ratio) change when constructing the retrieval pool with different numbers of old knowledge samples (ranging from 10 to the maximum number of users) in

Figure 2. In this figure, generation speed initially rises and then falls as the number of knowledge entries in the retrieval pool increases. When the retrieval pool is constructed with all users' old knowledge, the retrieval time ratio exceeds 20%, causing generation speed to drop from its peak of 134.5 token/s to 94.8 token/s, significantly affecting the acceleration. When faced with an industrial-scale number of users, such as 10 million, the retrieval pool becomes larger, which will exacerbate the retrieval inefficiency.




Figure 2: The impact of retrieval pool size.

Therefore, a large retrieval pool is not always advantageous. Although a larger retrieval pool can provide a greater volume of pertinent content, it also brings retrieval inefficiency, thereby impairing acceleration. It is imperative to construct an optimal retrieval pool that maintains low retrieval time while encompassing content similar to the text being generated.

2.3 Finding 2: Diversity Tolerance

Furthermore, we also investigate the impact of the diversity of LLM-generated texts on downstream tasks. Similar to the previous experiment, we leverage vicuna-7b-v1.3 to generate user preference knowledge on MovieLens-10M. However, during generation, we sample from the top- k most likely tokens to create approximate but diverse texts. We then adapt the encoding of knowledge from BERT to the CTR prediction task in RSs following [39]. Specifically, we generate four different sets of user preference knowledge for all the users in the dataset. The knowledge is then applied to two well-known CTR models, DIN [50] and DCNv2 [37], with their performance in terms of AUC and Logloss presented in Table 1. In the table, "**w/o augment**" refers to results without knowledge augmentation, while "**knowledge 1**" to "**knowledge 4**" denotes results augmented with knowledge generated under different samplings.

Table 1: Performance comparison between CTR models augmented by different knowledge.

Method	DIN		DCNv2	
	AUC	LL	AUC	LL
w/o augment	0.8163	0.3619	0.8115	0.3663
knowledge 1	0.8351	0.3469	0.8319	0.3500
knowledge 2	0.8353	0.3465	0.8314	0.3503
knowledge 3	0.8347	0.3466	0.8319	0.3499
knowledge 4	0.8349	0.3470	0.8323	0.3501

The results in the table indicate that recommendation tasks exhibit a high diversity tolerance for LLM-generated knowledge texts.

¹<https://huggingface.co/lmsys/vicuna-7b-v1.3>

Compared to models without augmentation, knowledge augmentation can result in a significant improvement, ranging from 1.5% to 2%. However, the performance difference between the diverse knowledge texts (knowledge 1-4) applied to downstream tasks is less than 0.1%, showing that recommendation tasks are not sensitive to the diversity of LLM-generated texts.

Previously, retrieval-based speculative decoding typically adopts greedy verification, which only accepts the token with the highest probability to ensure text consistency with autoregressive decoding. However, this strict verification limits the acceptance rate of draft tokens. Given that downstream tasks in RSs can tolerate diverse LLM texts, we can consider relaxing the verification, allowing speculative decoding to accept more draft tokens and generate more diverse texts, thereby further enhancing the acceleration.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

Based on the findings above, we have devised two enhancements for retrieval-based speculative decoding in recommendation knowledge generation. The **Customized Retrieval Pool** involves creating smaller retrieval pools tailored for similar items or users, thereby achieving low retrieval time. **Relaxed Verification** loosens the condition of greedy verification, which only accepts the highest probability token, to include the top- k most likely tokens, thereby increasing the acceptance rate of draft tokens.

The workflow of our proposed DARE, illustrated in Figure 3, encompasses three stages: customized retrieval pool construction, tree-based drafting, and relaxed verification. Before text generation, **customized retrieval pool construction** stage uses previously generated recommendation knowledge to build personalized retrieval pools in the form of trie tree [8]. We first divide the users and items into different groups and then construct a retrieval pool for each group. The subsequent stage, **tree-based drafting**, retrieves relevant content from the designated retrieval pool when generating new knowledge for a specific user or item. This process yields a pseudo-sequence from a trie subtree that encapsulates multiple potential successor texts with an associated attention mask, subsequently validated in parallel by the target LLM. In the **relaxed verification** stage, we accept tokens from the top- k highest-probability tokens that exceed a certain probability threshold p . This allows more draft tokens to be accepted and prevents divergence during generation, further improving the generation speed.

3.2 Customized Retrieval Pool Construction

As mentioned in Section 2.3, a customized retrieval pool requires moderate capacity and internal knowledge similarity. This necessitates the partition of users and items, with distinct retrieval pools assigned to different groups. To maintain knowledge similarity, we can incorporate collaborative signals to group similar users and items. A common method involves clustering items or users based on their embeddings derived from recommendation models trained on user-item interactions. However, newly introduced users and items may have limited or no interaction records, making it challenging to obtain reliable embeddings. Considering that users or items with similar attributes may be more alike, their attributes can serve as a basis for constructing similar groups. Therefore, we

design two retrieval pool construction schemes: one based on collaborative signals and the other on attributes. A binary router is devised to choose a retrieval pool for each user and item.

Collaborative-based retrieval pool groups items or users by clustering their embeddings that reflect collaborative signals. Initially, a recommendation model is trained on user-item interactions (e.g., LightGCN [14]) and subsequently provides related embeddings, such as those of IDs and attributes. Given that RSs continuously train models for recommendations, we can re-utilize these embeddings. When clustering algorithms, such as K-means [17], are applied to these embeddings to obtain distinct user or item groups. Users or items within the same cluster exhibit similarities, thereby ensuring that the knowledge generated by LLMs is more homogeneous. This, in turn, increases the probability of retrieving relevant texts.

Attribute-based retrieval pool partitions items or users without many interaction records by similar attributes. Although they lack interaction records to obtain well-trained embedding, they possess inherent attributes. Items or users with similar attributes are more likely to exhibit higher similarity, resulting in more consistent knowledge generation by LLMs. Thus, items or users with analogous attributes, such as category, can be placed in the same group. If the sizes of groups formed based on general attributes like category exceed a certain threshold, we further subdivide them with additional attributes, e.g., subcategory, which is selected by manually crafted rules or decision trees.

Subsequently, for each item or user in a group, if there is previously generated knowledge from LLMs, this knowledge will be used to construct a retrieval pool for this group in the form of a trie tree [8]. Trie tree is a data structure widely used for efficient retrieval and storage, as it efficiently handles prefix matching with each node as individual characters or words. Each group maintains its own trie tree, where each node represents a token and a path from the root node to a leaf node constitutes a branch [48]. These branches built with previously generated knowledge mentioned above are all **permanent branches** that would not be eliminated. During the generation of new knowledge, the current prompt and newly generated text are also relevant to subsequent generations. Therefore, we dynamically add the prompt and new content to the trie tree as **temporary branch** for the generation of each knowledge. As these additions may not necessarily enhance the acceleration of other knowledge generation, the branch will be eliminated once the generation is completed.

After constructing the collaborative-based and attribute-based retrieval pools, a **binary router** is designed to select the appropriate retrieval pool for users and items needing knowledge generation. It is highly flexible and can support various selection schemes. Based on our motivation, the default scheme is to select the collaborative-based retrieval pool for items and users with extensive interaction histories, while new users and items with few or no interactions are assigned to the attribute-based retrieval pool.

3.3 Tree-based Drafting

Before generating new knowledge for a user or item, we identify the corresponding retrieval pool D based on their binary router, IDs, and attributes. During the knowledge generation, we first retrieve the relevant sub-tree from D based on the current input text, which




Figure 3: Comparison between naive retrieval-based speculative decoding, ReSD, (above) and our proposed DARE (below). In the illustration, we take users as examples, and the same process is applicable to items. Note that the retrieved tree-structured draft is converted into a pseudo-sequence for parallel validation, which will be detailed in Section 3.3.

represents multiple potential successor sequences. Next, the pseudo-sequence, attention mask matrix, and position IDs for this sub-tree are generated to facilitate parallel validation by the target LLM with tree attention. Specifically, assuming the current input sequence is $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, the last n tokens of the input sequence are adopted as a prefix to extract a sub-tree T_t from D as follows

$$T_t = \text{Retrieve}(D, \{x_{t-n}, \dots, x_t\}, K) \quad (5)$$

where $\text{Retrieve}(\cdot)$ denotes retrieving a sub-tree from the trie tree with a prefix, and K is the maximum length of draft tokens. The sub-tree T_t is also a prefix tree, with each branch representing a potential successor draft sequence. Short prefixes yield a lot of content but may not be highly relevant, while long prefixes ensure high relevance but might fail to retrieve any content. Therefore, we will dynamically adjust n during the retrieval process following [48]. Initially, a relatively large n , *i.e.*, a long prefix, is used to guarantee relevance. If the number of retrieved tokens is significantly fewer than the maximum length K , we decrease n to retry the retrieval process further until obtaining a substantial number of tokens. Conversely, if the number of retrieved tokens exceeds K , the tokens with the highest frequency are selected as draft tokens.




Figure 4: Tree attention.

To reduce the number of decoding steps and increase the possibility of draft tokens being accepted, we aim to validate multiple possible draft sequences from the token tree T_t in a single forward

pass of the target LLM. Thus, we utilize the tree attention [30, 48] commonly employed in speculative decoding to validate multiple potential draft sequences in parallel, as illustrated in Figure 4. This mechanism constructs a pseudo-sequence $S_t = \{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_K\}$ for token tree T_t with a depth-first search algorithm. Note that the length of S_t may not always reach the maximum length K ; here, we use K for simplicity. Concurrently, it adjusts the attention mask M_t and position IDs P_t so that each node in the token tree can only see the preceding nodes on the current branch, ensuring that draft sequences from different branches do not interfere with each other.

3.4 Relaxed Verification

At this stage, the target LLM will input the original input sequence $\{x_1, \dots, x_t\}$, the pseudo-sequence $S_t = \{\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_K\}$, tree attention mask M_t , and position IDs P_t obtained during the drafting phase. It then performs a single forward for parallel validation of all the draft sequences, yielding conditional probability at each position:

$$q_i = \mathcal{M}(x_{\leq t}, \tilde{x}_{\leq i}, P_t, M_t), \quad i = 1, \dots, K + 1, \quad (6)$$

where q_i denotes the probability distribution of all the tokens in the vocabulary, and \mathcal{M} is the target LLM. In strict/greedy verification, we start from the first position and check if the token \tilde{x}_i at the current position i equals the token with the highest probability in q_i following Eq (4). If they match, we accept the token \tilde{x}_i ; otherwise, we reject it. Similarly, if a predecessor node in the token tree T_t is rejected, all of its successor nodes will be skipped. We then proceed to validate the next feasible branch, ultimately accepting the verified branch with the maximum length.

Since we find that recommendation tasks exhibit a high diversity tolerance of LLM-generated knowledge texts in Section 2.3, the strict verification could be relaxed to further enhance the generation speed. Therefore, we expand the verification criteria from the highest probability token to the top- k probable tokens, *i.e.*,

$$\tilde{x}_i \in \text{TopK}(q_i, k), \quad (7)$$

where the function $\text{TopK}(\cdot)$ selects the tokens with the top- k probabilities in q_i . However, our experiments in Section 4.3.1 indicate that merely relaxing this constraint can lead to divergent generations, where the text generated in this way is significantly longer than that with autoregressive decoding. This may occur because tokens amongst top- k probabilities, e.g., $e \in \text{TopK}(q_i, k)$, might still have very low actual probabilities $q_i(e)$. Thus, we also impose a probability threshold p to the actual probability and obtain:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{x}_i \in \text{TopK}(q_i, k), \\ q_i(\tilde{x}_i) > p, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $q_i(\tilde{x}_i)$ represents the probability of \tilde{x}_i in distribution q_i and the token \tilde{x}_i is accepted only if it meets two conditions in Eq (8). This relaxed verification enhances the acceptance rate of draft tokens by relaxing the highest probability to the top- k probabilities and effectively prevents divergent generations via the probability threshold p , which is validated in Section 4.3.1.

4 EXPERIMENT

To gain more insights into DARE, we tend to address the following research questions (RQs) in this section.

- **RQ1:** How does DARE perform versus naive retrieval-based speculative decoding under various LLM-based RS frameworks?
- **RQ2:** What roles do DARE’s two modules, customized retrieval pool and relaxed verification, play in its performance?
- **RQ3:** How compatible is DARE with different LLMs?
- **RQ4:** How does DARE perform in industrial scenarios?

4.1 Setup

4.1.1 Dataset. Our experiments are conducted on two public datasets, **MovieLens-10M**² (ML-10M for short) and **Amazon-Books**³. The preprocessing of datasets, including the knowledge generation and downstream task, mainly following [39]. Additionally, we simulate streaming behaviors and divide the user’s historical behaviors into two segments, old and new histories, as mentioned in Section 2.2. All items are randomly divided into two equally sized groups: one group as existing items and the other as newly introduced items. To construct retrieval pools, we first employ LLMs to generate old knowledge for users’ old histories and existing items with autoregressive decoding. Then, experiments on acceleration and downstream tasks are conducted on the new history and new items. More details about datasets can be found in Appendix A.

4.1.2 Backbone Framework and Baselines. As DARE is a model-agnostic decoding strategy, it can accelerate a wide range of recommendation knowledge generation tasks and frameworks. To validate DARE’s acceleration performance across different frameworks, we select several typical LLM-based recommendation frameworks, including **KAR** [39], **TRAWL** [28], **ONCE** [26] and **RLMRec** [32]. These frameworks roughly encompass two major categories of tasks: **user and item knowledge generation**, despite the specific task instructions may vary, such as user and item profiling or knowledge extraction. Besides, we implement the naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (**ReSD**) as a baseline. This method uses all

historical knowledge to construct a prefix tree as a global retrieval pool and employs greedy verification to ensure that generated texts are consistent with autoregressive decoding. It also adopts tree attention to remove the impact of this mechanism on acceleration.

To validate our model’s performance on downstream tasks, we select a crucial task in RSs, **CTR prediction**, as the downstream task following [28, 39], and choose two representative CTR models, **DIN** [50] and **DCNv2** [37]. The knowledge generated from the four frameworks mentioned above is first encoded by BERT and then adapted to these two models, and we also compare their performance with different speedup strategies, DARE and ReSD.

4.1.3 Evaluation Metrics. For acceleration, we use *Gen. Speed*, which measures the number of tokens generated per second, and *Speedup*, the ratio of the generation speed of the acceleration scheme to that of autoregressive decoding following [48]. During ablation, we adapt *AAL* (average acceptance length), which indicates the average number of draft tokens accepted per decoding step, and *ART* (average retrieval time), representing the average time spent retrieving drafts from retrieval pool for each piece of knowledge. For the downstream task, we employed two commonly used metrics in CTR prediction: *AUC* and *Logloss (LL for short)* [37, 39, 50].

4.1.4 Reproducibility. All the acceleration experiments on public datasets are conducted on the same NVIDIA RTX 4090 with 24GB memory and 64 CPU cores⁴. Unless specified, the LLMs employed in these experiments refer to vicuna-7b-v1.3, whose generation speed is 37.4 tokens/s with autoregressive decoding. Our binary router assigns users to a collaborative-based retrieval pool and items to an attribute-based retrieval pool. The collaborative-based retrieval pool adopts K-means clustering with embeddings from LightGCN [14]. The number of retrieval pools ranges from 3 to 10 for both approaches. As for verification, we typically set $k = 2$ and $p = 0.1$. More details can be found in Appendix A

4.2 Overall Performance (RQ1)

The acceleration and the downstream performance of DARE are two key aspects we need to investigate. First, we compare DARE with naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (ReSD) two tasks (user and item knowledge generation) under four LLM-based recommendation frameworks. Next, we utilize DARE and ReSD to generate knowledge for all new user histories and items, adapting this knowledge to DIN and DCNv2 according to different frameworks’ designs. The above results are presented in Table 2.

From the acceleration results, we draw the following observations: (i) DARE consistently outperforms ReSD in terms of acceleration across different frameworks and tasks. For instance, in the user knowledge generation task of KAR on Amazon-Books, DARE achieves an acceleration of 4.77× compared to ReSD’s 1.71×, showcasing an improvement of 178%. This demonstrates that the two optimizations of DARE significantly enhance speedup performance in generating recommendation knowledge. (ii) The speedup for user knowledge generation is more significant than that for item knowledge generation, with DARE showing greater improvement over ReSD on the user side. DARE achieves an acceleration of 3.86x-4.92x for users, compared to 2.14x-3.28x for items. This may be

²<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/10m/>

³https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~jmcauley/datasets/amazon_v2/

⁴Our code will be available at https://github.com/YunjiaXi/DARE_code.

Table 2: Speedup and downstream performance of naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (ReSD) and DARE.

Frame-work	Speedup Method	ML-10M								Amazon-Books							
		Speedup Performance				Downstream Performance				Speedup Performance				Downstream Performance			
		User Task		Item Task		DIN		DCNv2		User Task		Item Task		DIN		DCNv2	
		Gen. Speed	Speedup	Gen. Speed	Speedup	AUC	LL	AUC	LL	Gen. Speed	Speedup	Gen. Speed	Speedup	AUC	LL	AUC	LL
base	/	/	/	/	/	0.8163	0.3619	0.8115	0.3663	/	/	/	/	0.8269	0.5041	0.8241	0.5075
KAR	ReSD	94.8	2.53×	82.8	2.21×	0.8351	0.3469	0.8319	0.3500	64.3	1.71×	75.2	2.01×	0.8360	0.4962	0.8308	0.5000
	DARE	171.3	4.58×	107.3	2.87×	0.8349	0.3474	0.8318	0.3500	178.9	4.77×	123.0	3.28×	0.8358	0.4965	0.8306	0.4996
TRAWL	ReSD	70.9	1.90×	81.4	2.18×	0.8338	0.3485	0.8314	0.3506	82.2	2.19×	76.9	2.05×	0.8311	0.4997	0.8301	0.5005
	DARE	164.9	4.41×	100.5	2.69×	0.8336	0.3485	0.8314	0.3506	144.6	3.86×	120.2	3.21×	0.8311	0.4998	0.8300	0.5005
ONCE	ReSD	68.9	1.84×	66.3	1.77×	0.8321	0.3511	0.8283	0.3537	71.7	1.91×	60.1	1.60×	0.8337	0.4952	0.8289	0.5016
	DARE	154.9	4.14×	80.2	2.14×	0.8319	0.3511	0.8286	0.3529	184.5	4.92×	100.1	2.67×	0.8332	0.4956	0.8285	0.5017
RLMRec	ReSD	62.0	1.66×	85.2	2.28×	0.8301	0.3516	0.8281	0.3534	61.0	1.63×	56.3	1.50×	0.8378	0.4904	0.8325	0.4964
	DARE	152.8	4.09×	113.7	3.04×	0.8301	0.3515	0.8282	0.3537	150.5	4.01×	116.8	3.11×	0.8380	0.4903	0.8327	0.4962

due to user preferences continuity, resulting in higher similarity between old and new user knowledge.

From the downstream performance, we make the following observations: (i) Knowledge generated by LLMs significantly enhances downstream task performance, with the extent of enhancement varying across frameworks and datasets. For instance, on ML-10M, knowledge from KAR provides a 2.3% improvement in AUC for DIN. (ii) Across different frameworks, datasets, and backbone CTR models, the performance difference between knowledge generated by DARE and ReSD on downstream tasks is negligible. This indicates that DARE can maintain the performance of downstream tasks while providing significant acceleration of knowledge generation.

4.3 In-depth Analysis


4.3.1 Ablation Study (RQ2). To validate the effectiveness of the two modules we designed in DARE, Customized Retrieval Pool and Relaxed Verification, we conduct ablation and further analysis experiments on them. First, we create several variants for the Customized Retrieval Pool: **GRP** utilizes all the old knowledge to generate a global retrieval pool, **CRP** represents our designed Customized Retrieval Pool, and **RRP** employs random grouping to create retrieval pools with the same size of CRP. These variants are incorporated with greedy verification, whereas **RV+GRP**, **DARE**, and **RV+RRP** are their respective versions enhanced by Relaxed Verification (RV). We examine the performance of these variants and our DARE on user knowledge generation task within framework KAR, whose results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Ablation of DARE.

Variants	ML-10M				Amazon-Books			
	AAL	ART	Gen. Speed	Speedup	AAL	ART	Gen. Speed	Speedup
GRP	6.2	1.019	94.8	2.53×	5.64	4.120	64.3	1.71×
RRP	5.41	0.383	128.6	3.44×	5.12	0.181	128.7	3.43×
CRP	5.51	0.121	136.3	3.64×	5.29	0.218	139.5	3.72×
RV+GRP	8.32	1.976	88.7	2.37×	7.25	7.235	57.4	1.53×
RV+RRP	7.41	0.215	162.2	4.34×	6.63	0.344	155.6	4.15×
DARE	7.54	0.064	171.3	4.58×	6.76	0.108	178.9	4.77×

Firstly, our designed Customized Retrieval Pool (CRP) significantly enhances generation speed, attributed to CRP’s ability to reduce Average Retrieval Time (ART) while maintaining a relatively high Average Acceptance Length (AAL), average number of draft tokens accepted per decoding step. Compared to the global retrieval

pool (GRP), CRP drastically reduces retrieval time from retrieval pools, and it achieves higher AAL than random grouping retrieval pools (RRP) of the same size. This demonstrates that CRP maintains moderate capacity and content similarity. Secondly, Relaxed Verification (RV) boosts token acceptance rates, leading to higher AAL when combined with any retrieval pool. Although the global pool combined with RV (GRP+RV) yields the highest AAL due to its comprehensive content, its large retrieval pool also extends retrieval time, thus hindering overall generation speed. Finally, CRP and RV complement each other; their combination results in reduced retrieval time and higher token acceptance rates. This synergy allows our method, DARE, to achieve a faster generation speed.

**Figure 5: Ablation on Relaxed Verification.**

Next, we delve deeper into relaxed verification by designing several variants: **top-1** employs greedy verification, **top-k** satisfies only Eq (7) by accepting tokens with the highest top-k ($k = 2$) probabilities, and **top-p** explores the effect of only meeting the probability threshold, that is accepting tokens with highest probability or absolute probabilities greater than p ($p = 0.1$). **RV** is our designed Relaxed Verification that meets the condition in Eq (8) with $k = 2$ and $p = 0.1$. We investigate the difference in the number of generated tokens and generation speed on the user knowledge generation task within the framework KAR, as shown in Figure 5.

The results show that compared to the original top-1, both top-k, top-p, and RV significantly enhance generation speed. However, top-k suffers from divergent generation issues, leading to a substantial increase in the number of generated tokens. This ultimately lengthens the total generation time, sometimes surpassing that of top-1 (refer to Appendix C), thus failing to achieve practical acceleration. Top-p’s performance is inconsistent; it causes divergent generation in Amazon-Books, whereas in ML-10M, the length of

the generated text is notably shortened. By combining these approaches, RV achieves a similar length of text generated to that of top-1 while maintaining a generation speed similar to top-k.

4.3.2 Compatibility Study (RQ3). Previous experiments involved the compatibility of DARE across different datasets, frameworks, and tasks. This section investigates the compatibility of DARE with various backbone LLMs. We select some widely used LLMs, e.g., **Mistral-7B-instruct-v0.2**, **ChatGLM2-6B**, **vicuna-7B-v1.5**, **Qwen-7B-Chat**, and **Qwen-1.8B-Chat**, and present DARE’s acceleration performance on user/item knowledge generation tasks within the framework KAR in Table 7. Note that the autoregressive generation speeds of different LLMs vary; we have included the table with these generation speeds (Vanilla) in the Appendix B due to page limitations. Firstly, across various backbone LLMs, our proposed DARE consistently and significantly outperforms ReSD, demonstrating DARE’s strong compatibility with different backbone LLMs. Secondly, DARE usually exhibits better acceleration effects on larger LLMs. For instance, on Amazon-Book, DARE achieves accelerations of 5.10x and 4.69x for Qwen-7B-Chat, while for Qwen-1.8B-Chat, the accelerations are 4.77x and 3.98x.

Table 4: Speedup comparison between naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (ReSD) and DARE with various LLMs.

Backbone LLM	Side	Speedup Method	ML-10M		Amazon-Books	
			Gen. Speed	Speedup	Gen. Speed	Speedup
Mistral-7B-Instruct	user	ReSD	66.10	1.60×	91.4	2.21×
		DARE	179.00	4.33×	178.9	4.32×
	item	ReSD	80.60	1.95×	59.4	1.43×
		DARE	95.30	2.31×	121.5	2.93×
ChatGLM2-6B	user	ReSD	107.40	2.52×	89.1	2.10×
		DARE	194.70	4.57×	165.0	3.88×
	item	ReSD	94.30	2.21×	71.1	1.67×
		DARE	106.80	2.51×	117.7	2.77×
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	user	ReSD	101.10	2.67×	62.4	1.70×
		DARE	167.80	4.44×	173.3	4.72×
	item	ReSD	91.10	2.41×	83.3	2.27×
		DARE	112.20	2.97×	123.9	3.38×
Qwen-7B-Chat	user	ReSD	88.10	2.94×	69.60	2.33×
		DARE	169.00	5.63×	152.40	5.10×
	item	ReSD	71.90	2.40×	68.70	2.30×
		DARE	87.10	2.90×	140.10	4.69×
Qwen-1.8B-Chat	user	ReSD	78.60	1.92×	105.90	2.58×
		DARE	220.00	5.38×	196.20	4.77×
	item	ReSD	112.40	2.75×	76.20	1.85×
		DARE	149.20	3.65×	163.60	3.98×

4.4 Industrial Application (RQ4)

Beyond public datasets, we also conduct experiments and deployment in industrial scenarios. We choose a large-scale commercial advertising scenario where an existing LLMs-based knowledge generation solution is deployed and significant improvements are achieved. This solution invokes LLMs to analyze advertisements from diverse aspects, e.g., their characteristics, potential target audience, competitive advantages, etc., and then applies the encoding of generated text to a downstream CTR model. We integrate ReSD and

DARE into the LLMs generation task within this scenario and obtain the results in Table 5. The results indicate that DARE achieves a 3.45x speedup, with a 26% improvement over ReSD.

Table 5: Speedup comparison on industrial scenarios.

Method	Vanilla	ReSD	DARE
Gen. Speed	27.3	74.6	94.2
Speedup	1.00×	2.73×	3.45×

Next, we explore whether the knowledge generated by DARE impacts downstream tasks in industrial scenarios. We employ DARE and ReSD to generate advertisement knowledge and compare their performance applied to CTR model DFFM [13], as presented in Table 6. "Base" indicates the absence of LLM-generated knowledge enhancement, while "DARE" and "ReSD" means the CTR model directly utilizes the generated knowledge. "DARE-cluster" and "ReSD-cluster" refer to a commonly used optimization approach in the industry, where the encoding of generated knowledge is converted into categorical features through clustering prior to its application in the CTR model. The results in the table reveal that DARE achieves enhancements comparable to those of ReSD under both direct utilization and clustering optimization, indicating that DARE can sustain acceleration without compromising downstream performance.

Table 6: Downstream performance on industrial scenarios.

Method	Base	ReSD	DARE	ReSD-cluster	DARE-cluster
AUC	0.7374	0.7396	0.7393	0.7409	0.7405

Currently, DARE has been deployed in this scenario. We find that DARE can reduce the overall generation time to approximately one-third of the original while maintaining the original recommendation performance. Besides, DARE only requires modifying the decoding strategy of offline LLMs without affecting the online serving, making it easy to extend to other scenarios.

5 RELATED WORK

5.1 LLM-based Recommendation

The advent of LLMs has brought substantial transformations to many fields, and in recent years, numerous studies have emerged applying LLMs to RSs. Based on how LLMs are utilized, LLM-based recommendations can be categorized into two types. One type involves employing LLMs directly as recommenders to generate recommendations. Generally, zero-shot LLMs underperform compared to traditional models in recommendation tasks [7, 12, 16, 22, 25, 36, 40]. However, LLMs fine-tuned on recommendation data often surpass traditional models [2, 24, 46, 49, 52], such as TALLREC [2] and ReLLa [24]. Despite these advancements, deploying LLMs as recommenders poses significant challenges due to their high inference latency, which is incompatible with the low-latency requirements of RSs. The other line of work leverages LLMs offline as feature enhancers for traditional recommendation models [9, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 39]. For example, KAR [39] designs factorization prompting to elicit accurate reasoning on user and item knowledge and employs a hybrid-expert adaptor to adapt the knowledge to the recommendation tasks. This approach avoids the high

online serving latency of LLMs, making it the mainstream method for integrating LLMs into industrial recommender systems.

Our work focuses on the latter, a more deployable approach. We aim to mitigate the high time and resource consumption when using LLMs offline to generate knowledge for large-scale industrial RSs, specifically by introducing speculative decoding.

5.2 Speculative Decoding

Although LLMs have achieved remarkable proficiency in many fields, their inference latency is a significant obstacle to their widespread application. This inefficiency primarily stems from the autoregressive nature of LLMs, where only one token is generated per decoding step. To accelerate LLMs' inference, speculative decoding has been proposed [18, 35, 42]. This method first efficiently drafts multiple tokens and then utilizes the target LLM to verify parallelly, allowing multiple tokens to be generated in a single decoding step [43]. Current research focuses on two main areas: how to draft and how to verify. The former aims to design effective drafters to produce draft tokens meeting the target LLMs' requirements efficiently. This includes retrieving relevant text from databases [15, 48], generating text with smaller models from the same series [6, 18], using the target LLM for self-drafting [5, 34, 35, 44], and employing knowledge distillation to align the target LLM with the drafter [5, 21, 35, 51]. The latter explores how to verify more draft sequences to improve the token acceptance rate, such as token tree verification [5, 15, 21, 30, 48].

The above works are primarily focused on accelerating general text generation tasks. We find that retrieval-based speculative decoding is particularly suitable for recommendations, and there is potential for further improvement in the acceleration of recommendations. To this end, we have designed two enhancements to further improve the performance of speculative decoding.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we identify the issue of inference efficiency during deploying LLM-based recommendations and introduce speculative decoding to accelerate recommendation knowledge generation. Based on characteristics of speculative decoding in recommendations, we design two key optimizations: Customized Retrieval Pool to reduce retrieval time and Relaxed Verification to increase the number of accepted tokens. Experiments demonstrate that DARE achieves a 3-5x speedup, and it has been deployed to online advertising scenarios within a large-scale commercial environment.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609* (2023).
- [2] Keqin Bao, Jizhi Zhang, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 1007–1014.
- [3] Alexander Brinkmann, Roece Shraga, and Christian Bizer. 2023. Product Attribute Value Extraction using Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12537* (2023).
- [4] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712* (2023).
- [5] Tianle Cai, Yuhong Li, Zhengyang Geng, Hongwu Peng, Jason D Lee, Deming Chen, and Tri Dao. 2024. Medusa: Simple llm inference acceleration framework with multiple decoding heads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10774* (2024).
- [6] Charlie Chen, Sebastian Borgeaud, Geoffrey Irving, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Laurent Sifre, and John Jumper. 2023. Accelerating large language model decoding with speculative sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01318* (2023).
- [7] Sunhao Dai, Ninglu Shao, Haiyuan Zhao, Weijie Yu, Zihua Si, Chen Xu, Zhongxiang Sun, Xiao Zhang, and Jun Xu. 2023. Uncovering ChatGPT's Capabilities in Recommender Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02182* (2023).
- [8] Rene De La Briandais. 1959. File searching using variable length keys. In *Papers presented at the March 3-5, 1959, western joint computer conference*. 295–298.
- [9] Kounianhua Du, Jizheng Chen, Jianghao Lin, Yunjia Xi, Hangyu Wang, Xinyi Dai, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, and Weinan Zhang. 2024. DisCo: Towards Harmonious Disentanglement and Collaboration between Tabular and Semantic Space for Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00011* (2024).
- [10] Wenqi Fan, Zihuai Zhao, Jiatong Li, Yunqing Liu, Xiaowei Mei, Yiqi Wang, Jiliang Tang, and Qing Li. 2023. Recommender systems in the era of large language models (llms). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02046* (2023).
- [11] Chenhao Fang, Xiaohan Li, Zehong Fan, Jianpeng Xu, Kaushiki Nag, Evren Korpeoglu, Sushant Kumar, and Kannan Achan. 2024. LLM-Ensemble: Optimal Large Language Model Ensemble Method for E-commerce Product Attribute Value Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2910–2914.
- [12] Yunfan Gao, Tao Sheng, Youlin Xiang, Yun Xiong, Haofen Wang, and Jiawei Zhang. 2023. Chat-REC: Towards Interactive and Explainable LLMs-Augmented Recommender System. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14524* (2023).
- [13] Wei Guo, Chenxu Zhu, Fan Yan, Bo Chen, Weiwen Liu, Huifeng Guo, Hongkun Zheng, Yong Liu, and Ruiming Tang. 2023. DFFM: Domain Facilitated Feature Modeling for CTR Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 4602–4608.
- [14] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 639–648.
- [15] Zhenyu He, Zexuan Zhong, Tianle Cai, Jason D Lee, and Di He. 2023. Rest: Retrieval-based speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08252* (2023).
- [16] Yupeng Hou, Junjie Zhang, Zihan Lin, Hongyu Lu, Ruobing Xie, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2024. Large language models are zero-shot rankers for recommender systems. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 364–381.
- [17] K Krishna and M Narasimha Murty. 1999. Genetic K-means algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)* 29, 3 (1999), 433–439.
- [18] Yaniv Leviathan, Matan Kalman, and Yossi Matias. 2023. Fast inference from transformers via speculative decoding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 19274–19286.
- [19] Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, Jiayong Mao, Dian Li, and Ying Shan. 2023. TagGPT: Large Language Models are Zero-shot Multimodal Taggers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03022* (2023).
- [20] Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, Dugang Liu, and Li Chen. 2023. Large Language Models for Generative Recommendation: A Survey and Visionary Discussions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01157* (2023).
- [21] Yuhui Li, Fangyun Wei, Chao Zhang, and Hongyang Zhang. 2024. Eagle: Speculative sampling requires rethinking feature uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15077* (2024).
- [22] Jianghao Lin, Bo Chen, Hangyu Wang, Yunjia Xi, Yanru Qu, Xinyi Dai, Kangning Zhang, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. 2024. ClickPrompt: CTR Models are Strong Prompt Generators for Adapting Language Models to CTR Prediction. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 3319–3330.
- [23] Jianghao Lin, Xinyi Dai, Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Bo Chen, Xiangyang Li, Chenxu Zhu, Huifeng Guo, Yong Yu, Ruiming Tang, et al. 2023. How Can Recommender Systems Benefit from Large Language Models: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05817* (2023).
- [24] Jianghao Lin, Rong Shan, Chenxu Zhu, Kounianhua Du, Bo Chen, Shigang Quan, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. 2024. Rella: Retrieval-enhanced large language models for lifelong sequential behavior comprehension in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 3497–3508.
- [25] Junling Liu, Chao Liu, Renjie Lv, Kang Zhou, and Yan Zhang. 2023. Is ChatGPT a Good Recommender? A Preliminary Study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10149* (2023).
- [26] Qijiong Liu, Nuo Chen, Tetsuya Sakai, and Xiao-Ming Wu. 2024. Once: Boosting content-based recommendation with both open- and closed-source large language models. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 452–461.
- [27] Zhenghao Liu, Zulong Chen, Moufeng Zhang, Shaoyang Duan, Hong Wen, Liangyue Li, Nan Li, Yu Gu, and Ge Yu. 2024. Modeling User Viewing Flow using Large Language Models for Article Recommendation. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 83–92.

- [28] Weiqing Luo, Chonggang Song, Lingling Yi, and Gong Cheng. 2024. KELLM-Rec: Knowledge-Enhanced Large Language Models for Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06642* (2024).
- [29] Hanjia Lyu, Song Jiang, Hanqing Zeng, Yinglong Xia, and Jiebo Luo. 2023. Llm-rec: Personalized recommendation via prompting large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15780* (2023).
- [30] Xupeng Miao, Gabriele Oliaro, Zhihao Zhang, Xinhao Cheng, Zeyu Wang, Zhengxin Zhang, Rae Ying Yee Wong, Alan Zhu, Lijie Yang, Xiaoxiang Shi, et al. 2024. Specinfer: Accelerating large language model serving with tree-based speculative inference and verification. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3*. 932–949.
- [31] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. CoRR abs/2303.08774 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>
- [32] Xubin Ren, Wei Wei, Lianghao Xia, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Junfeng Wang, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024. Representation learning with large language models for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 3464–3475.
- [33] Yankun Ren, Zhongde Chen, Xinxing Yang, Longfei Li, Cong Jiang, Lei Cheng, Bo Zhang, Linjian Mo, and Jun Zhou. 2024. Enhancing Sequential Recommenders with Augmented Knowledge from Aligned Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 345–354.
- [34] Andrea Santilli, Silvio Severino, Emilian Postolache, Valentino Maiorca, Michele Mancusi, Riccardo Marin, and Emanuele Rodolà. 2023. Accelerating transformer inference for translation via parallel decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10427* (2023).
- [35] Mitchell Stern, Noam Shazeer, and Jakob Uszkoreit. 2018. Blockwise parallel decoding for deep autoregressive models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31 (2018).
- [36] Hangyu Wang, Jianghao Lin, Xiangyang Li, Bo Chen, Chenxu Zhu, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2023. FLIP: Towards Fine-grained Alignment between ID-based Models and Pretrained Language Models for CTR Prediction. *arXiv e-prints* (2023), arXiv–2310.
- [37] Ruoxi Wang, Rakesh Shivanna, Derek Cheng, Sagar Jain, Dong Lin, Lichan Hong, and Ed Chi. 2021. DCN V2: Improved Deep & Cross Network and Practical Lessons for Web-Scale Learning to Rank Systems. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 1785–1797.
- [38] Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, et al. 2023. A Survey on Large Language Models for Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19860* (2023).
- [39] Junjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Xiaoling Cai, Hong Zhu, Jieming Zhu, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, Rui Zhang, et al. 2024. Towards open-world recommendation with knowledge augmentation from large language models. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Recommender Systems*.
- [40] Junjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2024. MemoCRS: Memory-enhanced Sequential Conversational Recommender Systems with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04960* (2024).
- [41] Junjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Yang Wang, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, Yue Zhu, Rui Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2023. On-device integrated re-ranking with heterogeneous behavior modeling. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 5225–5236.
- [42] Heming Xia, Tao Ge, Peiyi Wang, Si-Qing Chen, Furu Wei, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. Speculative decoding: Exploiting speculative execution for accelerating seq2seq generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. 3909–3925.
- [43] Heming Xia, Zhe Yang, Qingxiu Dong, Peiyi Wang, Yongqi Li, Tao Ge, Tianyu Liu, Wenjie Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2024. Unlocking efficiency in large language model inference: A comprehensive survey of speculative decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07851* (2024).
- [44] Seongjun Yang, Gibbeum Lee, Jaewoong Cho, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. 2023. Predictive pipelined decoding: A compute-latency trade-off for exact LLM decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05908* (2023).
- [45] Junliang Yu, Hongzhi Yin, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Jundong Li, and Zi Huang. 2023. Self-supervised learning for recommender systems: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [46] Yang Zhang, Fuli Feng, Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Qifan Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2023. Collm: Integrating collaborative embeddings into large language models for recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19488* (2023).
- [47] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223* (2023).
- [48] Yao Zhao, Zhitian Xie, Chenyi Zhuang, and Jinjie Gu. 2023. Lookahead: An inference acceleration framework for large language model with lossless generation accuracy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12728* (2023).
- [49] Bowen Zheng, Yupeng Hou, Hongyu Lu, Yu Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Ming Chen, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Adapting large language models by integrating collaborative semantics for recommendation. In *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1435–1448.
- [50] Guorui Zhou, Xiaoqiang Zhu, Chenru Song, Ying Fan, Han Zhu, Xiao Ma, Yanghui Yan, Junqi Jin, Han Li, and Kun Gai. 2018. Deep Interest Network for Click-Through Rate Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1059–1068.
- [51] Yongchao Zhou, Kaifeng Lyu, Ankit Singh Rawat, Aditya Krishna Menon, Afshin Rostamizadeh, Sanjiv Kumar, Jean-François Kagy, and Rishabh Agarwal. 2023. Distillspec: Improving speculative decoding via knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08461* (2023).
- [52] Yaochen Zhu, Liang Wu, Qi Guo, Liangjie Hong, and Jundong Li. 2024. Collaborative large language model for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 3162–3172.
- [53] Yutao Zhu, Huaying Yuan, Shuting Wang, Jiongnan Liu, Wenhan Liu, Chenlong Deng, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Large language models for information retrieval: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07107* (2023).

A DATASET AND REPRODUCIBILITY

Our experiments are conducted on two public datasets, **MovieLens-10M** and **Amazon-Books**. **MovieLens-10M** (ML-10M for short) contains 10 million movie ratings applied to 10,000 movies by 72,000 users. The ratings are converted into binary labels by labeling ratings 4 and 5 as positive and the rest as negative. **Amazon-Books** refers to the “Books” category of the Amazon Review Dataset. We filter out the less-interacted users and items, remaining 49,391 users and 78,318 items with 5,002,043 interactions. In this dataset, ratings of 5 are regarded as positive and the rest as negative. The preprocessing of the two datasets, including the knowledge generation and downstream recommendation task, mainly follows [39]. We first employ LLMs to generate recommendation knowledge and then adapt the knowledge to the downstream tasks. Vicuna-7b-v1.3⁵ is employed to generate fine-grained user and item knowledge with the same prompt of KAR.

To implement speculative decoding, we simulate streaming behaviors and divide the user’s historical behavior into multiple segments. For simplicity, the user’s historical behavior $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is divided into two segments to simulate changes in user behavior. We fixed the length of user history used by the LLM to $m(\frac{n}{2} < m < n)$, designating x_1, \dots, x_m as the old history and x_{n-m}, \dots, x_n as the new history. Then, we use vicuna-7b-v1.3 to generate user-side preference knowledge for both new and old histories, with traditional autoregressive decoding for the old history and speculative decoding for the new history following [48]. Before generating, a retrieval pool, in the form of a prefix tree, is constructed with the knowledge obtained from the old history. During knowledge generation, we retrieve relevant text from the prefix tree as a draft for the target LLM to validate.

As for acceleration experiments, we randomly sample 100 users and 100 items as the test set, and all results are averaged over these samples. Unless explicitly stated, all acceleration tests on the same dataset are conducted on the same set of 100 users and items. Regarding the retrieval pool, we construct collaborative-based retrieval pools for users, forming three groups in both ML-10M and Amazon-Books. For items, we utilize attribute-based retrieval pools with category as the attribute for partition, resulting in 9 groups for ML-10M and 10 groups for Amazon-Books. Each group’s retrieval pool consists of the previously generated knowledge of the items or users within the group, with the pool size potentially controlled via random sampling. The optimal retrieval pool size may vary across datasets and frameworks, and a grid search within $\{500, 1000, 2000, 3000, 4000, 5000\}$ is performed for optimal size.

B COMPATIBILITY STUDY

Previously, our experiments involved the compatibility of DARE across different datasets, frameworks, and tasks. In this section, we investigate the compatibility of DARE with various backbone LLMs. We selected some widely used LLMs, such as **Mistral-7B-instruct-v0.2**, **ChatGLM2-6B**, **vicuna-7B-v1.5**, **Qwen-7B-Chat**, and **Qwen-1.8B-Chat**, and compared DARE’s acceleration performance on user/item knowledge generation tasks within the framework KAR, whose results are presented in Table 7. Note that the autoregressive generation speeds of different LLMs vary; we have

included the table with these generation speeds (**Vanilla**). Firstly, across various backbone LLMs, our proposed DARE consistently and significantly outperforms ReSD, demonstrating DARE’s strong compatibility with different backbone LLMs. Secondly, DARE exhibits better acceleration effects on larger LLMs. For instance, on Amazon-Book, DARE achieves accelerations of 5.10x and 4.69x for Qwen-7B-Chat, while for Qwen-1.8B-Chat, the accelerations are 4.77x and 3.98x.

Table 7: Speedup comparison between naive retrieval-based speculative decoding (ReSD) and DARE with various LLMs.

Backbone LLM	Side	Speedup Method	ML-10M		Amazon-Books	
			Gen. Speed	Speedup	Gen. Speed	Speedup
Mistral-7B-instruct	user	Vanilla	41.30	1.00×	41.4	1.00×
		ReSD	66.10	1.60×	91.4	2.21×
		DARE	179.00	4.33×	178.9	4.32×
	item	ReSD	80.60	1.95×	59.4	1.43×
		DARE	95.30	2.31×	121.5	2.93×
		Vanilla	42.60	1.00×	42.5	1.00×
ChatGLM2-6B	user	ReSD	107.40	2.52×	89.1	2.10×
		DARE	194.70	4.57×	165.0	3.88×
		Vanilla	42.60	1.00×	42.5	1.00×
	item	ReSD	94.30	2.21×	71.1	1.67×
		DARE	106.80	2.51×	117.7	2.77×
		Vanilla	37.80	1.00×	36.7	1.00×
Vicuna-7B-v1.5	user	ReSD	101.10	2.67×	62.4	1.70×
		DARE	167.80	4.44×	173.3	4.72×
		Vanilla	30.00	1.00×	29.90	1.00×
	item	ReSD	91.10	2.41×	83.3	2.27×
		DARE	112.20	2.97×	123.9	3.38×
		Vanilla	30.00	1.00×	29.90	1.00×
Qwen-7B-Chat	user	ReSD	88.10	2.94×	69.60	2.33×
		DARE	169.00	5.63×	152.40	5.10×
		Vanilla	40.90	1.00×	41.10	1.00×
	item	ReSD	71.90	2.40×	68.70	2.30×
		DARE	87.10	2.90×	140.10	4.69×
		Vanilla	40.90	1.00×	41.10	1.00×
Qwen-1.8B-Chat	user	ReSD	78.60	1.92×	105.90	2.58×
		DARE	220.00	5.38×	196.20	4.77×
		Vanilla	40.90	1.00×	41.10	1.00×
	item	ReSD	112.40	2.75×	76.20	1.85×
		DARE	149.20	3.65×	163.60	3.98×
		Vanilla	40.90	1.00×	41.10	1.00×

C ABLATION ON RELAXED VERIFICATION

Table 8: Ablation on Relaxed Verification.

Variants	ML-10M				Amazon-Books			
	AAL	Gen. Speed	# Token	AT	AAL	Gen. Speed	# Token	AT
top-1	5.51	136.30	514.70	3.78	5.29	139.50	615.60	4.41
top-k	7.57	173.00	575.50	3.33	7.27	182.70	713.50	3.90
top-p	7.91	202.10	489.20	2.42	7.47	203.10	787.30	3.88
RV	7.54	171.30	508.20	2.93	6.76	178.90	633.10	3.67

We delve deeper into the relaxed verification mechanism by designing several variants of verification: **top-1** employs greedy verification, **top-k** satisfies only Eq (7) by accepting tokens with the highest top- k ($k=2$) probabilities, and **top-p** explores the effect of only meeting the probability threshold, that is accepting tokens with highest probability or absolute probabilities greater than δ ($\delta=0.1$). **RV** is our designed Relaxed Verification that meets the condition in Eq (8) with $k=2$ and $\delta=0.1$. We investigate the difference in the number of generated tokens (# Token), generation speed (Gen.

⁵<https://huggingface.co/lmsys/vicuna-7b-v1.3>

Speed), average acceptance length (AAL), and average generation time per knowledge (AT) of these methods on the user knowledge generation task within the framework KAR, as illustrated in Table 8.

The results show that compared to the original top-1, both top-k, top-p, and RV significantly enhance generation speed. However, top-k suffers from divergent generation issues, leading to a substantial increase in the number of generated tokens. This ultimately lengthens the total generation time, sometimes surpassing that of top-1, thus failing to achieve practical acceleration. Top-p's performance is inconsistent; it causes divergent generation in Amazon-Books, whereas in ML-10M, the length of the generated text is notably shortened. By combining these approaches, RV achieves a similar length of text generated to that of top-1 while maintaining a generation speed similar to top-k.

D CASE STUDY

To investigate which draft tokens DARE actually accepts, we randomly select a user from the ML-10M dataset and employ vicuna-7b-v1.3 to generate user preference knowledge with DARE. We utilize the prompt of KAR [39] to generate user knowledge and the results generated by DARE are as follows, where we use | to separate the content generated at each decoding step:

Based | on the user's movie viewing history and other relevant factors |, their preferences can be analyzed as follows:

- 1. Genre: The user seems to enjoy a variety of | genres, including action, comedy, drama, and | science fiction |.*
- 2. Directors/Actors: They have a | preference for movies directed by and starring famous directors and | actors such as Quentin Tarantino |, Kevin Spacey, and Morgan | Freeman.*
- 3. Time Period/Country: The user | enjoys movies from various time periods and countries, including | classics from the 1990s and newer releases from | the 2000s and 2010s |.*
- 4. Characters: The user | seems to appreciate movies with | strong, memorable | characters, such as those | featuring Ace | Ventura, Forrest Gump, and Leon |.*
- 5. Plot/Theme: The user enjoys movies with | engaging plots and themes, | such as those with | elements of mystery, | adventure, and drama.*
- 6 | . Mood/Tone: The user prefers movies | with a variety | of moods and tones, including comedies, | dramas |, and thrillers.*
- 7. Critical Acclaim/Award: The user seems to appreciate movies that | have received critical acclaim and awards, such as | 12 Monkeys, The Shawshank Redemption, and | The Fugitive. |*
- 8. Production Quality: The user enjoys movies with | high production quality, as evidenced by their favorites like | Braveheart and The Rock. |*
- 9 | . Soundtrack: The user seems to appreciate movies with memorable | soundtracks, such as Pulp Fiction | and Speed |.*

It is evident that, in most cases, DARE can generate multiple tokens within a single decoding step. Some of these received tokens pertain to commonly used phrases, movie titles, and actor/director names, while others involve the recombination of key preferences related to user interests, e.g., genre and theme.