
RALLREC+: Retrieval Augmented Large Language Model Recommendation with Reasoning

Sichun Luo^{1,2}, Jian Xu³, Xiaojie Zhang², Linrong Wang⁴, Sicong Liu⁵, Hanxu Hou^{1*}, Linqi Song^{2*}

¹Dongguan University of Technology ²City University of Hong Kong

³Tsinghua University ⁴Chinese University of Hong Kong ⁵Xiamen University
sichunluo2@gmail.com

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have been integrated into recommender systems to enhance user behavior comprehension. The Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) technique is further incorporated into these systems to retrieve more relevant items and improve system performance. However, existing RAG methods have two shortcomings. (i) In the *retrieval* stage, they rely primarily on textual semantics and often fail to incorporate the most relevant items, thus constraining system effectiveness. (ii) In the *generation* stage, they lack explicit chain-of-thought reasoning, further limiting their potential.

In this paper, we propose Representation learning and Reasoning empowered retrieval-Augmented Large Language model Recommendation (RALLREC+). Specifically, for the retrieval stage, we prompt LLMs to generate detailed item descriptions and perform joint representation learning, combining textual and collaborative signals extracted from the LLM and recommendation models, respectively. To account for the time-varying nature of user interests, we propose a simple yet effective reranking method to capture preference dynamics. For the generation phase, we first evaluate reasoning LLMs on recommendation tasks, uncovering valuable insights. Then we introduce knowledge-injected prompting and consistency-based merging approach to integrate reasoning LLMs with general-purpose LLMs, enhancing overall performance. Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets validate our method’s effectiveness. Code is available at https://github.com/sichunluo/RALLRec_plus.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated significant potential in many domains due to impressive world knowledge and reasoning capability [1, 27, 5]. Recently, LLMs have been integrated into recommendation tasks [37, 23, 25, 32]. One promising direction for LLM-based recommendations, referred to as LLMRec, involves directly prompting the LLM to perform recommendation tasks in a text-based format [3, 36, 24]. However, simply using prompts with recent user history can be suboptimal, as they may contain irrelevant information that distracts the LLMs from the task at hand. To address this challenge, ReLLa [21] incorporates a retrieval augmentation technique, which retrieves the most relevant items and includes them in the prompt. This approach aims to improve the understanding of the user profile and improve the performance of recommendations. Furthermore, GPT-FedRec [35] proposes a hybrid Retrieval Augmented Generation mechanism to enhance privacy-preserving recommendations by using both an ID retriever and a text retriever.

Despite the advancements, current methods have limitations. ReLLa relies primarily on text embeddings for retrieval, which is suboptimal as it overlooks collaborative semantic information from the

*Corresponding Author

item side in recommendations. The semantics learned from text are often inadequate as they typically only include titles and limited contextual information. GPT-FedRec does not incorporate user’s recent interest, and the ID based retriever and text retrieval are in a separate manner, which may not yield the best results. The integration of text and collaborative information presents challenges as these modalities are not inherently aligned.

Another challenge arises in the generation phase. Existing work typically prompts general-purpose LLMs to generate answers, resulting in models that implicitly map inputs to outputs without explicit reasoning steps. This approach reduces explainability and interpretability, as the chain-of-thought reasoning [31] is overlooked, thereby constraining the model’s potential. Recently, reasoning LLMs, such as the OpenAI-o1 [27] and DeepSeek-R1 [7], have garnered significant attention for their advanced reasoning capabilities. However, their suitability for recommendation tasks remains unexplored. Although some prior efforts have attempted to integrate reasoning ability into recommendation systems [4, 29], these approaches often rely on specialized workflows that lack adaptability across domains. In contrast, we propose a training-free method to leverage reasoning LLMs, enhancing their flexibility and applicability.

In this work, we propose Representation Learning and Reasoning enhanced Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models for Recommendation (RALLREC+). Specifically, regarding the retrieval stage, instead of solely relying on abbreviated item titles to extract item representations, we prompt the LLM to generate detailed descriptions for items utilizing its world knowledge. These generated descriptions are used to extract improved item representations. This representation is concatenated with the abbreviated item representation. Subsequently, we obtain collaborative semantics for items using a recommendation model. This collaborative semantic is aligned with textual semantics through self-supervised learning to produce the final representation. This enhanced representation is used to retrieve items, thereby improving Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Model recommendations. To enhance the generation stage, we first evaluate the reasoning LLM on recommendation tasks, uncovering intriguing insights. Based on these findings, we propose an effective knowledge-injected prompting method. By incorporating prior knowledge from recommendation experts, this approach enables the reasoning LLM to deliver more precise predictions. Additionally, we introduce a consistency-based merging technique to integrate the reasoning LLM with a general-purpose LLM, further improving overall performance.

Note that some preliminary findings were reported at the ACM Web Conference 2025 (WWW’25) [33]. The enhancements made in this extended version of the work are as follows:

- We upgrade the RALLREC framework to RALLREC+. While RALLREC solely enhances the retrieval stage through representation learning, RALLREC+ extends this by focusing on the generation stage. Specifically, we evaluate reasoning LLM on recommendation tasks and propose simple yet effective strategies to boost model performance.
- We expand our experimental evaluation by incorporating additional models and settings, providing clearer evidence of RALLREC+’s superiority.
- Lastly, we restructure the paper to better articulate the motivations, objectives, and advancements of these revisions, offering readers deeper insight into this extended work.

In a nutshell, our contribution is threefold.

- We propose RALLREC+, which incorporates collaborative information and learns joint representations to retrieve more relevant items, thereby enhancing the retrieval-augmented large language model recommendation.
- We evaluate reasoning models on recommendation tasks, uncovering several interesting insights. Leveraging these findings, we propose a simple yet effective framework to adapt reasoning models into existing retrieval-augmented LLM recommendation systems.
- We conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed RALLREC+, further revealing valuable findings.

2 Related Work

2.1 LLM for Recommendation

Recent advancements in LLMs have significantly reshaped recommender systems by leveraging their natural language understanding and generation capabilities for enhanced personalization [22, 32, 24]. Existing research categorizes LLM-based approaches into two paradigms: discriminative and generative [32]. In the discriminative paradigm, LLMs are used to extract textual features, such as user and item embeddings, for traditional recommendation algorithms [15]. Conversely, the generative paradigm employs LLMs, such as ChatGPT and Llama, to directly generate recommendations or explanations, excelling in zero-shot and few-shot scenarios [14].

Despite these advancements, simply using prompts with recent user history can be suboptimal, as they may contain irrelevant information that distracts the LLMs from the task at hand. Thus, retrieval-augmented generation technique is further integrated for better performance.

2.2 Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) improves LLM performance by dynamically integrating relevant external knowledge during inference [18, 6, 2]. This approach has proven effective across various NLP tasks, such as language modeling [9], open-domain question answering [13], and knowledge-intensive dialogue systems [16]. In the recommendation domain, RAG has been adopted to enhance item retrieval and user understanding. Notably, ReLLa [21] leverages RAG to augment LLMs with retrieved textual semantics for improved user comprehension and recommendation performance. Similarly, GPT-FedRec [35] employs RAG within a federated learning framework to ensure privacy-preserving recommendations.

However, existing methods often fail to learn comprehensive embeddings, leading to suboptimal retrieval and generation results. Our work addresses this limitation by introducing joint representation learning and reasoning enhancements.

2.3 LLM Reasoning

The reasoning capabilities of LLMs have evolved significantly. Early work on Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, introduced by [31], demonstrated that prompting LLMs to generate step-by-step reasoning traces improves performance on complex tasks such as arithmetic and symbolic reasoning. Building on this, learning-based methods have sought to embed reasoning capabilities directly into LLMs, reducing reliance on external prompts. STaR [34] iteratively fine-tunes models on self-generated reasoning traces, baking CoT-like behavior into the model itself. Similarly, [20] trains process reward models (PRMs) to evaluate intermediate reasoning steps, outperforming outcome-based rewards in tasks requiring multi-step logic. OpenAI o1 model [27] marks a significant leap in this direction, leveraging large-scale reinforcement learning (RL) to natively integrate CoT during inference. Unlike traditional autoregressive LLMs, o1 employs test-time compute to iteratively refine its reasoning, achieving state-of-the-art results on challenging benchmarks.

However, none of the previous works attempted to apply o1-like reasoning to LLM recommendation, resulting in a research gap. In this paper, we aim to bridge this gap by evaluating and leveraging the zero-shot reasoning ability of LLMs.

3 Evaluation

We first conduct an evaluation of reasoning LLM on recommendation tasks and yield some interesting findings. An example of response generated by general LLM and reasoning LLM is shown in Figure 1.

Dataset. In this paper, we focus on the click-through rate (CTR) prediction [21]. We utilize three widely used public datasets: BookCrossing [38], MovieLens [10], and Amazon [26]. For the MovieLens dataset, we select the MovieLens-1M subset, and for the Amazon dataset, we focus on the Movies & TV subset. We apply the 5-core strategy to filter out long-tailed users/items with less than 5 records. The statistics are shown in Table 1.




Figure 1: Example of the response generated by general LLM and reasoning LLM.

Table 1: The dataset statistics.

Dataset	#Users	#Items	#Samples	#Fields	#Features
BookCrossing	8,723	3,547	227,735	10	14,279
MovieLens	6,040	3,952	970,009	9	15,905
Amazon	14,386	5,000	141,829	6	22,387

Table 2: The comparison of general purpose model and reasoning model. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

Model	BookCrossing			MovieLens			Amazon		
	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow
Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct	0.5894	0.6839	0.5418	0.5865	0.6853	0.5591	0.7025	0.7305	0.4719
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B	0.6147	0.7065	0.5487	0.5944	0.6850	0.5752	0.6874	0.5392	0.7792
Improvement (%)	+4.29	-3.30	+1.27	+1.35	+0.04	+2.88	-2.15	+26.19	+65.12

Comparison between Reasoning LLM and General LLM. To evaluate the impact of reasoning capabilities in LLMs for recommendation tasks, we compare DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B, a model supervised fine-tuned with distilled CoT reasoning data [7], against Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, a general-purpose LLM of the same size. Both models are evaluated using a simple retrieval approach, ensuring a fair comparison. Following the official guidance, we set the temperature to 0.6 for DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B models². We run the experiment five times and calculate the average.

The results of this comparison are presented in Table 2, where we report the accuracy, log loss, and AUC scores. We observe that the reasoning LLM always achieves better accuracy compared to the general LLM. This improvement may be attributed to the CoT reasoning, which enables the model to follow longer and more accurate reasoning paths, thereby enhancing its decision-making process. However, we also note that the reasoning LLM exhibits a lower AUC or Log Loss score in some cases. This could be due to the model being overly confident in its predictions, which might lead to a higher rate of false positives or false negatives, adversely affecting these metrics.

TAKEAWAY I: Reasoning LLMs generally outperform general LLMs in recommendation tasks.

Analysis of Retrieval in Reasoning LLM. We further investigate the impact of retrieval on the performance of reasoning LLMs. Specifically, we employ the representation learning enhanced retrieval mechanism in Sec. 4.2 to augment the model’s input with relevant information. For a fair comparison, we use the DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B model as the base model in all experiments. The results, presented in Table 3, demonstrate that incorporating retrieval leads to improved model performance across all three datasets. This enhancement can be attributed to the inclusion of more relevant items, which facilitates the model’s reasoning process.

TAKEAWAY II: Retrieval augments the model’s performance by providing relevant contextual information that enhances reasoning capabilities.

²<https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1>

Table 3: The comparison of reasoning model *w/* and *w/o* retrieval. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

<i>w/</i> retrieval	BookCrossing			MovieLens			Amazon		
	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow
\times	0.6147	0.7065	0.5487	0.5944	0.6851	0.5752	0.6874	0.5392	0.7792
\checkmark	0.6274	0.7064	0.5498	0.6028	0.6805	0.5790	0.7014	0.5335	0.7879
Improvement (%)	+2.07	+0.01	+0.20	+1.41	+0.67	+0.66	+2.04	+1.06	+1.12




Figure 2: Comparison of response length *w.r.t.* accuracy in reasoning LLMs.




Figure 3: Comparison of response consistency *w.r.t.* accuracy in reasoning LLMs.

Analysis of Response Length in Reasoning LLM. We also explore the relationship between the length of the reasoning LLM’s response and its performance on recommendation tasks. Prior studies in mathematical reasoning have shown that longer responses often lead to better performance [7]. This raises a natural question: *does response length affect LLM recommendation performance?*

To analyze this, we conducted the following experiment. We compared response lengths and accuracies across various problems. We sorted the responses length in ascending order and categorized the responses into five groups and then calculated the mean accuracy for each group, where accuracy indicates whether the model’s final answer was correct. The results, detailed in Figure 2 reveal an intriguing trend: the shortest responses group (Group 1) achieve the highest accuracy, with performance declining as response length increases. This finding contrasts sharply with observations in mathematical reasoning tasks. The data consistently indicate that shorter responses outperform longer ones in this context. We hypothesize that this may reflect “*overthinking*” by the model, where excessive elaboration introduces redundant steps or errors, undermining the final answer. In contrast to mathematical reasoning, where problems often require multi-step deductions, the tasks in our study may favor direct inference or concise solutions.

TAKEAWAY III: Contrary to trends in mathematical reasoning tasks, shorter responses correlate with improved performance in recommendation tasks.

Analysis of Response Consistency in Reasoning LLM. We further analyze the response consistency in reasoning LLMs. To this end, we calculate the variance of all responses for each sample, denoted as $\text{var}(\mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ represents the set of generated responses. Additionally, we evaluate performance within a sliding window approach. We repeat the experiment five times, sorting the indices of the responses by their variance for each sample. The sorted data is then divided into distinct windows, and we compute the average accuracy for each window to analyze performance trends. For the BookCrossing dataset, we set the window size to 500 samples, while for the MovieLens and Amazon datasets, we use a window size of 1,000 samples. As depicted in Figure 3, our results indicate




Figure 4: RALLREC+ with representation learning enhanced retrieval and reasoning enhanced generation.

a strong correlation between response consistency (*i.e.*, lower variance) and superior performance metrics. This suggests that models generating more consistent responses are likely to exhibit enhanced reliability and effectiveness in reasoning tasks.

TAKEAWAY IV: More consistent responses are generally associated with improved results.

4 Methodology

4.1 Framework Pipeline

The pipeline of the developed framework is illustrated in Figure 4. The RALLREC+ encompasses both the retrieval and generation processes. In the retrieval process, we first learn a joint representation of users and items, allowing us to retrieve the most relevant items in semantic space. These items are then fused with the most recent items by a reranker and incorporated into the prompts. The constructed prompts can be used solely for inference or to train a more effective model through instruction tuning (IT).

For the generation phase, the base LLM responds to the prompt for inference, with the option to use either a standard or customized model. We investigate adapting reasoning LLMs for recommendation tasks by first evaluating their performance in this context. Subsequently, we propose a technique to integrate these models into existing systems.




Figure 5: Comparison of textual descriptions with fixed template (upper) and automatic generation (blow).

4.2 Representation Learning enhanced Retrieval

To learn better item embeddings³ for reliable retrieval, we propose to integrate both the text embedding from textual description and collaborative embedding from user-item interaction, as well as the joint representation through self-supervised training.

4.2.1 Textual Representation Learning

In previous work [21], only the fixed text template with basic information such as item title was utilized to extract textual information. However, we argue that relying solely on the fixed text format is inadequate, as it may not capture sufficient semantic depth, *e.g.*, two distinct and irrelevant items may probably have similar names. To enhance this, we take advantage of the LLMs to generate a more comprehensive and detailed description containing the key attributes of the item (*e.g.*, Figure 5), which can be denoted as

$$t_{\text{desc}}^i = \text{LLM}(b^i|p), \quad (1)$$

where b^i is the basic information of the i -th item and the p is the template for prompting the LLMs. Subsequently, we derive textual embeddings by feeding the text into LLMs and taking the hidden representation as in [21], represented as

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{desc}}^i = \text{LLM}_{\text{emb}}(t_{\text{desc}}^i). \quad (2)$$

Since the plain embedding of item title e_{title}^i could also be useful, we aim to directly concatenate these two kinds of embeddings to obtain the final textual representations, denoted by

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i = [e_{\text{title}}^i || \mathbf{e}_{\text{desc}}^i]. \quad (3)$$

It is worth noting that those textual embeddings are reusable after being extracted and they already contain affinity information attributed to the rich knowledge of LLMs.

4.2.2 Collaborative Representation Learning

A notable shortcoming of previous LLM-based approaches is their failure to incorporate collaborative information, which is directed learned from the user-item interaction records and thus can be complementary to the text embeddings. To this end, we utilize conventional recommendation models to extract collaborative semantics, denoted as

$$\{\mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^i\}_{i=1}^n = \text{RecModel}(\{(u, i) \in \mathcal{V}\}), \quad (4)$$

where n is the total number of items and \mathcal{V} is the interaction history.

4.2.3 Joint Representation Learning

A straightforward approach for integrating above two representations is to directly concatenate the textual and collaborative representations. However, since these representations may not be on the same dimension and scale, this might not be the best choice. Inspired by the success of contrastive learning in aligning different views in recommendations [39], we employ a self-supervised learning technique to effectively align the textual and collaborative representations. Specifically, we adopt a

³We interchangeably use the representation and embedding to denote the extracted item feature considering the habits in deep learning and information retrieval domains.

simple two-layer MLP as the projector for mapping the original text embedding space into a lower feature space and use the following self-supervised training objective

$$\mathcal{L}_{ssl} = -\mathbb{E} \left\{ \log \left[\frac{f(\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i, \mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^i)}{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} f(\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i, \mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^v)} \right] + \log \left[\frac{f(\mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^i, \mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i)}{\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} f(\mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^i, \mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^v)} \right] \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $f(\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i, \mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^v) = \exp(\text{sim}(\text{MLP}(\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i), \mathbf{e}_{\text{colla}}^v))$ and $\text{sim}(\cdot)$ is the cosine similarity function. After the joint representation learning, we can get the aligned embedding for each item i as

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{ssl}}^i = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{e}_{\text{text}}^i). \quad (6)$$

4.2.4 Embedding Mixture

Instead of retrieval using different embeddings separately, we find that integrating those embeddings before retrieval can present better performance, therefore we directly concat them after magnitude normalization

$$\mathbf{e}_{\text{item}} = [\bar{\mathbf{e}}_{\text{text}} \parallel \bar{\mathbf{e}}_{\text{colla}} \parallel \bar{\mathbf{e}}_{\text{ssl}}], \quad (7)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{e}} := \mathbf{e} / \|\mathbf{e}\|$. With the final item embeddings, we can retrieve the most relevant items to the target item by simply comparing the dot-production for downstream recommendation tasks.

4.2.5 Prompt Construction

To form a prompt message that LLMs can understand, we use a similar template as in [21] by filling the user profile, listing the relevant behavior history and instructing the model to give a prediction. We also observed that the pre-trained base LLMs may perform poorly in instruction following. Therefore, we collect a small amount of training data for instruction tuning, where the prompts are constructed with similarity-based retrieval and a *data augmentation* technique is also employed by re-arranging the retrieved sequence according to the timestamp to reduce the impact of item order.

4.2.6 Reranker

Since we can retrieve the most recent K items as well as the most relevant K items, relying solely on one of them may not be the optimal choice. During the inference stage, we further innovatively design a reranker to merge these two different channels. The reranker can be either learning-based or rule-based; in this case, we utilize a heuristic rule-based reranker. For each item, we assign a channel score S_c and a position score S_{pos} . We assign the channel score as γ and $(1 - \gamma)$ for embedding-based and time-based channel, respectively. The position score is inversely proportional to the position in the original sequence, *i.e.*, $\{1, \frac{1}{2^\beta}, \dots, \frac{1}{K^\beta}\}$. The hyper-parameters γ and β are tunable. The total score for each item is calculated as the production of these two scores

$$\text{Score}^i = S_c^i * S_{pos}^i. \quad (8)$$

By taking the items with top- K scores, we can obtain a refined retrieval result to maximize the prediction performance.

4.3 Reasoning enhanced Generation

Based on the insights in Sec. 3, we propose a knowledge-injected prompting method and a consistency-based merging technique to adapt a reasoning LLM with a general-purpose LLM, resulting in improved performance.

4.3.1 Aggregate Reasoning and Tuned LLM Synergy

The experiment result in Sec. 3 reveals a critical dichotomy: while vanilla reasoning LLMs demonstrate superior structured reasoning capabilities compared to general-purpose LLMs, they underperform domain-tuned LLMs with a large gap [33]. This presents a fundamental challenge: how to enhance reasoning LLMs effectively? Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) is a standard approach to align LLMs with domain-specific tasks [22]. Fine-tuning general LLMs requires ground-truth labels. However, fine-tuning reasoning LLMs is more challenging: user preferences are highly subjective, making it difficult to craft gold-standard reasoning paths for guidance. Additionally, SFT can be resource-intensive, posing practical limitations. To solve this, our key innovation stems from two mechanisms: (i) knowledge-injected prompting, which enriches reasoning LLMs with domain knowledge; and (ii) consistency-based merging, which combines reasoning and general LLMs to aggregate their strengths, boosting performance effectively.

Table 4: The performance of different models in default settings. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

Model		BookCrossing			MovieLens			Amazon		
		AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow
ID-based	DeepFM	0.5480	0.8521	0.5212	0.7184	0.6205	0.6636	0.6419	0.8281	0.7760
	xDeepFM	0.5541	0.9088	0.5304	0.7199	0.6210	0.6696	0.6395	0.8055	0.7711
	DCN	0.5532	0.9356	0.5189	0.7212	0.6164	0.6681	0.6369	0.7873	0.7744
	AutoInt	0.5478	0.9854	0.5246	0.7138	0.6224	0.6613	0.6424	0.7640	0.7543
LLM-based	Llama3.1	0.5894	0.6839	0.5418	0.5865	0.6853	0.5591	0.7025	0.7305	0.4719
	ReLLa	0.7125	0.6458	0.6368	0.7524	0.6182	0.6804	0.8401	0.5074	0.8224
	Hybrid-Score	0.7096	0.6409	0.6334	0.7646	0.6149	0.6843	0.8405	0.5065	0.8256
Ours	RALLREC	0.7162	0.6365	0.6506	0.7658	0.6140	0.6942	0.8416	0.5059	0.8331
	RALLREC+	0.7175	0.6354	0.6518	0.7663	0.6118	0.6948	0.8412	0.5036	0.8343

4.3.2 Knowledge-injected prompting

We propose a novel prompt augmentation strategy that transfers knowledge from the recommendation expert (*e.g.*, tuned LLM \mathcal{M}_G) to the reasoning LLM (\mathcal{M}_R). For input query x , we first extract \mathcal{M}_G 's prediction $k_G = \mathcal{M}_G(x)$ through its output layer. These predictions are then projected into natural language space and injected into the original query x . Then the knowledge-enhanced prompt for \mathcal{M}_R becomes:

$$p_{\text{aug}} = \left[\underbrace{[\text{Task Instruction}]}_{\text{Base Prompt}}; \underbrace{x}_{\text{Input}}; \underbrace{k_G}_{\text{Injected Knowledge}} \right] \quad (9)$$

This allows \mathcal{M}_R to take advantage of \mathcal{M}_G 's learned patterns while maintaining its intrinsic reasoning capabilities. We use the prompt "Another one think the answer might be [Yes/No]" as the injected knowledge for our task.

4.3.3 Consistency-based merging

Result-level merging across different models offers a simple yet effective approach to integrate their predictions. Drawing from findings in Sec. 3.3.1, more consistent responses correlate with improved outcomes, which we interpret as a measure of model confidence. Consequently, we propose assigning higher weights to more confident predictions during merging, enhancing overall performance.

Let \mathcal{M}_R generate K reasoning traces using the augmented prompt, producing mean prediction \bar{P}_R and variance σ_R^2 . The tuned LLM \mathcal{M}_G provides prediction \bar{P}_G with variance σ_G^2 estimation. Our fusion mechanism combines these through consistency-calibrated weighting:

$$P_{\text{final}} = \frac{\alpha \cdot \frac{\bar{P}_R}{\sigma_R^2 + \epsilon} + \frac{\bar{P}_G}{\sigma_G^2 + \epsilon}}{\alpha \cdot (\sigma_R^2 + \epsilon)^{-1} + (\sigma_G^2 + \epsilon)^{-1}} \quad (10)$$

where α is a hyperparameter. The ϵ term is a small number that ensures numerical stability.

5 Experiment

In this section, we assess the performance of our framework and aim to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How does our proposed RALLREC+ framework compare with both the conventional recommendation models and the state-of-the-art LLM-based RAG recommendation methods?
- **RQ2:** Do the designed components of our model function effectively?
- **RQ3:** How do different hyper-parameters affect the final recommendation performance?

5.1 Baseline

We compare our approach with baseline methods, which include both ID-based and LLM-based recommendation systems. For ID-based methods, we select DeepFM [8], xDeepFM [19], DCN [30],

Table 5: The performance of different variants of RALLREC+. We remove different components of RALLREC+ to evaluate the contribution of each part to the model. The best results are highlighted in boldface. KP refer to knowledge inject prompting and CM refer to consistency based merging.

Variants		BookCrossing			MovieLens			Amazon		
w/ KP	w/ CM	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow
\times	\times	0.7141	0.6392	0.6483	0.7641	0.6160	0.6945	0.8397	0.5071	0.8335
\times	\checkmark	0.7158	0.6375	0.6506	0.7639	0.6146	0.6944	0.8404	0.5052	0.8332
\checkmark	\times	0.7163	0.6363	0.6506	0.7656	0.6127	0.6940	0.8405	0.5044	0.8337
\checkmark	\checkmark	0.7175	0.6354	0.6518	0.7663	0.6118	0.6948	0.8412	0.5036	0.8343

and AutoInt [28] as our baseline models. We utilize Llama3.1-8B-Instruct [5] as the base model and LightGCN [11] to learn collaborative embeddings in our comparisons. For LLM-based methods, we consider ReLLa [21] and a Hybrid-Score based retrieval as in [35]. RALLREC includes solely on representation learning enhanced retrieval, while RALLREC+ integrates both representation learning enhanced retrieval and reasoning enhanced generation. By default, we apply the LoRA method [12] and 8-bit quantization to conduct instruction-tuning as in [21] and the maximum length of history is $K = 30$. Similar to ReLLa [21], we collect the user history sequence before the latest item and the ratings to construct the prompting message and ground-truth. For the reranker in our method, we search the γ over $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{5}\}$ and fix $\beta = 1$ in the experiments. We set α to 0.1 and ϵ to e^{-3} for all experiments unless specifically specified.

5.2 Main Result

From the numerical results presented in Table 4, several noteworthy observations emerge. Firstly, the vanilla ID-based methods generally underperform LLM-based methods, demonstrating that LLMs can better leverage textual and historical information for preference understanding. Secondly, among LLM-based baselines, ReLLa effectively incorporates a retrieval-augmented approach but relies predominantly on simple textual semantics for item retrieval. Hybrid-Score, which considers both ID-based and textual features, also improves over the zero-shot LLM setting (Llama3.1). However, both ReLLa and Hybrid-Score still fail to fully leverage the rich collaborative semantics and the alignment between textual and collaborative embeddings. In contrast, RALLREC and RALLREC+ consistently achieve the best results across all three datasets, outperforming both ID-based and LLM-based baselines. The improvements are statistically significant with p -values less than 0.01, emphasizing the robustness of our approach.

5.3 Ablation Study

To assess the contributions of key components in RALLREC+, we conduct ablation studies by systematically removing Knowledge injected Prompting (KP) and Consistency based Merging (CM). Results are shown in Table 5, and the best performance is highlighted in boldface.

We observe a noticeable decline in AUC and an increase in log loss when removing KP, underscoring KP’s critical role in enhancing the reasoning LLM’s contextual understanding. It consistently weakens performance across all datasets without injecting domain knowledge into the reasoning LLM’s prompts. Additionally, when excluding CM, which aligns predictions from reasoning LLM and the tuned LLM using consistency metrics, also reduces performance, highlighting CM’s role in stabilizing the fusion process. The full model, incorporating both KP and CM, consistently outperforms ablated variants across all metrics and datasets, achieving the highest AUC, lowest log loss, and best accuracy. Removing both components yields the weakest results, confirming their complementary strengths: KP boosts reasoning capabilities, while CM ensures effective prediction alignment.

5.4 Analysis of Retrieval

In this section, we evaluate the retrieval mechanisms of the proposed method, focusing solely on the representation learning and reranking components without incorporating reasoning LLMs. By isolating these elements, we assess their standalone effectiveness in enhancing item retrieval for




Figure 6: Impact of α on reasoning LLMs performance across three datasets.




Figure 7: Impact of ϵ on reasoning LLMs performance across three datasets.

recommendation tasks. Experiments compare embedding strategies and reranking approaches across datasets, providing insights into their contributions to overall performance.

5.4.1 Reranking and Retrieval Methods

Figure 8 compares different retrieval and prompt construction approaches on the MovieLens. We observe the retrieval-then-mix strategy achieves worse performance regarding the AUC metric. Our reranker, which balances semantic relevance and temporal recency, outperforms both plain recent-history-based prompts and simple hybrid retrieval strategies. These results emphasize the necessity of refining retrieved items through post-processing rather than relying solely on a single retrieval strategy.

5.4.2 Embedding Strategies

In Table 6, we evaluate different embedding schemes for retrieval. Text-based embeddings, derived from LLM-generated descriptions, yield suboptimal performance compared to ID-based embeddings, which leverage user-item interaction signals more effectively. Concatenating these two representations outperforms either alone, achieving better results by capturing both textual and collaborative insights. Further enhancement is observed when aligning the concatenated embeddings with self-supervised learning, which refines their semantic coherence and boosts performance across datasets. These results highlight the progressive improvement from single-modality embeddings to joint representations.

5.5 Hyperparameter Studies

5.5.1 Study of α

The hyperparameter α balances the contributions of the reasoning LLM and the tuned LLM in the final prediction P_{final} . We evaluate its impact by varying α over $[0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5]$, shifting influence from \mathcal{M}_G (smaller α) to \mathcal{M}_R (larger α), while fixing $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ to isolate α 's effect. The results are shown in Figure 6. We observe distinct trends emerge across different datasets. For BookCrossing, AUC peaks at a moderate α before a slight decline, log loss improves with increasing α , and accuracy maximizes at a higher α . For Amazon, AUC decreases steadily as α rises, log loss improves, and accuracy remains stable. In MovieLens, AUC declines gradually, log loss decreases, and accuracy peaks at an intermediate α . These patterns indicate that smaller α values favor \mathcal{M}_G , boosting AUC, while larger α enhances log loss by leveraging \mathcal{M}_R 's reasoning. Accuracy varies by dataset, reflecting differing sensitivities to reasoning contributions.




Figure 8: Comparison of fine-tuning and inference settings.

Table 6: The comparison of different embeddings used for historic behavior retrieval during inference. For fair comparisons, the model is instruction-tuned using the RAG-enhanced training data, while the inference prompt is constructed based on the embedding similarity without re-ranking. The best results are highlighted in boldface.

Embedding Variant	BookCrossing			MovieLens			Amazon		
	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow	AUC \uparrow	Log Loss \downarrow	ACC \uparrow
Text-based	0.7034	0.6434	0.6426	0.7583	0.6188	0.6798	0.8408	0.4931	0.8222
ID-based	0.7084	0.6414	0.6357	0.7580	0.6153	0.6867	0.8431	0.4930	0.8244
Concat. w/o SSL	0.7127	0.6411	0.6391	0.7633	0.6153	0.6828	0.8439	0.4925	0.8244
Concat. w/ SSL	0.7141	0.6413	0.6471	0.7653	0.6144	0.6850	0.8442	0.4924	0.8269

Table 7: The statistics for DeepSeek-Llama generated token per response across all datasets.

Dataset	BookCrossing	MovieLens	Amazon
# Tokens/Response	687.2	740.3	661.6




Figure 9: Comparison of response latency *w.r.t.* Llama and DeepSeek-Llama model across three datasets.

5.5.2 Study of ϵ

The parameter ϵ stabilizes prediction weighting in the fusion equation by preventing division-by-zero errors, based on variances (σ_R^2 and σ_G^2). We test its effect over $[10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}]$, with $\alpha = 0.1$ fixed. Figure 7 presents the results. For BookCrossing, performance optimizes at an intermediate ϵ , with AUC, log loss, and accuracy peaking, though very small ϵ values degrade AUC. For Amazon, AUC and log loss improve up to a mid-range ϵ , with accuracy favoring a larger value. In MovieLens, AUC and log loss stabilize mid-range, while accuracy peaks slightly higher. These trends suggest that an intermediate ϵ balances performance and stability across datasets, avoiding degradation seen at extremes.

5.6 Analysis of Model Efficiency

Reasoning LLMs, despite their advanced capabilities, exhibit slower performance compared to general LLMs due to the generation of extensive chains of thought. To assess this, we compare the inference latency of a general LLM (Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, short for Llama) and a reasoning LLM

(DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B, short for DeepSeek-Llama) across three datasets using the vLLM [17] framework for acceleration. The hardware for the platform includes Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6354 CPU @ 3.00GHz and NVIDIA 48G A40 GPU. Latency is measured as the time per response in seconds. The result is shown in Figure 9. We observe the general LLM demonstrates significantly higher efficiency compared to the reasoning LLM across all datasets. On average, the reasoning LLM’s inference latency is over 11 times greater than that of the general LLM. This substantial difference is primarily due to the reasoning LLM generating much longer responses, with an average of nearly 700 tokens per response, as detailed in Table 7.

6 Conclusion

We introduce RALLREC+, a framework that enhances Retrieval-Augmented LLM recommendations by integrating representation learning and reasoning. It combines textual and collaborative semantics through self-supervised learning and leverages reasoning LLMs for improved performance. Experiments on three datasets show RALLREC+ outperforms conventional and state-of-the-art methods. Our findings reveal that reasoning LLMs excel in recommendations, retrieval augmentation boosts reasoning, and response consistency correlates with better result. Future work could explore fine-tuning reasoning LLMs to deepen their task-specific capabilities, integrate reinforcement learning to dynamically refine recommendation policies, and investigate hybrid architectures blending reasoning and generative strengths.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [3] Keqin Bao, Jizhi Zhang, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 1007–1014, 2023.
- [4] Millennium Bismay, Xiangjue Dong, and James Caverlee. Reasoningrec: Bridging personalized recommendations and human-interpretable explanations through llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23180*, 2024.
- [5] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [6] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023.
- [7] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [8] Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang, Yunming Ye, Zhenguo Li, and Xiuqiang He. Deepfm: a factorization-machine based neural network for ctr prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.04247*, 2017.
- [9] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020.
- [10] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. The movielens datasets: History and context. *Acm transactions on interactive intelligent systems*, 5(4):1–19, 2015.
- [11] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, YongDong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 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*, page 639–648, 2020.
- [12] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *ICLR*, 1(2):3, 2022.
 - [13] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. Distilling knowledge from reader to retriever for question answering. In *ICLR 2021-9th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
 - [14] Jianchao Ji, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Wenyue Hua, Yingqiang Ge, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. Genrec: Large language model for generative recommendation. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, pages 494–502. Springer, 2024.
 - [15] Sein Kim, Hongseok Kang, Seungyeon Choi, Donghyun Kim, Minchul Yang, and Chanyoung Park. Large language models meet collaborative filtering: An efficient all-round llm-based recommender system. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1395–1406, 2024.
 - [16] Mojtaba Komeili, Kurt Shuster, and Jason Weston. Internet-augmented dialogue generation. *CoRR*, abs/2107.07566, 2021.
 - [17] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 611–626, 2023.
 - [18] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
 - [19] Jianxun Lian, Xiaohuan Zhou, Fuzheng Zhang, Zhongxia Chen, Xing Xie, and Guangzhong Sun. xdeepfm: Combining explicit and implicit feature interactions for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 1754–1763, 2018.
 - [20] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
 - [21] Jianghao Lin, Rong Shan, Chenxu Zhu, Kounianhua Du, Bo Chen, Shigang Quan, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Rella: Retrieval-enhanced large language models for lifelong sequential behavior comprehension in recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 3497–3508, 2024.
 - [22] Sichun Luo, Bowei He, Haohan Zhao, Wei Shao, Yanlin Qi, Yinya Huang, Aojun Zhou, Yuxuan Yao, Zongpeng Li, Yuanzhang Xiao, et al. Recranker: Instruction tuning large language model as ranker for top-k recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 2024.
 - [23] Sichun Luo, Wei Shao, Yuxuan Yao, Jian Xu, Mingyang Liu, Qintong Li, Bowei He, Maolin Wang, Guanzhi Deng, Hanxu Hou, et al. Privacy in llm-based recommendation: Recent advances and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01363*, 2024.
 - [24] Sichun Luo, Jiansheng Wang, Aojun Zhou, Li Ma, and Linqi Song. Large language models augmented rating prediction in recommender system. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7960–7964. IEEE, 2024.
 - [25] Sichun Luo, Yuxuan Yao, Bowei He, Yinya Huang, Aojun Zhou, Xinyi Zhang, Yuanzhang Xiao, Mingjie Zhan, and Linqi Song. Integrating large language models into recommendation via mutual augmentation and adaptive aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13870*, 2024.
 - [26] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, 2019.
 - [27] OpenAI. Learning to reason with llms. OpenAI Blog, 2024.
 - [28] Weiping Song, Chence Shi, Zhiping Xiao, Zhijian Duan, Yewen Xu, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. AutoInt: Automatic feature interaction learning via self-attentive neural networks.

- In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 1161–1170, 2019.
- [29] Alicia Y Tsai, Adam Kraft, Long Jin, Chenwei Cai, Anahita Hosseini, Taibai Xu, Zemin Zhang, Lichan Hong, Ed H Chi, and Xinyang Yi. Leveraging llm reasoning enhances personalized recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00802*, 2024.
 - [30] Ruoxi Wang, Bin Fu, Gang Fu, and Mingliang Wang. Deep & cross network for ad click predictions. In *Proceedings of the ADKDD'17*, pages 1–7. 2017.
 - [31] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
 - [32] Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, et al. A survey on large language models for recommendation. *World Wide Web*, 27(5):60, 2024.
 - [33] Jian Xu, Sichun Luo, Xiangyu Chen, Haoming Huang, Hanxu Hou, and Linqi Song. Rallrec: Improving retrieval augmented large language model recommendation with representation learning, 2025.
 - [34] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, and Noah D Goodman. Star: Self-taught reasoner. In *Proceedings of the NIPS*, volume 22, 2022.
 - [35] Huimin Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Qian Jiang, and Dong Wang. Federated recommendation via hybrid retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04256*, 2024.
 - [36] Jizhi Zhang, Keqin Bao, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. Is chatgpt fair for recommendation? evaluating fairness in large language model recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, pages 993–999, 2023.
 - [37] Zihuai Zhao, Wenqi Fan, Jiatong Li, Yunqing Liu, Xiaowei Mei, Yiqi Wang, Zhen Wen, Fei Wang, Xiangyu Zhao, Jiliang Tang, et al. Recommender systems in the era of large language models (llms). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02046*, 2023.
 - [38] Cai-Nicolas Ziegler, Sean M McNee, Joseph A Konstan, and Georg Lausen. Improving recommendation lists through topic diversification. In *Proceedings of the 14th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 22–32, 2005.
 - [39] Ding Zou, Wei Wei, Xian-Ling Mao, Ziyang Wang, Minghui Qiu, Feida Zhu, and Xin Cao. Multi-level cross-view contrastive learning for knowledge-aware recommender system. In *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 1358–1368, 2022.