

Can LLM-Driven Hard Negative Sampling Empower Collaborative Filtering? Findings and Potentials.

Chu Zhao
chuzhao@stumail.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Enneng Yang
ennengyang@stumail.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Yuting Liu
yutingliu@stumail.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Jianzhe Zhao
zhaojz@swc.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Guibing Guo*
guogb@swc.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Xingwei Wang
wangxw@mail.neu.edu.cn
Northeastern University
Shenyang, China

Abstract

Hard negative samples can accelerate model convergence and optimize decision boundaries, which is key to improving the performance of recommender systems. Although large language models (LLMs) possess strong semantic understanding and generation capabilities, systematic research has not yet been conducted on how to generate hard negative samples effectively. To fill this gap, this paper introduces the concept of Semantic Negative Sampling and explores how to optimize LLMs for high-quality, hard negative sampling. Specifically, we design an experimental pipeline that includes three main modules, profile generation, semantic negative sampling, and semantic alignment, to verify the potential of LLM-driven hard negative sampling in enhancing the accuracy of collaborative filtering (CF). Experimental results indicate that hard negative samples generated based on LLMs, when semantically aligned and integrated into CF, can significantly improve CF performance, although there is still a certain gap compared to traditional negative sampling methods. Further analysis reveals that this gap primarily arises from two major challenges: noisy samples and lack of behavioral constraints. To address these challenges, we propose a framework called **HNLMLRec**, based on fine-tuning LLMs supervised by collaborative signals. Experimental results show that this framework outperforms traditional negative sampling and other LLM-driven recommendation methods across multiple datasets, providing new solutions for empowering traditional RS with LLMs. Additionally, we validate the excellent generalization ability of the LLM-based semantic negative sampling method on new datasets, demonstrating its potential in alleviating issues such as data sparsity, popularity bias, and the problem of false hard negative samples. Our implementation code is available at <https://github.com/user683/HNLMLRec>.

*Corresponding authors.

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

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

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

CCS Concepts

• **Information systems** → **Recommender systems**.

Keywords

Collaborative Filtering, Negative Sampling, Large Language Model

ACM Reference Format:

Chu Zhao, Enneng Yang, Yuting Liu, Jianzhe Zhao, Guibing Guo, and Xingwei Wang. 2018. Can LLM-Driven Hard Negative Sampling Empower Collaborative Filtering? Findings and Potentials.. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Negative sampling [2, 5, 12, 54] plays a vital role in collaborative filtering (CF) recommendations by generating negative signals from a vast amount of unlabeled data, helping models capture user preferences more accurately. In particular, sampling the hard negative samples—highly similar to positive samples but difficult for the model to distinguish—can provide more valuable information and greater gradients to the model, accelerating convergence and reinforcing decision boundaries. Currently, existing hard negative sample methods [51] employ a two-stage strategy to generate hard negatives: the first stage samples a fixed number of unobserved items from a simple static distribution, while the second stage uses a more complex negative sampling strategy to select the final negative samples. Despite its success, data sparsity in the first stage can hinder the selection of representative negative samples, while in the second stage, the model often selects popular items as negatives, failing to capture user preferences and leading to suboptimal performance. We illustrate in Figure 5 that the performance of these methods is significantly affected by data sparsity and popularity bias. Recently, due to the powerful ability of large language models (LLMs) to understand and reason complex texts, they have been widely applied in fields such as natural language processing [26, 42] and computer vision. Leveraging their rich world knowledge and strong reasoning capabilities, researchers have begun to explore the use of large language models to enhance the performance of traditional recommendation systems [28, 39].

However, how to fully utilize the robust semantic expressiveness of LLMs to precisely generate semantically hard negative samples for user-item interaction pairs, based on an in-depth analysis of user

preferences, to enhance recommendation performance remains an unexplored area of research. To fill this gap, this paper innovatively proposes the application of LLMs in the negative sampling process of CF, aiming to enhance the performance of recommendation models by mining hard negative samples at the semantic level. Specifically, we design an LLM-driven CF framework for negative sampling, which consists of three modules: Profile Generation, Semantic Negative Sampling, and Semantic Alignment. In detail, the Profile Generation module extracts deep semantic features from user behavior data and item descriptions using prompt engineering and contextual learning techniques to construct high-quality user and item profiles. The Semantic Negative Sampling module generates hard negative samples guided by prompt templates based on the generated semantic profiles. Finally, the Semantic Alignment module maps the hard negative samples generated by the LLMs into the latent representation space of the recommendation model, optimizing the embedding representations of users and items through a contrastive learning mechanism. We conduct experiments on three real-world datasets, and the empirical findings are as follows: (1) The negative sampling method based on LLMs effectively enhances the performance of CF models. For instance, on the Yelp2018 dataset, using LightGCN [9] as the backbone model, the LLM-driven negative sampling method achieves a maximum performance improvement of 3.22% compared to the batch random negative sampling method. (2) The LLM-driven negative sampling framework adheres to the scaling law principle, and as the scale of the LLM increases, the recommendation performance further improves. For example, on the Toys dataset, when the parameter size of the Qwen model increases from 1B to 70B, the performance improves by an average of 2.68%. (3) Despite its effectiveness, a performance gap remains between the LLM-based and traditional negative sampling methods. For instance, on the Toys dataset, using NDCG@20 as the metric, the LLM-based method scores 0.0190, while MixgcF scores 0.0193. We further analyze the limitations of the aforementioned LLM-Driven negative sampling method, which faces two challenges:

- **Noisy Samples.** The samples generated by LLMs may extend beyond the original item pool or even include meaningless noise, negatively impacting the model optimization process and harming model performance.
- **Lack of Behavioral Constraints.** When transformed into embedding representations, the semantically hard negative samples produced by the LLMs may lead to excessive semantic distances due to a lack of constraints from user collaborative information, hindering effective alignment with the embeddings generated from real user behavior data.

We introduce the fine-tuning framework **HNLMLRec** to tackle the above two key challenges. To address **Noisy samples**, we leverage a pre-trained negative sampling model to generate representations of hard negatives directly, avoiding the generation of noisy text. For **Lack of Behavioral Constraints**, we integrate user-item features with profiles to create hybrid prompts, enabling the model to capture complex collaborative signals. We then bridge the semantic gap between general and recommendation domains through contrastive supervised fine-tuning. Importantly, our model outputs negative sample embeddings directly, avoiding semantic noise and

enhancing embedding space consistency. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Empirical Finds.** We are the first to propose the concept of semantic negative sampling and design a comprehensive experimental pipeline to explore the potential of LLM-driven hard negative sampling methods in enhancing CF performance. The experimental results show that LLMs can effectively identify high-quality hard negative samples, significantly improving the performance of recommendation models. Despite its effectiveness, LLM-based negative sampling still lags behind traditional methods in performance.
- **Model Framework.** We analyze the limitations of the LLM-driven hard negative sampling method and propose a fine-tuning-based recommendation framework, **HNLMLRec**, to tackle the challenges of Noisy Samples and Lack of Behavioral Constraints.
- **Evaluation and Potentials.** We conduct performance comparisons of HNLMLRec with ID-based hard negative sampling methods across multiple datasets. The experimental results demonstrate that HNLMLRec significantly outperforms other methods, achieving a maximum performance improvement of 8.46%. Moreover, we further validated the potential of LLM-driven negative sampling in addressing data sparsity, popularity bias, mitigating the false hard negative sample issue, and its strong generalization capability on new datasets.

2 Preliminary

Collaborative Filtering. Given a user set $U = \{u_i\}_{i=1}^M$ and an item set $V = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$, along with the observed user-item interaction matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{|M| \times |N|}$, if user u has interacted with item v , then $R_{uv} = 1$, otherwise it is 0. CF methods typically learn an encoder function $f(\cdot)$ to map users and items into low-dimensional vector embeddings and predict the user's preference for items by calculating the similarity between these vectors. The Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [29] loss function is commonly used to optimize the encoder $f(\cdot)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{BPR} = \sum_{(u,v) \in R} -\log(\sigma(s(u,v) - s(u,v^-))) \quad (1)$$

where $s(u,v)$ represents the predicted score of user u for item v , σ is the sigmoid function and v^- denotes the negatively sampled item.

Negative sampling. The BPR method optimizes the model by contrasting positive and negative samples. Negative samples v^- serve as contrasting signals, allowing the model to discern between items users prefer and those they do not. In-batch random negative sampling is typically used, where items the user has not interacted with are considered negative samples. High-quality hard negative samples can effectively assist the model in learning better decision boundaries between positive and negative samples. This approach typically involves pre-selecting a candidate set, from which samples are chosen as hard negative samples.

3 Empirical Study of LLM-Driven Hard Negative Sampling in Recommendation

Following the research framework of [30], this section addresses two key research questions: **Q1:** Can LLMs effectively mine hard




Figure 1: The overall pipeline of LLM-driven semantic negative sampling enhancing graph CF consists of three main components: user-item profile generation, semantic negative sampling, semantic alignment, and model training.

negative samples to improve traditional CF methods? **Q2:** If feasible, how do LLM-driven negative sampling methods compare to state-of-the-art ID-based CF methods? We design a pipeline that integrates LLM-mined hard negative samples into CF to investigate these questions. Section 3.1 details the pipeline implementation and experimental setup, while Section 4.1 evaluates the feasibility of LLMs for hard negative sample mining and compares its performance with SOTA ID-based methods.

Prompt \mathcal{S}_H : Hard Negative Sample Generation

System Prompt: You will act as an assistant to help me generate a hard negative sample for a user. **Hard negative samples that are very similar to the user's historical preferences or interaction records but are actually not of interest to the user or do not meet the user's needs.** Below are the instructions: **1.** User information will be described in JSON format, containing the following attributes: Each interacted business will be described in JSON format, with the following attributes: { "title": "the name of the business", (if there is no business, I will set this value to "None") "description": "a description of what types of users will like this business", "review": "the user's review on the business" (if there is no review, I will set this value to "None") } **Response:** Please provide your answer in JSON format, following this structure: { "hard negative item": "The name of the generated negative sample" (if unable to generate, set this value to "None"), "reasoning": "briefly explain your reasoning for the summarization" }

3.1 LLM Semantic Negative Sampling

Building on existing works [28, 45] that utilize LLMs to enhance recommendation algorithms, we first collect user review information, historical interaction records, item attribute information, and review content. Using LLMs, we construct user profiles and item profiles separately. Based on the above profile information, we further identify samples corresponding to users and items, ultimately leveraging the embeddings generated by the LLMs to enhance the CF model. Specifically, for a given item title T , attribute information $Atr.$, and multiple user comments $R_v = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$, we combine these into a text string to create the input prompt $\mathcal{D}_v = \{T, Atr., R_v\}$

for generating the item profile. By incorporating the system prompt for the item \mathcal{S}_v , the item profile information \mathcal{P}_v can be obtained as:

$$\mathcal{P}_v = \text{LLM}(\mathcal{S}_v, \mathcal{D}_v). \quad (2)$$

Similar to the process of constructing item profiles, for an individual user u , we first construct an input prompt $\mathcal{D}_u = \{R_u, \mathcal{P}_v\}$, where $R_u = [r_1, \dots, r_n]$ is the collection of user comments. Using the following method, the user profile can be derived as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_u = \text{LLM}(\mathcal{S}_u, \mathcal{D}_u). \quad (3)$$

For a given user-item interaction pair (u, v) , along with the generated user profile \mathcal{P}_u and item profile \mathcal{P}_v , and incorporating the system prompt \mathcal{S}_H for generating hard negative samples, we can combine these elements into an input prompt $\mathcal{D}_H = \{(u, v), \mathcal{P}_u, \mathcal{P}_v\}$. Due to space limitations, the system prompts for generating user profiles \mathcal{S}_u and item profiles \mathcal{S}_v are described in the code implementation link.

Subsequently, using the LLMs, we generate one or more hard negative samples for the user-item pair. It is important to note that in the system prompt \mathcal{S}_H , we clearly define the semantics of hard negative samples: **they are similar to the user's historical preferences or interaction records but do not align with their interests or needs.** The specific process is outlined as follows:

$$Neg = \text{LLM}(\mathcal{S}_H, \mathcal{D}_H), \quad (4)$$

where Neg is the difficult negative sample textual representation directly outputted by the large model. Following previous work, we utilize a text embedding model that has been shown to effectively transform diverse text inputs into fixed-length vectors while preserving their inherent meaning and contextual information. The entire process is illustrated as follows:

$$e^{llm} = \mathcal{T}(Neg), \quad (5)$$

where e^{llm} represents the embeddings of hard negative samples. $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ is the text embedding model (text-embedding-ada-002 [27]). It is worth noting that if multiple samples are generated, they are merged into one through an average pooling operation. In the main experiments of this paper, only one hard negative sample is used. The hard negative sample embeddings obtained from the LLMs semantic space typically have high dimensions (e.g., LLaMA's output embedding dimension is 4096), making them unsuitable for direct input into the recommendation latent space. An intuitive

solution is to use a nonlinear multilayer perceptron (MLP) to map the high-dimensional embeddings to a lower-dimensional space to address this. The following outlines the process of mapping hard negative samples from the semantic space to the recommendation latent space:

$$e^{hard} = W_2 \cdot ReLU(W_1 \cdot e^{llm} + b_1) + b_2, \quad (6)$$

where W_1 and W_2 are the weight matrices, while b_1 and b_2 are the corresponding bias terms in the MLP. Following the above process, we can obtain the hard negative embedding for each user-item pair. To balance the diversity and difficulty of samples and prevent the model from overemphasizing a specific type of negative sample, for the user-item pair (u, v) , after obtaining e^{hard} , we combine it with randomly sampled negative embeddings e^- from the batch to generate the final negative samples, as follows:

$$\tilde{e}^- = (1 - \alpha) \cdot e^- + \alpha \cdot e^{hard}, \quad (7)$$

where α is the penalty factor coefficient. We use the BPR loss as the optimization objective and the Eq. (1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{BPR} = \sum_{(u, v^+) \in \mathcal{O}^+} \ln \sigma(\mathbf{e}_u \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{e}}^- - \mathbf{e}_u \cdot \mathbf{e}_v), \quad (8)$$

where σ is the sigmoid function, \mathcal{O}^+ is the set of positive feedback. \mathbf{e}_{u_i} and \mathbf{e}_{v_i} represent the user and item embeddings obtained through CF methods. We employ contrastive learning to align better the semantic embeddings generated by the large model, which contains world knowledge, with the latent space of CF models. This approach aligns the embeddings generated by the LLMs with those from traditional CF models while leveraging the hard negatives produced by the large model to enhance the distinguishing capability of the traditional model. This combination effectively integrates the signals from traditional CF with negative sample embeddings obtained through LLMs semantic sampling, further improving recommendation accuracy. Specifically, we employ InfoNCE [40] loss to perform contrastive learning on the embeddings of users, items, and hard negatives, as shown below:

$$\mathcal{L}_{align} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{(e_u, e_v^+)} \log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(e_u, e_v^+)/\tau)}{\sum_{e_v \in \{e_v^+, e^{hard}\}} \exp(\text{sim}(e_u, e_v)/\tau)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\text{sim}(\cdot)$ represents the similarity function, typically the cosine similarity. τ is the temperature parameter that controls the smoothness of the distribution. $|\mathcal{B}|$ indicates the batch sample size. By combining the multiple training objectives, the pipeline is optimized to minimize the following overall objective:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{BPR} + \lambda_1 \cdot \mathcal{L}_{align} + \lambda_2 \cdot \|\Theta\|_F^2, \quad (10)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 represent hyperparameters utilized for balancing the loss. The final term corresponds to the Frobenius norm regularization applied to the parameters. Figure 1 illustrates the entire pipeline's architecture.

To explore the feasibility of LLMs to mine hard negative samples and enhance traditional graph-based CF, we employ LightGCN as the backbone and integrate multiple LLMs into our proposed pipeline, conducting extensive comparative experiments. The results are reported in Table 1. Specifically, we compare our approach with classic CF algorithm baselines, including Matrix Factorization (MF) [15], NGCF [37], and LightGCN [9], on the Toys & Games,




Figure 2: The fine-tuning framework of HNLMLRec leverages collaborative information.

CDs & Vinyl, and Yelp 2018 datasets (detailed information about the datasets and baselines can be found in Section 5.1).

For the Q1, from Table 1 we have the following observations: **The hard negative sample sampling method based on language models can improve recommendation accuracy in most cases, indicating that the hard negative samples generated by language models in the semantic space can enhance CF algorithms' performance.** We employ advanced language models, such as Llama3.1-8B and ChatGPT-3.5, to generate hard negative samples, significantly enhancing traditional graph-based CF methods. Experimental results demonstrate that this approach outperforms baseline models across various metrics, improving performance as model parameter size increases. For example, smaller models like Qwen2.5-0.5B and Llama3.2-1B showed limited improvement or even performance degradation compared to LightGCN, indicating their limited ability to capture semantic preferences.

For Q2, we compare our experimental results with SOTA traditional negative sampling methods, as shown in Figure 3. We evaluate the performance of Qwen family language models with varying parameter sizes and ChatGPT-3.5 against MixGCF [12]. Notably, *Base* represents the backbone model LightGCN, while "T-3.5" denotes ChatGPT-3.5. **The figure demonstrates that as the model parameter size increases, the performance of these methods gradually surpasses that of LightGCN but remains below the performance of the negative sampling method MixGCF.** Additionally, in Figure 3 (d), we employed the traditional vector model BERT to convert text generated by Qwen2-7B into vectors, and the results indicate that its performance is significantly lower than the baseline model. This suggests that the vectors generated by such models lack discriminative capability.

Based on above experimental results, We argue that, under the current pipeline, using LLMs to extract hard negative samples for improving CF methods may fall short of SOTA ID-based approaches due to two key challenges: (1) **Noisy Samples:** LLM-generated samples may extend beyond the original item pool or introduce irrelevant noise, negatively impacting model optimization and performance. (2) **Lack of Behavioral Constraints:** Unlike ID-based methods that directly model user-item interactions, LLM-generated

Table 1: Overall performance comparison. The best results are highlighted in bold and the second-best results are underlined. "*" implies the improvements over the best baseline are statistically significant (p-value < 0.05) under one-sample t-tests.

Method	Toys & Games				CDs & Vinyl				Yelp2018			
	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20
MF	0.0158	0.0103	0.0267	0.0134	0.0262	0.0183	0.0447	0.0237	0.0398	0.0268	0.0668	0.0355
NGCF	0.0156	0.0092	0.0316	0.0140	0.0265	0.0160	0.0500	0.0230	0.0407	0.0278	0.0703	0.0371
LightGCN	0.0205	0.0135	0.0346	0.0178	0.0309	0.0195	0.0565	0.0273	0.0434	0.0303	0.0746	0.0402
Qwen2-0.5B [46]	0.0198	0.0125	0.0322	0.0160	0.0292	0.0181	0.0539	0.0256	0.0435	0.0302	0.0701	0.0387
Llama3-1B [6]	0.0207	0.0124	0.0343	0.0171	0.0306	0.0191	0.0543	0.0268	0.0436	0.0304	0.0747	0.0404
Mistral-7B [13]	0.0214	0.0139	0.0357	0.0183	0.0321	0.0204	0.0576	0.0280	0.0438	0.0306	0.0750	0.0406
Qwen2-7B [46]	0.0217	0.0140	0.0361	0.0185	0.0325	0.0206	0.0579	0.0282	0.0440	0.0307	0.0752	0.0406
Llama3-8B [6]	0.0220	0.0141	0.0365	0.0186	0.0330	0.0208	0.0582	0.0284	0.0441	0.0308	0.0755	<u>0.0408</u>
Qwen2-70B [46]	0.0223	<u>0.0145</u>	0.0367	<u>0.0187</u>	0.0332	0.0210	0.0585	0.0285	<u>0.0440</u>	0.0309	0.0756	<u>0.0408</u>
Llama3-70B [6]	<u>0.0224</u>	0.0144	0.0369	<u>0.0187</u>	<u>0.0335</u>	<u>0.0211</u>	<u>0.0587</u>	<u>0.0286</u>	0.0439	0.0310	<u>0.0758</u>	0.0406
ChatGPT-3.5 [18]	0.0225*	0.0158*	0.0373*	0.0190*	0.0337*	0.0212*	0.0590*	0.0288*	0.0448*	0.0311*	0.0760*	0.0411*

semantic negative samples often fail to capture behavioral patterns, potentially embedding extraneous noise fully.

4 Improving Better Recommendation through LLM-Driven Negative Sampling

To mitigate the challenges above further, we propose a framework (HNLMRec) based on fine-tuning LLMs with collaborative signals for generating high-quality hard negative samples, as illustrated in Figure 2. Precisely, the framework consists of hybrid prompt construction and supervised fine-tuning. To address the challenge of the lack of behavioral constraints, we leverage embeddings of users and items generated by a pre-trained CF model and integrate them into the prompt to guide the model in better capturing user behavior patterns. Additionally, for the issue of Semantic Shift, we employ supervised fine-tuning with collaborative signals to directly generate negative sample embeddings that incorporate both collaborative signals and world knowledge, thereby ensuring that the generated negative samples are semantically accurate and aligned with user preferences.

4.1 Empirical Findings (Q1)

4.2 Hybrid Prompt Construction

Recent studies [14, 17] have attempted to integrate collaborative signals into prompts as inputs for LLMs, aiming to align the semantic information of LLMs with collaborative embeddings. Building on these insights, we utilize a pre-trained CF method (in this work, we use the SOTA model MixGCF) to obtain user embeddings e_u and item embeddings e_v and incorporate them into the input prompts. Specifically, the input prompt consists of instruction I and query Q . The instruction provides a detailed explanation of the specific task for the model. For example, the instruction could be *generate a hard negative sample*. For each user-item interaction pair, we treat it as a query and replace the original user and item IDs with the obtained user and item embeddings while linking the user and item profile information. We then concatenate it with the

instruction to form the input prompt for the LLM as follows:

$$Q_{final} = Prompt(I, e_u, \mathcal{P}_u, e_v, \mathcal{P}_v) \quad (11)$$

It is worth noting that the embeddings generated by MixGCF exhibit a lower dimensionality (typically 64-dimensional or 128-dimensional.) compared to the standard token embeddings used in LLMs. To address this discrepancy, we employ a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) as a powerful tool to effectively transform these lower-dimensional embeddings into a higher-dimensional space, enhancing their representational capacity and facilitating more robust downstream tasks. The mapping method utilized here is analogous to the one outlined in Equation (6), which provides a mathematical framework for this transformation; however, for the sake of brevity, we will refrain from delving into the specific details of this process in the current discussion.

4.3 Contrastive Fine-tuning

Recent research has shown that LLMs can effectively generate high-quality text embeddings [35], demonstrating significant advantages in tasks such as retrieval and matching. Inspired by this work, we propose a method for directly generating hard negative sample embeddings through fine-tuning LLMs, thus avoiding the problem of generated items possibly not being in the item pool or not existing. Furthermore, we aim to generate hard negative sample embeddings encompassing the original collaborative information and the world knowledge encoded within the large model. To achieve this goal, we integrate collaborative signals in constructing prompts and use the hard negative sample embeddings outputted by MixGCF as label values during the fine-tuning process. Specifically, we directly follow the approach in [35], which employs contrastive learning to supervise the fine-tuning of LLMs. At the end of the input prompt Q_{final} and the hard negative samples N_{emb} generated by MixGCF, we add a [EOS] token. By extracting the vector of the last layer corresponding to the [EOS] token, we obtain the query embedding Q_{emb} and the label embedding N_{emb}^+ . Subsequently, we use the InfoNCE loss to train the model, which maximizes the similarity of




Figure 3: Evaluating the impact of model parameter size on recommendation performance.

Table 2: The table below compares the performance of various competing methods and HNLMLRec across three datasets. Bold text indicates the highest score, while underlining denotes the best result among the baseline methods. An asterisk (*) signifies a statistically significant improvement over the best baseline method (i.e., t-test with $p < 0.05$).

Backbone Model	Toys & Games				CDs & Vinyl				Yelp2018				
	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	
MF	-RNS	0.0148	0.0093	0.0257	0.0114	0.0201	0.0153	0.0447	0.0237	0.0398	0.0272	0.0627	0.0348
	-DNS	0.0181	0.0118	0.0284	0.0152	0.0291	0.0203	0.0463	0.0255	0.0376	0.0269	0.0640	0.0355
	-MixGCF	0.0196	0.0122	0.0272	0.0151	<u>0.0300</u>	<u>0.0215</u>	0.0496	0.0264	0.0361	0.0258	0.0694	0.0363
	-AHNS	0.0184	0.0123	0.0311	0.0163	<u>0.0284</u>	0.0179	<u>0.0449</u>	0.0259	0.0398	0.0268	0.0668	0.0355
	-KAR	0.0183	0.0122	0.0318	0.0163	0.0283	0.0178	0.0448	0.0258	0.0397	0.0267	0.0667	0.0354
	-LLMRec	0.0187	<u>0.0128</u>	0.0273	0.0152	0.0284	0.0179	0.0449	0.0259	0.0362	0.0259	0.0668	0.0355
	-RLMRec	<u>0.0204</u>	0.0123	<u>0.0319</u>	<u>0.0164</u>	0.0292	0.0204	0.0497	<u>0.0267</u>	<u>0.0418</u>	<u>0.0288</u>	<u>0.0705</u>	<u>0.0379</u>
	OURS	0.0219*	0.0137*	0.0346*	0.0177*	0.0312*	0.0223*	0.0518*	0.0283*	0.0433*	0.0296*	0.0735*	0.0394*
	Impro.%	7.35%	7.03%	8.46%	7.93%	4.00%	3.72%	2.62%	5.60%	3.59%	2.78%	4.26%	3.96%
NGCF	-RNS	0.0166	0.0109	0.0283	0.0135	0.0225	0.0160	0.0491	0.0230	0.0385	0.0278	0.0644	0.0354
	-DNS	0.0195	0.0111	0.0296	0.0146	0.0253	<u>0.0200</u>	0.0521	0.0254	0.0414	0.0289	0.0704	0.0349
	-MixGCF	<u>0.0214</u>	<u>0.0139</u>	0.0312	0.0161	0.0257	0.0191	<u>0.0537</u>	0.0256	0.0429	<u>0.0298</u>	<u>0.0727</u>	0.0396
	-AHNS	0.0200	0.0125	0.0300	0.0150	0.0255	0.0195	0.0525	0.0255	0.0420	0.0290	0.0710	0.0370
	-KAR	0.0205	0.0130	0.0305	0.0155	0.0256	0.0193	0.0530	0.0258	0.0425	0.0295	0.0715	0.0380
	-LLMRec	0.0208	0.0120	0.0315	0.0160	0.0260	0.0192	0.0520	0.0257	0.0435	0.0281	0.0709	0.0398
	-RLMRec	0.0192	0.0132	<u>0.0318</u>	<u>0.0162</u>	<u>0.0262</u>	0.0198	0.0530	<u>0.0259</u>	<u>0.0438</u>	0.0294	0.0725	<u>0.0400</u>
	OURS	0.0227*	0.0146*	0.0328*	0.0172*	0.0273*	0.0208*	0.0541*	0.0265*	0.0450*	0.0309*	0.0739*	0.0413*
	Impro.%	6.07%	5.04%	3.14%	6.17%	4.20%	4.00%	2.08%	2.32%	2.74%	5.10%	1.65%	3.25%
LightGCN	-RNS	0.0205	0.0135	0.0337	0.0178	0.0309	0.0175	0.0506	0.0253	0.0434	0.0303	0.0643	0.0351
	-DNS	0.0212	0.0139	0.0341	0.0178	0.0319	0.0210	0.0543	0.0271	0.0380	0.0267	0.0746	0.0402
	-MixGCF	<u>0.0227</u>	<u>0.0143</u>	0.0352	0.0183	<u>0.0334</u>	<u>0.0211</u>	0.0565	0.0281	0.0440	0.0306	0.0768	0.0411
	-AHNS	0.0221	0.0138	0.0356	0.01820	0.0328	0.0200	0.0559	0.0275	0.0364	0.0259	0.0773	0.0402
	-KAR	0.0220	0.0136	0.0365	0.0181	0.0327	0.0199	0.0544	0.0274	0.0363	0.0258	0.0780	0.0401
	-LLMRec	0.0220	0.0137	0.0364	0.0180	0.0326	0.0198	0.0569	0.0273	0.0362	0.0257	0.0769	0.0400
	-RLMRec	0.0225	0.0140	<u>0.0367</u>	<u>0.0184</u>	0.0325	0.0209	<u>0.0577</u>	<u>0.0285</u>	<u>0.0450</u>	<u>0.0311</u>	<u>0.0781</u>	<u>0.0409</u>
	OURS	0.0237*	0.0150*	0.0388*	0.0195*	0.0347*	0.02201*	0.0597*	0.02965*	0.0466*	0.0318*	0.0819*	0.0425*
	Impro.%	4.36%	4.90%	5.15%	5.98%	3.89%	4.27%	3.47%	4.21%	3.56%	2.25%	4.87%	3.41%
SGL	-RNS	0.0215	0.0142	0.0344	0.0181	0.0323	0.0189	0.0525	0.0265	0.0442	0.0316	0.0791	0.0402
	-DNS	0.0218	0.0142	0.0349	0.0182	0.0344	0.0214	0.0558	0.0290	0.0488	0.0345	0.0833	0.0447
	-MixGCF	<u>0.0237</u>	<u>0.0157</u>	<u>0.0370</u>	<u>0.0197</u>	<u>0.0357</u>	<u>0.0222</u>	0.0587	0.0289	0.0498	0.0350	<u>0.0841</u>	<u>0.0457</u>
	-AHNS	0.0228	0.0147	0.0358	0.0188	0.0346	0.0217	0.0589	0.0290	0.0486	0.0340	0.0820	0.0448
	-KAR	0.0230	0.0148	0.0360	0.0189	0.0348	0.0218	0.0590	0.0291	0.0487	0.0341	0.0822	0.0449
	-LLMRec	0.0232	0.0149	0.0362	0.0190	0.0350	0.0220	0.0592	0.0292	0.0490	0.0345	0.0825	0.0450
	-RLMRec	0.0235	0.0150	0.0365	0.0192	0.0352	<u>0.0222</u>	<u>0.0595</u>	<u>0.0293</u>	<u>0.0492</u>	<u>0.0348</u>	0.0830	0.0455
	OURS	0.0248*	0.0162*	0.0402*	0.0210*	0.0376*	0.0230*	0.0613*	0.0304*	0.0515*	0.0355*	0.0863*	0.0467*
	Impro.%	4.64%	3.18%	8.65%	6.60%	5.32%	3.60%	3.03%	3.75%	3.41%	1.43%	2.62%	2.19%

positive pairs while minimizing the similarity of negative pairs:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SFT} = -\log \frac{\exp(Q_{\text{emb}} \cdot N_{\text{emb}}^+ / \tau)}{\exp(Q_{\text{emb}} \cdot N_{\text{emb}}^+ / \tau) + \sum_{i=1}^N \exp(Q_{\text{emb}} \cdot N_{\text{neg}}^i / \tau)} \quad (12)$$

where N_{neg}^i is the embedding vector of the i -th negative sample (with N negative samples). In the aforementioned fine-tuning stage, we utilize LoRA [11] to fine-tune the LLMs, thereby conserving

computational resources. We leverage the fine-tuned LLMs to directly generate hard negative sample embeddings e^{llm} based on the input prompt construction method described in Equation (11), and further process them through the semantic alignment module and training module illustrated in Figure 1.

5 Experiments

In this section, we will present and analyze the experimental results in detail to validate the performance advantages of HNLMRec over ID-based graph CF algorithms. Additionally, we further verify the effectiveness and robustness of the model through ablation studies and hyperparameter analysis. Finally, we also design experiments to explore the potential of leveraging LLMs for semantic negative sampling in the following four scenarios. **P1**: New dataset (generalization ability), **P2**: Popularity bias, **P3**: Data sparsity issues, **P4**: alleviating the False Hard Negative Sample (FHNS) problem.

5.1 Experimental Settings

Datasets. We conduct comparative experiments on four real-world datasets, including Toys & Games, CDs & Vinyl, Yelp2018, and Amazon Electronics 2023. Among these, the Amazon Electronics 2023 dataset was used to evaluate the generalization performance of HNLMRec after fine-tuning on the first three datasets. For detailed information and processing steps of the datasets, please refer to the README file in our implementation code.

Baselines. This paper classifies the baselines we utilize into three distinct groups. **Traditional Collaborative Filtering:** MF, NGCF, DGCF [38], and LightGCN. **Negative Sampling Methods:** RNS [15] (Random Negative Sampling), DNS [31] (which controls negative sampling through predefined parameters), MixGCF [12] (which synthesizes hard negative samples by injecting positive samples), and AHNS [16] (which adaptively selects hard negative samples during training). **LLM-Enhanced Methods:** KAR [45] and RLMRec [28] enhance traditional recommendations by generating user and item descriptions, while LLMRec [39] generates user and item attribute information for enhancement.

Implementation Details. We chose Llama3-8B as the base model in the model fine-tuning task. We collect 100,000 data points from Yelp2018, Toys, and CDs and constructed the dataset required for fine-tuning according to Eq. (11). The fine-tuning process is done on a system equipped with eight NVIDIA 4090 GPUs, utilizing 4-bit quantization technology. To ensure a fair comparison, all large models in the baseline used Llama3-8B as the base model. To ensure a fair comparison, all large models in the baseline used Llama3-8B as the base model.

5.2 Overall Performance (Q2)

To evaluate the performance of the fine-tuned HNLMRec model compared to the ID-based negative sampling methods, we integrate it into five classic CF algorithms and conduct comparative experiments on three datasets. We utilize 5 random initializations for the experiments and report the results in Table 3. From Table 2, we draw the following conclusions: From an overall performance perspective, the fine-tuned HNLMRec demonstrates significant improvement compared to the baseline models, particularly outperforming other

ID-based negative sampling methods, which provides strong evidence for the effectiveness of HNLMRec. Through in-depth analysis, we attribute the performance enhancement primarily to the following two reasons: (1) HNLMRec leverages LLMs to profile users and items accurately, and based on these profiles, it performs semantic negative sampling on user-item interaction pairs, enabling more precise identification of semantically hard negativesamples. (2) By integrating user and item embeddings from the latent space into the prompt and fine-tuning the large model using hard negative sample embeddings output by the CF model, HNLMRec ensures that the hard negative samples generated by the LLM incorporate both the world knowledge within the LLM and the semantic information of the original embeddings, thereby achieving more accurate semantic alignment.


In Table 2, we further compare other methods that leverage LLMs to enhance CF. The results demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms these approaches. Specifically, KAR utilizes LLMs to construct representations of users and items but treats semantic representations merely as input features to the model. Without a semantic alignment mechanism, it may introduce irrelevant knowledge from the LLM, thereby generating noise. LLMRec primarily infers attributes of unknown users and items through interaction data to enhance recommendations, while RLMRec enhances the recommendation model by generating profiles of users and items. These two methods outperform KAR due to their more reasonable semantic alignment structures. However, the lack of a fine-tuning mechanism to further constrain the generated results makes it difficult for them to avoid introducing noise. In contrast, this further validates the necessity of HNLMRec’s fine-tuning on interaction datasets to constrain the generated results, effectively reducing noise and improving performance. Notably, in Figure 4(c) and (d), we compare the convergence speed of HNLMRec with other ID-based negative sampling methods. As illustrated in the figures, HNLMRec exhibits a significantly faster convergence rate than the baseline methods. This accelerated convergence can be attributed to our LLM-driven framework’s high-quality hard negative samples, which provide more informative gradients during training. The results further validate the effectiveness of our approach in enhancing model optimization and demonstrate the superiority of HNLMRec in terms of both efficiency and performance.

5.3 Ablation Study


We conduct ablation experiments using LightGCN as the backbone model on three datasets to investigate the impact of each component on model performance. The experimental results are shown in Table 3. To evaluate the effect of fine-tuning the model with recommendation data, we test the performance without fine-tuning (i.e., using only the pipeline shown in Figure (1), denoted as w/o SCFT). The results indicate that the model performance significantly declines without fine-tuning, highlighting the importance of leveraging collaborative signals to fine-tune the large model for semantic alignment. Additionally, the variant w/o Align, which removes the contrastive alignment module from the framework, also shows a notable performance drop. This further demonstrates the significant gap between semantic embeddings and collaborative

Table 3: The ablation study on the Yelp, Toys, and CDs dataset with the backbone model LightCN. "*" implies the improvements over the best baseline are statistically significant (p-value< 0.05) under one-sample t-tests.

Method	Toys & Games				CDs & Vinyl				Yelp2018			
	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20	R@10	N@10	R@20	N@20
HNLMRec	0.0237	0.0150	0.0388	0.0195	0.0347	0.0220	0.0597	0.0297	0.0466	0.0318	0.0819	0.0425
w/o SCFT	0.0220	0.0141	0.0365	0.0186	0.0330	0.0208	0.0582	0.0284	0.0441	0.0308	0.0755	0.0408
w/o Align	0.0205	0.0130	0.0345	0.0175	0.0310	0.0195	0.0545	0.0270	0.0425	0.0285	0.0765	0.0385

**Figure 4: Figure (a) and (b) illustrate the impact of the number of negative samples and different settings of the hyperparameter α on model performance. Figure (c) and (d) present the comparison of convergence speeds between HNLMRec, implemented with MF as the backbone, and other ID-based negative sampling methods on Toys and Yelp2018 dataset.****Table 4: Overall performance comparison on the Amazon Fashion dataset**

Methods	R@10	R@20	N@10	N@20	
ID-based	RNS	0.0076	0.0048	0.0119	0.0058
	-DNS	0.0085	0.0050	0.0122	0.0060
	-MixGCF	<u>0.0097</u>	0.0052	0.0127	0.0062
	-AHNS	0.0090	0.0051	0.0125	0.0061
LLM-based	-KAR	0.0078	0.0049	0.0120	0.0059
	-LLMRec	0.0091	0.0058	0.0126	0.0060
	-RLMRec	0.0096	<u>0.0054</u>	<u>0.0130</u>	<u>0.0062</u>
OURS	-HNLMRec	0.0098*	0.0055*	0.0132*	0.0064*
	Improv.%	2.08%	1.85%	1.54%	3.22%

**Figure 5: (a) Performance comparison on the Toys dataset with varying proportions of training data (using LightGCN as the backbone model). (b) Model performance comparison across different popularity groups.**

embeddings, and without alignment, it is challenging to effectively enhance traditional recommendation methods.

5.4 Hyper-parameter Analysis

In this section, we explore the impact of the number of hard negative samples and the mixing coefficient α on model performance. As shown in Figure 4 (a), during the training process, the model performance gradually improves and eventually stabilizes as the

number of hard negative samples used increases. In this work, the LLM generates the hard negative samples before model training, and readers can adjust the number of negative samples based on specific datasets. Additionally, we investigate the influence of the hyperparameter α on performance, which primarily controls the mixing ratio of hard negative samples to random negative samples. A larger α value indicates a higher proportion of hard negative samples. From Figure 5(b), it can be observed that as the α value increases, the model performance initially improves, but when the α value is set too large, the performance significantly declines. We analyze that this may be because a larger α value excessively diminishes the contribution of random negative samples while increasing the model's sensitivity to hard negative samples, leading to training difficulties or overfitting and making it challenging for the model to learn the global distribution fully.

5.5 Potentials of LLM-Driven Hard Negative Sampling

Good Generalization on New Dataset (P1). We test the performance of HNLMRec, fine-tuned on other datasets, against ID-based negative sampling methods and LLM-based methods using LightGCN as the backbone model on the Amazon Fashion dataset. As shown in Table 4, HNLMRec significantly outperforms other baseline models, demonstrating its strong generalization capability on new datasets without requiring additional fine-tuning for specific datasets. We attribute this to the powerful generalization ability of LLMs, the domain adaptability gained through fine-tuning, the robustness of semantic negative sampling, and the common characteristics across datasets. These factors collectively enable HNLMRec to maintain excellent performance across different datasets. **Robust Performance Under Sparse Data Conditions (P2).** Data sparsity is one of the main challenges faced by ID-based negative sampling methods. Due to the limited historical interaction data of users, traditional negative sampling methods often generate




Figure 6: Case Study on LLM-Driven Semantic Negative Sampling for Mitigating False Negative Sample Problems.

negative samples that lack challenge, making it difficult to effectively distinguish between items that users truly like and those they are not interested in, thereby affecting recommendation accuracy. In Figure 5 (a), we compare the performance of HNLMRec with baseline models under different proportions of training data. The experimental results show that HNLMRec significantly outperforms the baseline models. We attribute this advantage to the powerful semantic understanding capability of LLMs, which can accurately capture user preferences even with limited interaction data, thereby enabling high-quality hard negative sample mining and improving model performance. The experimental results further demonstrate the potential of LLMs in alleviating data sparsity issues through precise hard negative sample sampling.

Achieving High Performance on Popularity Bias Distributions P(3). Popular items dominate interactions in RS due to frequent recommendations, while long-tail item interactions are sparse. ID-based methods struggle with negative sampling from interaction data alone, lacking semantic information to reflect user preferences, which hampers performance accurately. Following the approach in [48], we categorize the test set into three subsets based on item popularity: Unpopular (the 80% of items with the fewest clicks), Popular (the top 5% of items), and Normal (the remaining items). As illustrated in Figure 5 (b), HNLMRec significantly outperforms other models in the long-tail subset, primarily due to the enhanced characterization of user preferences through LLM-provided semantic information. In the Popular subset, LightGCN with random negative sampling excels, reflecting a bias toward popular items. Additionally, we further validate the potential of language models in long-tail recommendations from the LLM-driven semantic negative sampling perspective [24, 25, 41].

Case Study on Alleviating FHNS (P4). To assess HNLMRec’s ability to address false negatives through semantic negative sampling, we conduct a case study on 10 representative users from the CDs & Vinyl and Yelp2018 datasets. For each user, we extract embeddings of negative samples generated by various methods, calculating cosine similarity with test set items. Samples with a similarity over 0.99 are labeled as false negatives. We then track the average proportion of false negatives per epoch. Figure 6 reveals that HNLMRec consistently demonstrates a significantly lower false negative proportion compared to other methods. Initially, HNLMRec’s false negative rate is comparable to that of MixGCF; however, it maintains a low ratio as training progresses. In contrast, AHNS and DNS show higher initial false negative rates due to their single-point sampling approach from the candidate pool, as the model

struggles to identify true hard negatives early in training. This case study illustrates that semantic negative sampling effectively mines challenging negatives, alleviating the issues associated with false hard negatives in ID-based methods.

6 Related Work

6.1 Negative Sampling in Recommendation

According to [44], negative sampling methods in recommender systems are classified into Point-wise and Line-wise Sampling Methods. **Point-wise sampling** directly selects negative samples from the candidate set, with static methods often randomly choosing items not interacted with by users [8, 10, 29, 36, 49]. Popular-based methods tend to select more frequent items as negatives [4, 34]. However, these methods lack adaptability and result in lower quality negatives. Dynamic methods have been proposed to adjust sampling strategies based on training status or user behavior [7, 31, 47], but they still depend on the candidate pool, limiting the extraction of high-quality negatives. In contrast, **line sampling** methods improve effectiveness by generating pseudo-negatives. For instance, MixGCF [12] interpolates between positive and negative samples, while DINS [44] employs boundary definitions and multi-hop pooling for flexibility. However, point sampling quality is affected by the candidate pool and data sparsity, and line sampling often focuses on popular samples, missing long-tail item characteristics. This impacts recommendations for cold-start users. Hence, this paper proposes employing LLM to accurately characterize user preferences and address these challenges through semantic negative sampling.

6.2 LLM-based Recommendation

Existing LLM-based recommendation algorithms can be divided into two categories [21, 43, 52]: using LLMs as recommenders and using LLMs to enhance traditional recommendations. The first method primarily recommends items through text generation paradigms. In earlier studies, researchers mainly focused on designing specific prompts or contextual learning strategies to adapt LLMs to downstream recommendation tasks [1, 20, 22, 33]. However, these methods often perform worse than traditional models. With the development of large model fine-tuning techniques, recent work has primarily focused on fine-tuning large models using recommendation-related corpora and aligning large models with traditional recommendations [3, 19, 23]. For instance, coLLM [50] maps collaborative information into the latent space of LLMs for representation alignment to improve recommendation performance. The second method enhances traditional recommender systems by utilizing semantic representations generated by LLMs [32, 53, 55]. This process typically involves leveraging LLMs to analyze user and item attributes, construct profiles, generate embeddings, and integrate them into traditional recommender systems. In this work, we explore using LLMs for semantic negative sampling to mine hard negative samples from user-item pairs, aiming to enhance the performance of traditional recommendation models.

7 Conclusion

This paper explores the potential of LLM-Driven negative sampling methods in enhancing the performance of CF models. Experimental results demonstrate that leveraging LLMs for semantic negative sampling can effectively improve the performance of CF methods. We further analyze the limitations of LLM-Driven negative sampling and introduce collaborative signals to supervise the fine-tuning of the model, achieving better alignment between the semantic space and the collaborative space. Additionally, we experimentally validate the generalization capability of the fine-tuned model on new datasets and thoroughly investigate its potential in mitigating data sparsity, popularity bias, and the challenge of hard negative sample (FHNS) selection.

However, the proposed HNLMRec in this paper still has room for further improvement in the future. First, although HNLMRec has demonstrated significant performance enhancements in experiments, its advantages can be further validated through theoretical analysis. Second, this paper primarily focuses on generating negative samples before training; future work could explore methods for dynamically generating negative samples during the training process. Lastly, researching how to design negative sampling methods in LLM-based generative recommendation to enhance recommendation accuracy is another promising direction worth exploring.

References

- [1] Arkadeep Acharya, Brijraj Singh, and Naoyuki Onoe. 2023. Llm based generation of item-description for recommendation system. In *RecSys*. 1204–1207.
- [2] Yu Bai, Sally Goldman, and Li Zhang. 2017. Tapas: Two-pass approximate adaptive sampling for softmax. *arXiv* (2017).
- [3] 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 *RecSys*. 1007–1014.
- [4] Mingyue Cheng, Fajie Yuan, Qi Liu, Shenyang Ge, Zhi Li, Runlong Yu, Defu Lian, Senchao Yuan, and Enhong Chen. 2021. Learning recommender systems with implicit feedback via soft target enhancement. In *SIGIR*. 575–584.
- [5] Jingtao Ding, Yuhan Quan, Quanming Yao, Yong Li, and Depeng Jin. 2020. Simplify and robustify negative sampling for implicit collaborative filtering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 1094–1105.
- [6] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv* (2024).
- [7] Kaiqi Gong, Xiao Song, Senzhang Wang, Songsong Liu, and Yong Li. 2022. Itsmcn: Informative training sample mining for graph convolutional network-based collaborative filtering. In *CIKM*. 614–623.
- [8] Li He, Xianzhi Wang, Dingxian Wang, Haoyuan Zou, Hongzhi Yin, and Guandong Xu. 2023. Simplifying graph-based collaborative filtering for recommendation. In *WSDM*. 60–68.
- [9] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *SIGIR*. 639–648.
- [10] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *WWW*. 173–182.
- [11] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv* (2021).
- [12] Tinglin Huang, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, Zhen Yang, Wenzheng Feng, Xinyu Wang, and Jie Tang. 2021. Mixgcf: An improved training method for graph neural network-based recommender systems. In *KDD*. 665–674.
- [13] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825* (2023).
- [14] Sein Kim, Hongseok Kang, Seungyeon Choi, Donghyun Kim, Minchul Yang, and Chanyoung Park. 2024. Large language models meet collaborative filtering: An efficient all-round llm-based recommender system. In *KDD*. 1395–1406.
- [15] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. 2009. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer* 42, 8 (2009), 30–37.
- [16] Riwei Lai, Rui Chen, Qilong Han, Chi Zhang, and Li Chen. 2024. Adaptive hardness negative sampling for collaborative filtering. In *AAAI*, Vol. 38. 8645–8652.
- [17] Yuxuan Lei, Jianxun Lian, Jing Yao, Xu Huang, Defu Lian, and Xing Xie. 2024. Recexplainer: Aligning large language models for explaining recommendation models. In *KDD*. 1530–1541.
- [18] Inbar Levkovich and Zohar Elyoseph. 2023. Suicide risk assessments through the eyes of ChatGPT-3.5 versus ChatGPT-4: vignette study. *JMIR mental health* 10 (2023), e51232.
- [19] Hao Li, Charless Fowlkes, Hao Yang, Onkar Dabeer, Zhuowen Tu, and Stefano Soatto. 2023. Guided recommendation for model fine-tuning. In *CVPR*. 3633–3642.
- [20] Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, and Li Chen. 2023. Prompt distillation for efficient llm-based recommendation. In *CIKM*. 1348–1357.
- [21] Lei Li, Yongfeng Zhang, Dugang Liu, and Li Chen. 2023. Large language models for generative recommendation: A survey and visionary discussions. *arXiv* (2023).
- [22] Jiayi Liao, Sihang Li, Zhengyi Yang, Jiancan Wu, Yancheng Yuan, Xiang Wang, and Xiangnan He. 2024. Llara: Large language-recommendation assistant. In *SIGIR*. 1785–1795.
- [23] Xinyu Lin, Wenjie Wang, Yongqi Li, Shuo Yang, Fuli Feng, Yinwei Wei, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. Data-efficient Fine-tuning for LLM-based Recommendation. In *SIGIR*. 365–374.
- [24] Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Wanyu Wang, Yejing Wang, Yuanshao Zhu, Xiangyu Zhao, Feng Tian, and Yefeng Zheng. 2024. Large language model empowered embedding generator for sequential recommendation. *arXiv* (2024).
- [25] Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Yejing Wang, Zijian Zhang, Feng Tian, Yefeng Zheng, and Xiangyu Zhao. 2024. LLM-ESR: Large Language Models Enhancement for Long-tailed Sequential Recommendation. In *NIPS*.
- [26] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. Large language models: A survey. *arXiv* (2024).
- [27] Zach Nussbaum, John X Morris, Brandon Duderstadt, and Andriy Mulyar. 2024. Nomic embed: Training a reproducible long context text embedder. *arXiv* (2024).
- [28] 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 *WWW*. 3464–3475.
- [29] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2012. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. *arXiv* (2012).
- [30] Leheng Sheng, An Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yuxin Chen, Xiang Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. Language Representations Can be What Recommenders Need: Findings and Potentials. *arXiv* (2024).
- [31] Wentao Shi, Jiawei Chen, Fuli Feng, Jizhi Zhang, Junkang Wu, Chongming Gao, and Xiangnan He. 2023. On the theories behind hard negative sampling for recommendation. In *WWW*. 812–822.
- [32] Zhongxiang Sun, Zihua Si, Xiaoxue Zang, Kai Zheng, Yang Song, Xiao Zhang, and Jun Xu. 2024. Large language models enhanced collaborative filtering. In *CIKM*. 2178–2188.
- [33] Yuuki Tachioka. 2024. User Knowledge Prompt for Sequential Recommendation. In *RecSys*. 1142–1146.
- [34] Hongwei Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Miao Zhao, Wenjie Li, Xing Xie, and Minyi Guo. 2019. Multi-task feature learning for knowledge graph enhanced recommendation. In *WWW*. 2000–2010.
- [35] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2023. Improving text embeddings with large language models. *arXiv* (2023).
- [36] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Yixin Cao, Meng Liu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Kgat: Knowledge graph attention network for recommendation. In *KDD*. 950–958.
- [37] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*. 165–174.
- [38] Xiang Wang, Hongye Jin, An Zhang, Xiangnan He, Tong Xu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. Disentangled graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*. 1001–1010.
- [39] Wei Wei, Xubin Ren, Jiabin Tang, Qinyong Wang, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Junfeng Wang, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024. Llmrec: Large language models with graph augmentation for recommendation. In *WWW*. 806–815.
- [40] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, and Yongfeng Huang. 2021. Rethinking infonce: How many negative samples do you need? *arXiv* (2021).
- [41] Junda Wu, Cheng-Chun Chang, Tong Yu, Zhankui He, Jianing Wang, Yupeng Hou, and Julian McAuley. 2024. Coral: collaborative retrieval-augmented large language models improve long-tail recommendation. In *KDD*. 3391–3401.
- [42] Junchao Wu, Shu Yang, Runzhe Zhan, Yulin Yuan, Derek F Wong, and Lidia S Chao. 2023. A survey on llm-generated text detection: Necessity, methods, and future directions. *arXiv* (2023).
- [43] Likang Wu, Zhi Zheng, Zhaopeng Qiu, Hao Wang, Hongchao Gu, Tingjia Shen, Chuan Qin, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Qi Liu, et al. 2024. A survey on large language models for recommendation. *WWW* 27, 5 (2024), 60.
- [44] Xi Wu, Liangwei Yang, Jibing Gong, Chao Zhou, Tianyu Lin, Xiaolong Liu, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Dimension independent mixup for hard negative sample in collaborative filtering. In *CIKM*. 2785–2794.

- [45] Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Xiaoling Cai, Hong Zhu, Jieming Zhu, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. 2024. Towards open-world recommendation with knowledge augmentation from large language models. In *Recsys*. 12–22.
- [46] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5 Technical Report. *arXiv* (2024).
- [47] Rex Ying, Ruining He, Kaifeng Chen, Pong Eksombatchai, William L Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Graph convolutional neural networks for web-scale recommender systems. In *KDD*. 974–983.
- [48] Junliang Yu, Hongzhi Yin, Xin Xia, Tong Chen, Lizhen Cui, and Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen. 2022. Are graph augmentations necessary? simple graph contrastive learning for recommendation. In *SIGIR*. 1294–1303.
- [49] Meng Yuan, Fuzhen Zhuang, Zhao Zhang, Deqing Wang, and Jin Dong. 2023. Knowledge-based Multiple Adaptive Spaces Fusion for Recommendation. In *RecSys*. 565–575.
- [50] 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* (2023).
- [51] Yuhan Zhao, Rui Chen, Riwei Lai, Qilong Han, Hongtao Song, and Li Chen. 2023. Augmented Negative Sampling for Collaborative Filtering. In *RecSys*. 256–266.
- [52] Zihuai Zhao, Wenqi Fan, Jiatong Li, Yunqing Liu, Xiaowei Mei, Yiqi Wang, Zhen Wen, Fei Wang, Xiangyu Zhao, Jiliang Tang, et al. 2023. Recommender systems in the era of large language models (llms). *arXiv* (2023).
- [53] 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 *ICDE*. IEEE, 1435–1448.
- [54] Qiannan Zhu, Haobo Zhang, Qing He, and Zhicheng Dou. 2022. A gain-tuning dynamic negative sampler for recommendation. In *WWW*. 277–285.
- [55] Yaochen Zhu, Liang Wu, Qi Guo, Liangjie Hong, and Jundong Li. 2024. Collaborative large language model for recommender systems. In *WWW*. 3162–3172.