
Play to Your Strengths: Collaborative Intelligence of Conventional Recommender Models and Large Language Models

Yunjia Xi

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

Weiwen Liu

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Shenzhen, China
liuweiw8@huawei.com

Jianghao Lin

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

Chuhan Wu

Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Beijing, China
wuchuhan1@huawei.com

Bo Chen

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

Ruiming Tang

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

Weinan Zhang

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

Yong Yu *

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

Abstract

The rise of large language models (LLMs) has opened new opportunities in Recommender Systems (RSs) by enhancing user behavior modeling and content understanding. However, current approaches that integrate LLMs into RSs solely utilize either LLM or conventional recommender model (CRM) to generate final recommendations, without considering which data segments LLM or CRM excel in. To fill in this gap, we conduct experiments on MovieLens-1M and Amazon-Books datasets, and compare the performance of a representative CRM (DCNv2) and an LLM (LLaMA2-7B) on various groups of data samples. Our findings reveal that LLMs excel in data segments where CRMs exhibit lower confidence and precision, while samples where CRM excels are relatively challenging for LLM, requiring substantial training data and a long training time for comparable performance. This suggests potential synergies in the combination between LLM and CRM. Motivated by these insights, we propose Collaborative Recommendation with conventional Recommender and Large Language Model (dubbed *CoReLLa*). In this framework, we first jointly train LLM and CRM and address the issue of decision boundary shifts through alignment loss. Then, the resource-efficient CRM, with a shorter inference time, handles simple and moderate samples, while LLM processes the small subset of challenging samples for CRM. Our experimental results demonstrate that CoReLLa outperforms state-of-the-art CRM and LLM methods significantly, underscoring its effectiveness in recommendation tasks.

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Performance of conventional recommender model (CRM) and Large Language Model (LLM) on different groups.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the emergence of large language models (LLMs) has opened up new opportunities within the realm of Recommender Systems (RSs). These LLMs, with their vast array of world knowledge and sophisticated reasoning capabilities, offer a unique opportunity to revolutionize user behavior modeling and content comprehension within RSs, thereby facilitating the delivery of more accurate and personalized recommendations [18, 34, 5, 1]. Current efforts have to some extent integrated large language models with recommender systems, either by injecting recommendation knowledge into LLMs [1, 14, 7, 35, 3] or by incorporating LLM knowledge into traditional recommender models (CRMs) [34, 23, 8, 23, 17, 31]. However, when generating final recommendations, they adopt a binary approach, either relying entirely on LLMs or conventional recommender models. None of the previous studies have explored which specific segments of recommendation data LLMs and CRMs really excel in, neglecting potential synergies that could be leveraged to enhance recommendation quality.

In addressing this gap, we conducted experiments on two widely-used recommendation datasets, MovieLens-1M² and Amazon-Books³, comparing the performance of the representative CRM (DCNv2 [32]) and LLM (LLaMA2-7B [30]) on different groups of data samples. First, we train a classical recommendation method DCNv2 on full training data and finetuned LLaMA2-7B with LoRA [11] on 10k and 100k training data following similar prompt in TALLREC [1]. Then, we adopt entropy as a confidence measurement [25], to calculate a model’s prediction uncertainty. We divided the test data into three groups by ranking DCNv2’s confidence in its own predictions, with the group “1” having the highest confidence and the group “3” having the lowest, as shown in Figure 1. Finally, we compare the performance of DCNv2 (*i.e.*, **CRM**) and LLaMA2-7B finetuned on 10k and 100k training data, denoted **LLM-10k** and **LLM-100k** in Figure 1, across these three groups. It is evident that in the first and second groups, LLM’s results lag behind CRM, with only LLM-100k matching CRM’s performance in the first group after trained on extensive data. This indicates that samples, where CRM excels, are relatively challenging for LLM, requiring substantial training data and long training time for comparable performance. This may be because a fully trained CRM can more easily capture certain collaborative signals unique to recommendations, such as associations between two items, while an LLM finetuned only on a subset of data may struggle to grasp such knowledge. On the contrary, in the third group, where CRM performs the least proficiently, both LLM-10k and LLM-100k outperform CRM. The low confidence of CRM may come from long-tail items [2], noisy samples [13], polarizing items [2], and inconsistent user behavior [13]. On such data, LLM can leverage its extensive world knowledge, semantic understanding, and reasoning abilities to achieve better performance, even with limited training data, like 10k.

From the above findings, a straightforward idea can be easily conceived: leveraging the strengths of each model. The resource-efficient CRM, with a shorter inference time, can handle simple and moderate samples, while LLM can process a small subset of challenging samples for CRM. Here, CRM and LLM bear a resemblance to System 1 and System 2 in the dual-process theory [9], which elucidates cognitive processing mechanisms. In line with this framework, System 1 is responsible

²<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/1m/>

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

for rapid, intuitive responses to familiar and straightforward tasks, conserving cognitive resources by swiftly executing existing routines for tasks. Conversely, System 2 engages in deliberative, analytical reasoning, activated when encountering novel or demanding situations that necessitate deeper cognitive engagement. By analogy, CRM operates akin to System 1, efficiently managing straightforward recommendation tasks with established patterns. At the same time, LLM functions akin to System 2, employing its expansive knowledge and reasoning abilities to tackle complex recommendation challenges that may require deeper comprehension and analysis. Nonetheless, a notable issue arises when CRM and LLM are trained independently: their decision boundaries may diverge, that is, their boundaries between different classes or categories may be different. Merging these models without addressing this discrepancy can result in a shift in decision boundaries [33], leading to inconsistencies in how they classify or recommend items. This alteration can lead to suboptimal outcomes, undermining the efficacy of the combined approach as shown in Table 2.

Therefore, we propose Collaborative Recommendation with conventional Recommender and Large Language Model (dubbed *CoReLLa*) wherein we engage in the joint training of the two models and alignment loss for enhanced synergy. First, LLM and CRM are trained together with a multi-stage training strategy, due to significant differences in the parameter volumes of the two models. Additionally, a specific alignment loss is devised to mitigate the issue of decision boundary shift, thereby fostering consistency in their outputs. After training, we utilize CRM’s predictions to assess the difficulty level of samples and subsequently delegate challenging samples to LLM, ultimately amalgamating their outcomes. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We conduct the first investigation into which subset of data CRM and LLM excel at, and find LLM performs better on data where CRM exhibits lower confidence and CRM can effortlessly handle samples that are challenging for LLM.
- We introduce CoReLLa, where LLM handles hard samples for CRM and addresses decision boundary shift issues through multi-stage joint training and alignment loss.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate that our model outperforms SOTA CRM and LLM methods significantly.

2 Related Work

This work is closely related to LLM-enhanced recommender systems, which can be roughly classified into two categories: (1) large language models as recommenders, and (2) conventional recommenders augmented by large language models.

Large Language Models as Recommenders. As large language models (LLMs) demonstrate remarkable performance across various tasks in the field of natural language processing (NLP), researchers start to investigate the potential applications of LLMs to various recommendation tasks. One important line of methods is to adopt LLMs as recommenders to generate recommendations directly. Due to the powerful zero-shot learning and in-context learning capabilities of LLMs, early attempts primarily focus on recommendation tasks in zero-shot manners. For instance, ChatRec [6] employs LLMs as recommender system interfaces for conversational multi-round recommendations. Liu *et al.* [21] investigate whether ChatGPT can serve as a recommender with task-specific prompts and report the zero-shot performance. Hou *et al.* [10] further report the zero-shot ranking performance of LLMs with historical interaction data. Sanner *et al.* [27] find that LLMs provide competitive performance for pure language-based preferences in the near cold-start recommendation case in comparison to item-based CF methods. However, directly leveraging LLMs for recommendations falls behind state-of-the-art conventional recommendation algorithms, since general-purpose LLMs lack domain knowledge and collaborative signals, which are important for recommendation tasks [18]. Therefore, the focus of later work shifts to how to inject recommendation knowledge into LLMs, primarily through parameter-efficiency finetuning. For example, TALLRec [1] finetunes LLaMA-7B model [29] with a LoRA [11] architecture on recommendation data. ReLLa [20] design retrieval-enhanced instruction tuning by adopting semantic user behavior retrieval as a data augmentation technique and finetunes Vicuna-13B. RecRanker [22] introduces instruction-tuned LLMs for diverse ranking tasks in top-k recommendations and proposes a hybrid ranking method that ensembles various ranking tasks.

Conventional Recommenders Augmented by Large Language Models. Apart from directly adopting LLMs as recommenders, many researchers are also exploring the integration of open-world

knowledge from LLMs into conventional recommendation models. Since large language models generally suffer from relatively long latency during inference, such an approach can enhance the recommendation effectiveness and meanwhile maintain the original inference efficiency, thereby avoiding the online inference latency issues caused by LLMs. For example, KAR [34] extracts open-world knowledge from LLMs and integrates the extracted knowledge into conventional recommendation models via a hybridized expert-integrated network. LLM-Rec [23] designs various prompting strategies to elicit LLM’s understanding of global and local item characteristics from GPT-3 (*text-davinci-003*), which improve the accuracy and relevance of content recommendations. Some researchers propose S&R Multi-Domain Foundation model [8], which finetunes ChatGLM2-6B [4] to extract domain invariant features for promoting search and recommendation performance in cold-start scenarios.

The above two types of work explore two ways of integrating LLMs and recommendations: injecting recommendation domain knowledge into LLMs and injecting LLM’s knowledge into conventional recommendation models (CRM). However, regardless of which method is used, both ultimately involve using LLMs or CRM models to infer the entire dataset, without exploring whether LLMs and CRM are better suited to certain parts of the dataset. Therefore, in this work, we explore the performance of LLMs and CRMs on different parts of the dataset and allow them to leverage their respective strengths.

3 Proposed Method

In this work, we focus on a core task of recommender systems, Click-Through Rate (CTR) prediction, usually formulated as a binary classification problem of predicting whether a user will click on an item. The dataset is denoted as $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_i, y_i), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$, where x_i represents the categorical features for the i -th instance, like item ID and user history, and y_i denotes the corresponding binary label.




Figure 2: Framework of CoReLLa.

As mentioned earlier, LLMs and CRMs each excel in different parts of recommendation data, so we have designed a framework to leverage the strengths of both CRM and LLM, making CRM handles easy samples and LLM deals with hard samples, as illustrated in Figure 2. To mitigate decision boundary shift issues, we need to align the two models during training, for which we have designed three training stages and an alignment loss. In the inference stage, when a sample arrives, it initially leverages the CRM branch, which has faster inference speed and lower resource consumption, to predict the result and calculate the prediction confidence. Once the confidence falls below a certain threshold, the LLM branch is activated, and the result predicted by LLM serves as the final result. Conversely, we adopt the outcome from CRM.

Specifically, a modality transformation module is introduced to transform the original data into recommendation and text modalities. For a data sample $\langle x_i, y_i \rangle$, the recommendation modality

input x_i^{ID} for CRM is in a multi-field categorical data format, a one-hot vector. As for the text modality LLM requires, we utilize a hard template in Template A. Similarly, the binary label $y_i \in \{1, 0\}$ is converted into $y_i^{text} \in \{\text{“Yes”}, \text{“No”}\}$.

$x_i^{text} = \text{“Below is the rating history of a user: } \{\{\text{user_history}\}\}. \text{ Please predict whether the user will like } \{\{\text{target_item}\}\} \text{ based on his/her rating history and the quality of the target item. You should ONLY answer no or yes. Answer: ”}$ (A)

Next, CRM takes x_i^{ID} and generates the click probability \hat{y}_i^{crm} . We utilize a commonly used confidence measurement, the prediction entropy, to select hard samples, as follows:

$$s_i = -\hat{y}_i^{crm} \log \hat{y}_i^{crm} - (1 - \hat{y}_i^{crm}) \log(1 - \hat{y}_i^{crm}). \quad (1)$$

Typically, higher entropy indicates lower confidence in the model’s predictions. The text modality x_i^{text} corresponding to these hard samples is then fed into LLM. Then LLM generates the next token \hat{y}_i^{text} as output, but \hat{y}_i^{text} is the discrete token sampled from the distribution of LLM, not the floating-point number in $[0, 1]$ required for CTR tasks. Therefore, we extract the probabilities of "Yes" and "No" from the token distribution generated by LLM, denoted as a and b , respectively. With a bidimensional softmax, we can obtain \hat{y}_i^{llm} which replaces the corresponding \hat{y}_i^{crm}

$$\hat{y}_i^{llm} = \frac{\exp(a)}{\exp(a) + \exp(b)} \in (0, 1). \quad (2)$$

Up to this point, we have only discussed the inference process of CoReLLa without delving into the training and optimization procedures. Next, we introduce a layer-wise alignment loss to facilitate the knowledge transformation between LLM and CRM, as well as aligning their outputs.

$$\mathcal{L}_{cal} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^C \|g^{llm}(h_{i, \mathcal{S}_j}^{llm}) - g^{crm}(h_{i, \mathcal{T}_j}^{crm})\|_2^\alpha, \alpha > 0. \quad (3)$$

In this context, both LLM and CRM consist of multiple layers, *i.e.*, transformer blocks in LLM and cross net in CRM like DCNv2. In Equation 4, $h_{i, \mathcal{S}_j}^{llm}$ and $h_{i, \mathcal{T}_j}^{crm}$ denote the hidden state of the i -th sample at the \mathcal{S}_j -th and \mathcal{T}_j -th layers of LLM and CRM, respectively. Here, \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are sets of layers chosen for LLM and CRM, and their size C and correspondence are hyper-parameters. However, the hidden states may have different dimensions, so two transformation functions, $g^{llm}(\cdot)$ and $g^{crm}(\cdot)$, are utilized to map them into the same dimension. In practice, both $g^{llm}(\cdot)$ and $g^{crm}(\cdot)$ are a fully-connected layer. Finally, the final objective is

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{llm} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{crm} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_{cal}, \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{llm} and \mathcal{L}_{crm} are the original loss of LLM and CRM, $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$, $\beta \in [0, \infty)$, and $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$ denotes the hyper-parameters that control the weight of losses.

To enhance the mix-up strategy of LLM and CRM, we employ a multi-stage training approach:

- **Stage 1 (CRM warm-up training):** In this phase, we train the CRM with the entire training set as an initialization. To achieve satisfactory results, CRM often requires substantial training data, a quantity challenging to attain during joint training with LLM. Thus, in this stage, $\alpha = \gamma = 0$ and $\beta = 1$.
- **Stage 2 (Joint training with alignment):** During this stage, we randomly select a small subset of training data, such as 1%, to simultaneously train LLM and CRM while calibrating their results. Here α, β , and γ are non-zero. In experiments, $\alpha = \beta = 1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$.
- **Stage 3 (LLM continue training):** The previous stage has observed a seesaw phenomenon in the optimization of CRM and LLM — as LLM continues to improve, CRM experiences a decline in performance. Therefore, after achieving favorable results in CRM during joint training, we cease joint training and proceed to continue training LLM with another randomly sampled subset from training data. Here, $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = \gamma = 0$.

4 Experiments

4.1 Setup

Our experiments are conducted on two public datasets, MovieLens-1M⁴ and Amazon-Book⁵. **MovieLens-1M** comprises 1 million ratings provided by 6000 users for 4000 movies. We follow common practices [36, 26] in CTR prediction for data processing. The ratings are transformed into binary labels, with ratings of 4 and 5 labeled as positive, and the rest as negative. The data samples are sorted by their global timestamps, with the first 80% selected as the training set, the middle 10% as the validation set, and the final 10% as the test set. The models receive inputs consisting of item ID, user ID, and associated attribute features of users and items. **Amazon-Book** [24] is derived from the "Books" category of the Amazon Review Dataset, and it undergoes filtration to exclude less-interacted users and items. The ratings of 5 are considered positive, while the rest are deemed negative. The preprocessing procedures of Amazon-Book are akin to those applied to MovieLens-1M, with the difference being the absence of user features.

Click-Through Rate (CTR) prediction aims to predict the likelihood of a user clicking on an item, which is a core task in recommendation systems. Therefore, our experiments are conducted based on CTR prediction tasks. We select several representative traditional CTR prediction models such as DCNv2 [32], FiBiNet [12], AutoInt [28], xDeepFM [16], Fi-GNN [15], *etc.*, as baselines. For instance, **xDeepFM** [16] leverages the power of both deep network and Compressed Interaction Network to generate feature interactions at the vector-wise level. **DCNv2** [32] is an improved framework of DCN which is more practical in large-scale industrial settings. **FiBiNet** [12] can dynamically learn the feature importance by Squeeze-Excitation network and fine-grained feature interactions by bilinear function. **FiGNN** [15] converts feature interactions into modeling node interactions on the graph for modeling feature interactions in an explicit way. **AutoInt** [28] adopts a self-attentive neural network with residual connections to model the feature interactions explicitly. Additionally, we also compare recommendation models based on LLM, including P5 [7], TALLREC [1], and CTRL [14], and adapted them to CTR prediction tasks. For example, **P5** [7] is a text-to-text paradigm that unifies recommendation tasks and learns different tasks with the same language modeling objective during pretraining. **TALLRec** [1] finetunes LLaMa-7B [29] with a LoRA architecture on recommendation tasks and enhances the recommendation capabilities of LLMs in few-shot scenarios. In our experiment, we implement TALLRec with LLaMa-2-7B-chat⁶, since it has better performance and ability of instruction following. We employ widely-used *ACC* (Accuracy), *AUC* (Area under the ROC curve) and *LogLoss* (binary cross-entropy loss) as evaluation metrics following [32, 28, 36]. A higher AUC value or a lower Logloss value, even by a small margin (*e.g.*, 0.001), can be viewed as a significant improvement in CTR prediction performance, as indicated by previous studies [16, 32, 19].

As for our model, we opt for DCNv2 [32] as the CRM and LLaMa2-7b-chat as the LLM. Firstly, DCN undergoes warm-up training on the entire dataset. Subsequently, DCN and LLaMa2-7b (finetuned with LoRA) are jointly trained on 20-30k data samples which are randomly selected from the training set. Finally, LLaMa2-7b is trained independently on the other 20-30k randomly selected data samples. Other parameters, such as batch size, learning rate, and weight decay are determined through grid search to achieve the best results. For fair comparisons, the parameters of the backbone model and the baselines are also tuned to achieve their optimal performance.

4.2 Overall Performance

We evaluate our proposed models and baseline models with AUC (Area under the ROC curve), ACC (Accuracy) and LogLoss (binary cross-entropy loss) in Table 1. Based on the experimental results, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) our model CoReLLa significantly outperforms CRM and PLM-based models. For instance, on Amazon-Books, our proposed CoReLLa demonstrates a notable improvement over the best baselines, with a 1.38% reduction in Logloss and a 1.03% increase in ACC. On the MovieLens-1M dataset, CoReLLa also demonstrates an improvement of 0.72% in AUC and 1.08% in ACC. This indicates that CoReLLa successfully integrated the strengths of LLM and CRM models, yielding superior results than both types of models. (2) Pure PLM-based recommendations

⁴<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/1m/>

⁵https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~jmcauley/datasets/amazon_v2/

⁶<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-chat-hf>

Table 1: Overall performance on two benchmark datasets. We underline the second-best value and denote the best result in bold, whose improvements are statistically significant with $p < 0.05$ against best baselines denoted by *.

Model	MovieLens-1M			Amazon-Books		
	AUC	Logloss	ACC	AUC	Logloss	ACC
DCNv2	0.7939	0.5469	<u>0.7230</u>	0.8255	0.5012	0.7481
xDeepFM	0.7925	0.5449	0.7210	0.8253	0.5021	0.7481
FiBiNet	<u>0.7947</u>	0.5442	0.7228	0.8254	0.5018	0.7479
AutoInt	0.7909	0.5472	0.7214	<u>0.8256</u>	<u>0.5010</u>	0.7480
DeepFM	0.7940	<u>0.5439</u>	0.7225	0.8252	0.5015	<u>0.7483</u>
FiGNN	0.7921	0.5464	0.7209	0.8224	0.5046	0.7458
P5	0.7902	0.5516	0.7174	0.7986	0.5320	0.7275
TALLREC	0.7931	0.5463	0.7209	0.8239	0.5060	0.7436
CTRL	0.7929	0.5465	0.7218	0.7996	0.5297	0.7253
CoReLLa	0.8001*	0.5402*	0.7308*	0.8303*	0.4941*	0.7558*

such as P5 and TALLREC often fall short compared to CRMs like FiBiNet and AutoInt. This also validates our conclusion in Figure 1 that LLM does not surpass CRM in most samples. This indicates that it remains challenging for LLM to surpass well-designed CRMs, and further integration with domain knowledge in the recommendation field may be required. However, utilizing larger language models tends to be more effective than smaller ones. For example, TALLREC based on LLaMa-7B outperforms CTRL based on BERT, suggesting that recommendation can benefit from larger language models.

4.3 Ablation Study

Table 2: Performance of different variants on two datasets. We denote the best result in bold

Variants	MovieLens-1M			Amazon-Books		
	AUC	Logloss	ACC	AUC	Logloss	ACC
w/o S1	0.6511	0.6611	0.6029	0.8046	0.5303	0.7354
w/o S2	0.7941	0.5467	0.7259	0.8265	0.4988	0.7486
w/o S3	0.7990	0.5400	0.7284	0.8277	0.4966	0.7468
w/o mix	0.7982	0.5410	0.7276	0.8285	0.4959	0.7501
CoReLLa	0.8001	0.5402	0.7308	0.8303	0.4941	0.7558

In this section, we explore how different training stages and the mix-up strategy of CoReLLa impact the final results. We design four variants and conduct experiments on two datasets, with the results presented in Table 1 2. In the table, "w/o S1", "w/o S2", and "w/o S3" respectively denote the exclusion of training stages 1 (CRM warm-up training), stage 2 (joint training with alignment), and stage 3 (LLM continue training). "w/o mix" indicates generating recommendations by CRM after the joint training in stage 2 without the mix-up strategy.

From the table, we observed the most significant decrease in model performance when excluding S1, primarily due to the pivotal role of CRM in our framework. The confidence level of CRM is used to determine which samples require processing by LLM, and CRM also handles the majority of the data. Hence, the entire framework relies on a high-quality CRM model. Typically, CRMs trained on the full dataset achieve better results, and removing Stage 1 leads to poorer performance since CRMs are only trained on a small amount of data, consequently resulting in a decrease in overall model performance. The removal of S2 also results in a notable decline, even inferior to the performance

of baseline CRMs, especially on AUC. This indicates that without joint training and alignment, the simple combination of LLM and CRM trained separately may experience decision boundary shifts and reduced effectiveness. While the exclusion of the mix-up strategy leads to a certain decline in performance, it still outperforms the baseline CRM. This implies that during joint training, LLM imparts knowledge to CRM, enhancing CRM’s performance.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we point out that current works solely use either LLM or CRM for recommendations, overlooking their distinct strengths. Therefore, we conduct the first experiments to compare the performance of CRM and LLM on various data segments. Findings show LLMs excel where CRMs exhibit lower confidence, suggesting synergies in their combination. Thus, we propose CoReLLa, which jointly trains LLM and CRM via a multi-stage training strategy and alignment loss to address the issues of decision boundary shifts. CoReLLa outperforms state-of-the-art CRM and LLM methods, highlighting its effectiveness in recommendation tasks.

References

- [1] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00447*, 2023.
- [2] Sergio Cleger-Tamayo, Juan M Fernández-Luna, Juan F Huete, and Nava Tintarev. Being confident about the quality of the predictions in recommender systems. In *ECIR*, pages 411–422. Springer, 2013.
- [3] Zeyu Cui, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. M6-rec: Generative pretrained language models are open-ended recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08084*, 2022.
- [4] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Glm: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335, 2022.
- [5] Luke Friedman, Sameer Ahuja, David Allen, Terry Tan, Hakim Sidahmed, Changbo Long, Jun Xie, Gabriel Schubiner, Ajay Patel, Harsh Lara, et al. Leveraging large language models in conversational recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.07961*, 2023.
- [6] Yunfan Gao, Tao Sheng, Youlin Xiang, Yun Xiong, Haofen Wang, and Jiawei Zhang. Chat-rec: Towards interactive and explainable llms-augmented recommender system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14524*, 2023.
- [7] Shijie Geng, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Yingqiang Ge, and Yongfeng Zhang. Recommendation as language processing (rlp): A unified pretrain, personalized prompt and predict paradigm (p5). In *RecSys*, page 299–315, 2022.
- [8] Yuqi Gong, Xichen Ding, Yehui Su, Kaiming Shen, Zhongyi Liu, and Guannan Zhang. An unified search and recommendation foundation model for cold-start scenario. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM ’23*, page 4595–4601, 2023.
- [9] Philip M Groves and Richard F Thompson. Habituation: a dual-process theory. *Psychological review*, 77(5):419, 1970.
- [10] Yupeng Hou, Junjie Zhang, Zihan Lin, Hongyu Lu, Ruobing Xie, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. Large language models are zero-shot rankers for recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08845*, 2023.
- [11] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.

- [12] Tongwen Huang, Zhiqi Zhang, and Junlin Zhang. Fibinet: Combining feature importance and bilinear feature interaction for click-through rate prediction. In *RecSys*, page 169–177, 2019.
- [13] Nima Joorabloo, Mahdi Jalili, and Yongli Ren. Improved recommender systems by denoising ratings in highly sparse datasets through individual rating confidence. *Information Sciences*, 601:242–254, 2022.
- [14] Xiangyang Li, Bo Chen, Lu Hou, and Ruiming Tang. Ctrl: Connect tabular and language model for ctr prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02841*, 2023.
- [15] Zekun Li, Zeyu Cui, Shu Wu, Xiaoyu Zhang, and Liang Wang. Fi-gnn: Modeling feature interactions via graph neural networks for ctr prediction. In *CIKM*, page 539–548, 2019.
- [16] Jianxun Lian, Xiaohuan Zhou, Fuzheng Zhang, Zhongxia Chen, Xing Xie, and Guangzhong Sun. Xdeepfm: Combining explicit and implicit feature interactions for recommender systems. In *KDD*, page 1754–1763, 2018.
- [17] Jianghao Lin, Bo Chen, Hangyu Wang, Yunjia Xi, Yanru Qu, Xinyi Dai, Kangning Zhang, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Clickprompt: Ctr models are strong prompt generators for adapting language models to ctr prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09234*, 2023.
- [18] Jianghao Lin, Xinyi Dai, Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Bo Chen, Xiangyang Li, Chenxu Zhu, Huifeng Guo, Yong Yu, Ruiming Tang, et al. How can recommender systems benefit from large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05817*, 2023.
- [19] Jianghao Lin, Yanru Qu, Wei Guo, Xinyi Dai, Ruiming Tang, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. Map: A model-agnostic pretraining framework for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1384–1395, 2023.
- [20] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11131*, 2023.
- [21] Junling Liu, Chao Liu, Renjie Lv, Kang Zhou, and Yan Zhang. Is chatgpt a good recommender? a preliminary study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10149*, 2023.
- [22] Sichun Luo, Bowei He, Haohan Zhao, Yinya Huang, Aojun Zhou, Zongpeng Li, Yuanzhang Xiao, Mingjie Zhan, and Linqi Song. Recranker: Instruction tuning large language model as ranker for top-k recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16018*, 2023.
- [23] Hanjia Lyu, Song Jiang, Hanqing Zeng, Yinglong Xia, and Jiebo Luo. Llm-rec: Personalized recommendation via prompting large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15780*, 2023.
- [24] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 188–197, 2019.
- [25] Laurence Anthony F. Park and Simeon Simoff. Using entropy as a measure of acceptance for multi-label classification. In *XIV*, 2015.
- [26] Jiarui Qin, Weinan Zhang, Xin Wu, Jiarui Jin, Yuchen Fang, and Yong Yu. User behavior retrieval for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2347–2356, 2020.
- [27] Scott Sanner, Krisztian Balog, Filip Radlinski, Ben Wedin, and Lucas Dixon. Large language models are competitive near cold-start recommenders for language-and item-based preferences. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on recommender systems*, pages 890–896, 2023.
- [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 *CIKM*, page 1161–1170, 2019.

- [29] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [30] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [31] Hangyu Wang, Jianghao Lin, Xiangyang Li, Bo Chen, Chenxu Zhu, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, and Yong Yu. Flip: Towards fine-grained alignment between id-based models and pretrained language models for ctr prediction. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2310, 2023.
- [32] Ruoxi Wang, Rakesh Shivanna, Derek Cheng, Sagar Jain, Dong Lin, Lichan Hong, and Ed Chi. Dcn v2: Improved deep & cross network and practical lessons for web-scale learning to rank systems. In *WWW*, page 1785–1797, 2021.
- [33] Ziqi Wang, Yuexin Wu, Frederick Liu, Daogao Liu, Le Hou, Hongkun Yu, Jing Li, and Heng Ji. Augmentation with projection: Towards an effective and efficient data augmentation paradigm for distillation. In *ICML*, 2023.
- [34] Yunjia Xi, Weiwen Liu, Jianghao Lin, Jieming Zhu, Bo Chen, Ruiming Tang, Weinan Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Yong Yu. Towards open-world recommendation with knowledge augmentation from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.10933*, 2023.
- [35] Yuhui Zhang, HAO DING, Zeren Shui, Yifei Ma, James Zou, Anoop Deoras, and Hao Wang. Language models as recommender systems: Evaluations and limitations. In *I (Still) Can't Believe It's Not Better! NeurIPS 2021 Workshop*, 2021.
- [36] Guorui Zhou, Xiaoqiang Zhu, Chenru Song, Ying Fan, Han Zhu, Xiao Ma, Yanghui Yan, Junqi Jin, Han Li, and Kun Gai. Deep interest network for click-through rate prediction. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, page 1059–1068, 2018.