
A SIMPLE YET EFFECTIVE APPROACH FOR DIVERSIFIED SESSION-BASED RECOMMENDATION *

Qing Yin, Hui Fang

Shanghai University of Finance and Economics
Shanghai, China
qyin.es@gmail.com, fang.hui@mail.shufe.edu.cn

Zhu Sun

Institute of High Performance Computing; Centre for Frontier AI Research, A*STAR
Singapore
sunzhuntu@gmail.com

Yew-Soon Ong

A*STAR Centre for Frontier AI Research; Nanyang Technological University
Singapore
asysong@ntu.edu.sg

ABSTRACT

Session-based recommender systems (SBRs) have become extremely popular in view of the core capability of capturing short-term and dynamic user preferences. However, most SBRs primarily maximize recommendation accuracy but ignore users' minor preferences, thus leading to filter bubbles in the long run. Only a handful of works, being devoted to improving diversity, depend on unique model designs and calibrated loss functions, which cannot be easily adapted to existing accuracy-oriented SBRs. It is thus worthwhile to come up with a *simple yet effective* design that can be used as a plugin to facilitate existing SBRs on generating a more diversified list in the meantime preserving the recommendation accuracy. In this case, we propose an end-to-end framework applied for every existing representative (accuracy-oriented) SBR, called diversified category-aware attentive SBR (DCA-SBR), to boost the performance on recommendation diversity. It consists of two novel designs: a model-agnostic diversity-oriented loss function, and a non-invasive category-aware attention mechanism. Extensive experiments on three datasets showcase that our framework helps existing SBRs achieve extraordinary performance in terms of recommendation diversity (e.g., an average of 74.1% increase on $ILD@10$) and comprehensive performance (e.g., an average of 52.3% lift on $F\text{-score}@10$), without significantly deteriorating recommendation accuracy compared to state-of-the-art accuracy-oriented SBRs. The source code can be obtained via github.com/qyin863/DCA-SBR.

Keywords recommender systems, session-based recommendation, diversification, diversified recommendation

1 Introduction

Session-based recommender systems (SBRs) have gained significant attention because they provide more timely and accurate recommendations by incorporating short-term and dynamic user preferences [1, 2]. To enhance recommendation accuracy, existing SBRs utilize sophisticated models like deep neural networks that capture short-term preferences from the most recent session. For instance, GRU4Rec [3] employs gated recurrent units (GRU) to learn a session's

*Citation:



Figure 1: NARM vs NARM+MTL. Note: +MTL denotes the variant of NARM via leveraging item categories as input and adopting the common multi-task learning framework.

sequential behaviors. Furthermore, the attention mechanism is imported to capture main-purpose (intent) preferences such as NARM [4] and STAMP [5]. Moreover, graph neural networks (GNNs) are utilized to learn more complex item relationships (e.g., SR-GNN [6], GC-SAN [7], and GCE-GNN [8]). For the above state-of-the-art (SOTA) SBRSSs, *attention mechanisms* are used together with RNNs or GNNs to improve recommendation performance [2].

However, the aforementioned SOTA (*accuracy-oriented*) SBRSSs would gradually overemphasize dominant interests and weaken minor ones [9], thus leading to a filter bubble [10, 11] over time. As such, *diversified* recommender systems (RSs) are raised to recommend more diverse lists (e.g., with items covering many categories). The diversified works in traditional recommendation fall into three major categories: post-processing heuristic methods [12, 9], determinantal point process (DPP) methods [13, 14, 15] and end-to-end learning methods [16, 17]. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are only three representative diversified SBRSSs such as MCPRN [18], ComiRec [19] and IDSR [20]. Both MCPRN and ComiRec design multiple channels rather than one major channel to learn multiple purposes in a session, where recommendations strive to satisfy these purposes instead of only capturing the main purpose as representative accuracy-oriented works (e.g., NARM). Following the above multiple-purpose assumption, IDSR also jointly incorporates both item relevance and diversity into the prediction score and loss function.

To conclude, existing studies on diversified SBRSSs mainly suffer from two challenges: (1) as we can tell from previous studies, model variants like multiple channels and unique diversity-oriented loss (objective) fitted for special diversity modules are carefully calibrated by diversified SBRSSs. However, such diversified designs cannot be easily adopted by existing representative accuracy-oriented SOTA SBRSSs. Thus, the first research challenge lies in how to come up with simple yet effective designs (like loss function) that can facilitate the diversity performance of SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRSSs? and (2) previous diversified works mostly fail to obtain a comparable performance on accuracy to those representative accuracy-oriented SBRSSs, since in most cases improved diversity is reached at the cost of sacrificing a certain level of accuracy. To mitigate the adversarial effect, side information like category of items is generally imported to help better learn user preferences [21, 22, 23]. However, for representative accuracy-oriented SBRSSs, we surprisingly find that simply concatenating item ID and its category information as the input and adopting the common multi-task learning framework, as in SBRSS+MTL [21], cannot considerably improve recommendation performance and may even result in worse performance in terms of accuracy metrics (see Figure 1). In this case, our second challenge is to seek for a solution that can help maintain recommendation accuracy for diversified SBRSSs by better exploiting category information.

Towards the aforementioned two issues, we propose a simple yet effective end-to-end Diversified Category-aware Attentive framework that can be easily instantiated with existing representative accuracy-oriented SBRSSs, called DCA-SBRSS, to help them generate a more diversified recommendation list without significantly sacrificing their accuracy performance. Given the widespread adoption and efficacy of attention mechanisms in existing state-of-the-art accuracy-oriented SBRSSs [2, 24], we extend our approach by incorporating category information into the attention mechanism. Specifically, DCA-SBRSS is composed of two particularly designed parts: (1) a Model-agnostic Diversity-oriented Loss (MDL) function, working with accuracy-oriented loss (e.g., cross-entropy loss), exploits items' category attribute and estimated item scores from the given SBRSS; and (2) a Non-invasive Category-aware Attention (NCA) mechanism, which inspired by NOVA [23] utilizes category information in a non-invasive way, instead of directly fusing category information, and acts as directional guidance (attention signal) to help more accurate session-based recommendation. The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We propose a simple yet effective diversity-oriented loss function that can be used as a model-agnostic and individual plugin to deep neural accuracy-oriented SBRSSs to improve their diversity performance, mitigating the technical gap between accuracy-oriented and diversified SBRSSs.

- We transfer the non-invasive idea from NOVA [23] into the common attention mechanism used in SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRSSs (e.g., NARM and GCE-GNN) to capture more accurate preference by utilizing category information in a non-invasive way, so as to efficiently help maintain recommendation accuracy.
- We conduct extensive experiments on three real-world datasets, in terms of accuracy, diversity, and comprehensive performance (jointly considering accuracy and diversity), to demonstrate the effectiveness of our DCA-SBRSS framework. Experimental results unveil that, our framework can help SOTA SBRSSs achieve extraordinary performance in terms of diversity and comprehensive performance (e.g., average 74.1% and 52.3% increase on $ILD@10$ and $F\text{-score}@10$ respectively), without significantly deteriorating recommendation accuracy in contrast with SOTA diversified SBRSSs (e.g., an average of only 1.6% decrease on accuracy regarding $NDCG@10$ but 138% increase on diversity for $ILD@10$ on Diginetica). Additionally, we fairly analyze the limitations of the standard comprehensive measure and offer alternative solutions.

2 Related work

Our study is related to two major areas: session-based recommendation, and diversified recommendation.

2.1 Session-Based Recommendation

The approaches on SBRSSs can be divided into two groups: conventional non-neural methods and deep neural ones. Typical conventional techniques include but are not limited to Item-KNN [25], BPR-MF [26], and FPMC [27]. For example, FPMC deploys Matrix Factorization (MF) with Markov Chain (MC) to better deal with dependent relationships between items in sequence. However, they generally suffer from inadequately addressing the item relationships in comparatively longer sequences. In contrast, deep neural networks can better deal with much longer sequences and thus generate more effective recommendation [28, 29]. For example, GRU4Rec [3] and its variants [28, 29] apply GRU to capture the long-term dependency in a sequence. NARM [4] further adopts an attention mechanism to assess the similarity between previous items and the last item in every session, and the hidden states are then weighted averaged to obtain the main-purpose session representation. And, STAMP [5] models both users’ general interests and current interests using attentive nets and basic multiple-layer perceptions (MLPs) instead of adopting RNNs.

However, the above techniques only model one-way transitions between successive items, ignoring transitions between contexts (i.e., other items in the session) [30]. Recently, GNNs have been employed to mitigate the research gap [31]. For instance, SR-GNN [6] and GC-SAN [7] import GNNs to generate more accurate item embedding vectors based on the current session graph built for each session. Besides the current session graph, GCE-GNN [8] also explores item relationships in the global session graph.

It is worth noting that, the above conventional and deep neural SBRSSs are all accuracy-oriented approaches that fail to consider diversity (i.e., non-diversified). Given that RSs have an iterative or closed feedback loop, this may result in filter bubbles [10, 11].

2.2 Diversified Recommendation

Towards individual diversity in traditional RSs, inspired by dissimilarity score in Maximal Marginal Relevance (MMR) [12], some studies [32, 33] define diversification on explicit aspects (categories) or sub-queries. Besides, DPP is utilized [13, 34, 14, 15] to provide a better relevance-diversity trade-off in recommendation as it can score sets of items collectively and consider negative correlations between various items. The aforementioned studies are two-stage ones which re-rank items accounting for diversity in the second stage. In traditional RS, there are only several end-to-end studies [16, 17] which simultaneously optimize diversity and accuracy.

To the best of our knowledge, there are only three diversified (and also end-to-end) works for session-based recommendation: MCPRN [18], ComiRec [19], and IDSR [20]. Specifically, MCPRN uses mixture-channel purpose routing networks to guide multi-purpose learning, while ComiRec explores two methods as multi-interest extraction modules (i.e., the dynamic routing and self-attentive methods). Thus, multiple session representations are used by MCPRN and ComiRec to capture user preferences which can implicitly satisfy user needs. In contrast, IDSR delivers the end-to-end recommendation under the guidance of the intent-aware diversity promoting (IDP) loss and explicitly creates set diversity. A “trade-off hyper-parameter” (in IDSR) is adopted to keep the balance between recommendation relevance and diversity.

To summarize, such diversified designs in those three works cannot be easily adapted to existing representative accuracy-oriented SBRSSs. Besides, regarding the widely-held “trade-off” relationship, these studies fail to obtain a satisfying performance on recommendation accuracy (can also be observed in Tables 4-6).




Figure 2: An Overview of Our Proposed DCA-SBRS.

3 Our DCA-SBRS Framework

In this section, we firstly formulate our research problem, and then introduce the two components in the proposed framework in detail.

3.1 Problem Statement and Model Overview

Let $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ be all of items and $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ be all of categories. Each anonymous session, denoted by $S = [x_1^s, x_2^s, \dots, x_t^s]$, consists of item IDs in chronological order (i.e., items clicked by a user), where x_i^s denotes the i -th item clicked within session S . Additionally, our framework uses the category attribute of items (i.e., c_i^s denotes the corresponding category of x_i^s) to guide the session representation learning for better item prediction. *Given a session S , the objective of our session-based recommendation aims to recommend a both diversified and accurate Top- N item list, denoted as $y = [y_1^s, y_2^s, \dots, y_N^s]$, for next-item prediction.*

To address the problem, we propose a Diversified Category-aware Attentive framework which can be instantiated with SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRS, named DCA-SBRS, to improve the diversity performance of the corresponding SBRS while preserving its recommendation accuracy. It mainly consists of two novel components: 1) Model-agnostic Diversity-oriented Loss function (**MDL**, L_{div}), working with accuracy-oriented loss (e.g., cross-entropy loss L_{acc}), which is built on items' category attribute and estimated item scores by the SBRS. It can help achieve more diverse recommendation lists towards existing SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRSs; 2) Non-invasive Category-aware Attention (**NCA**) mechanism, which utilizes category information as directional guidance to replace normal attention mechanism widely used in existing SBRSs. With such design, since there exists a widely-known "trade-off" relationship between recommendation accuracy and diversity [20], the adverse effect induced by diversity objective on recommendation accuracy can be partially alleviated.

Figure 2 presents the architecture of our DCA-SBRS framework, which depicts the installation of the MDL and NCA components on the basis of the general encoder-decoder framework and common attention mechanism from a SOTA SBRS, NARM [4]. Without losing generality, as shown in Figure 2, let encoder-decoder framework denotes the architecture of SOTA SBRSs where the encoder is to encode session representation, while the decoder is designed to estimate item scores for generating recommendations. The similarity layer projects the session representation into the item space, and then produces a Top- N recommendation list. We next present the two components in detail.




Figure 3: The Unbalanced Grouping Induced by the Category (the symbol ‘×’ denotes the outliers with a mass of involved items).

3.2 Model-agnostic Diversity-oriented Loss

The goal of this module is to enhance diversity performance by acting as a model-agnostic plugin to accuracy-oriented SBRs. The non-diversified SBRs frequently predict relevance scores of items by capturing preferences from item sequences. For simplicity, we attempt to leverage the obtained relevance scores as the foundation of this module and increase recommendation diversity by penalizing more monotonous Recommendation List (e.g., most items in a top-N recommended list of the same category). To fulfill the goal, as shown in Figure 2, the model-agnostic diversity-oriented loss (L_{div}) is designed to facilitate existing SBRs achieve the end-to-end learning. Specifically, we define it via using the entropy of estimated category distribution \hat{P}_c in a recommended list, given by,

$$L_{div} = -H(\hat{P}_c), \tag{1}$$

where $H(\hat{P}) = -\sum_j \hat{P}_{c_j} \log_2 \hat{P}_{c_j}$ ($c_j \in \mathcal{C}$) denotes the information entropy. A larger $H(\hat{P}_c)$ depicts that the recommended list is likely to be more diverse from the category perspective. In this case, its negative value can be regarded as penalizing the recommended list with low diversity. Intuitively, the reasonable \hat{P}_{c_i} ($c_i \in \mathcal{C}$) in a recommendation list should satisfy the following two characteristics:

- **In proportion to the number of items from the category c_i :** In real-world datasets, the grouping induced by categorical attribute can be very unbalanced [21]. For better understanding, we select two datasets (Diginetica and Retailrocket) and statistically show the number of items belonging to the same category using Box-plot as Figure 3. As can be observed, the outliers in the Box-plot depict that for some categories, a large group of items are involved while for others only a few. The category with a larger group of items is more likely to appear in the RL without considering *personalized preference*.
- **In proportion to relevance scores of items:** Regarding personalized preference, representative SBRs recommend Top- N items by ranking the predicted scores given session S . As a result, the items with much higher scores are more likely to appear in the RL along with their corresponding categories.

Considering that common accuracy-oriented SBRs only output predicted item scores without a special module capturing category scores, we simulate the category distribution in the RL, which can well satisfy the above two characteristics as below,

$$\hat{P}_{c_i} = \sum_{c(x_j)=c_i} \hat{P}_{x_j}, \tag{2}$$

where \hat{P}_{x_j} depicts the predicted personalized preference score of item x_j obtained by the given SOTA SBR ($\sum \hat{P}_{x_j} = 1$ using softmax function on all items). We sum the scores of items from the category c_i as the occurred probability of category c_i so as to consider both the number of items in c_i and personalized preference \hat{P}_{x_j} . Then, L_{div} combined with the origin accuracy-oriented loss L_{acc} (e.g., the cross-entropy of the prediction results [4, 8]) is the final loss function for model training,

$$L = L_{acc} + \lambda L_{div}, \tag{3}$$

where λ controls the importance of our proposed MDL.

Table 1: The Category-aware Attentive Signal Extension of Representative SBRs (the symbols used in these functions are aligned with the ones used in the original papers).

	Attention Signal	Category-aware Attention Signal
NARM	$\alpha_{tj} = \mathbf{v}^T \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{h}_t + \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{h}_j)$ $\mathbf{c}_t^s = \sum_{j=1}^t \alpha_{tj} \mathbf{h}_j$	$\alpha_{tj} = \mathbf{v}^T \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1 (\mathbf{h}_t + \mathbf{c}_t^s) + \mathbf{A}_2 (\mathbf{h}_j + \mathbf{c}_j^s))$ $\mathbf{c}_t^s = \sum_{j=1}^t \alpha_{tj} \mathbf{h}_j$
STAMP	$\mathbf{m}_s = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{x}_i$ $\alpha_i = \mathbf{W}_0 \sigma(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{m}_s + \mathbf{b}_a)$ $\mathbf{m}_a = \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \mathbf{x}_i$	$\mathbf{m}_s = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t (\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{c}_i)$ $\alpha_i = \mathbf{W}_0 \sigma(\mathbf{W}_1 (\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{c}_i) + \mathbf{W}_2 (\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{c}_t) + \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{m}_s + \mathbf{b}_a)$ $\mathbf{m}_a = \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \mathbf{x}_i$
GCE-GNN	$\mathbf{z}_i = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_3 [\mathbf{h}'_{v_i} \parallel \mathbf{p}_{1-i+1}] + \mathbf{b}_3)$ $\mathbf{s}' = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{h}'_{v_i}$ $\beta_i = \mathbf{q}_2^T \sigma(\mathbf{W}_4 \mathbf{z}_i + \mathbf{W}_5 \mathbf{s}' + \mathbf{b}_4)$ $\mathbf{S} = \sum_{i=1}^t \beta_i \mathbf{h}'_{v_i}$	$\mathbf{z}_i = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_3 [\mathbf{h}'_{v_i} \parallel \mathbf{p}_{1-i+1} \parallel \mathbf{c}_i^s] + \mathbf{b}_3)$ $\mathbf{s}' = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t (\mathbf{h}'_{v_i} + \mathbf{c}_i^s)$ $\beta_i = \mathbf{q}_2^T \sigma(\mathbf{W}_4 \mathbf{z}_i + \mathbf{W}_5 \mathbf{s}' + \mathbf{b}_4)$ $\mathbf{S} = \sum_{i=1}^t \beta_i \mathbf{h}'_{v_i}$

3.3 Non-invasive Category-aware Attention

There exists a widely-known ‘‘trade-off’’ relationship between recommendation accuracy and diversity [20]. In this case, the plugged diversity loss (in MDL) will probably lead to deteriorating performance on recommendation accuracy towards accuracy-oriented SBRs. To address this issue, we consider to exploit category information to enhance preference learning.

As shown in Figure 1, invasive fusion (like merely concatenating item embeddings with the relevant category embeddings as input), might not considerably improve recommendation accuracy. Therefore, considering that attention mechanisms are widely adopted by SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRs, we transfer the non-invasive idea from NOVA [23] into the common attention mechanism. Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, the encoder, employing a deep learning technique as an existing SBR (e.g., RNN [4], MLP [5], or GNN [6, 8]), firstly converts session $S = [x_1^s, x_2^s, \dots, x_t^s]$ into a set of high-dimensional hidden states $\mathbf{h} = [\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_t]$, which are weighted summed by attention signal output by common attention mechanism at time t (denoted as $\alpha_t = \{\alpha_{t1}, \dots, \alpha_{tt}\}$) to obtain the current session representation decoded at time t (denoted as \mathbf{s}_t).

The category-aware extensions for SOTA SBRs with attention mechanism (i.e. NARM, STAMP, and GCE-GNN) are described in detail in Table 1, where the symbols in the functions are unified with the original papers and thus the corresponding detailed explanation is omitted here. Note that \mathbf{c}_j^s is the corresponding category embedding vector of item x_j^s in session $S = [x_1^s, x_2^s, \dots, x_t^s]$.

Here, we use NARM [4] as an example to further elaborate our NCA. In NARM, the attention signal α_{tj} is computed as the correlation between the final hidden state \mathbf{h}_t and the hidden state of the j -th item, \mathbf{h}_j ,

$$\alpha_{tj} = q(\mathbf{h}_t, \mathbf{h}_j) = \mathbf{v}^T \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{h}_t + \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{h}_j), \quad (4)$$

where σ is an activate function (e.g., sigmoid function) and matrix \mathbf{A}_1 , \mathbf{A}_2 are used to transform hidden states into a latent space, respectively. Correspondingly, our NCA mechanism further uses the category attribute as directional guidance and keeps the hidden states undoped in their vector space. Specifically, NCA uses the category attribute to update the attention signal as:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{tj} &= q(\mathbf{h}_t \oplus \mathbf{c}_t^s, \mathbf{h}_j \oplus \mathbf{c}_j^s) \\ &= \mathbf{v}^T \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1 (\mathbf{h}_t + \mathbf{c}_t^s) + \mathbf{A}_2 (\mathbf{h}_j + \mathbf{c}_j^s)), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{c}_j^s is the corresponding category embedding vector of item x_j^s and \oplus denotes element-wise addition. Note that here we use the simplest fusor ‘addition’ to straightforwardly add the hidden states and category embedding vectors in this paper. It can also be replaced by other fusors, like ‘concatenation’ or ‘gating’ [23].

To conclude, by doing this, we have successfully exploited category information in a non-invasive way to help generate attention signals, with the goal of maintaining the recommendation accuracy.

3.4 Discussion: Simple yet Effective Approach

Our DCA-SBRs framework can serve as a plugin for SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRs to improve their diversity performance with MDL module while in the meantime striving to maintain their recommendation accuracy with NCA mechanism. Generally speaking, both MDL module and NCA mechanism can be easily equipped with existing SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRs to further promote their performance regarding diversity towards more trustworthy recommender systems [35, 36]. Extensive experimental results in Section 5 verify that our approach can help SOTA SBRs (i.e., NARM, STAMP, and GCE-GNN) obtain extraordinary performance in terms of recommendation diversity and comprehensive performance (considering both accuracy and diversity).

Table 2: Statistics of Datasets (Note: # train and #test are the number of sessions before sequence splitting preprocess; avg. len. denotes the average session length; DS is the diversity score defined in Section 4.3; and RR [37] is the repeat ratio, indicating the ratio of repeated items within a session.).

Dataset	Diginetica	Retailrocket	Tmall
# interactions	993,483	1,040,796	1,505,683
# train	186,670	283,446	188,756
# test	18,101	11,718	51,894
# items	43,097	45,831	96,182
# categories	995	871	822
avg. len.	4.8504	3.5262	6.0775
train DS	0.3741	0.4646	0.6575
test DS	0.3721	0.4893	0.6278
train RR	0.1301	0.2488	0
test RR	0.1317	0.2370	0

Besides, our approach is much more lightweight (simple yet effective) than existing diversified recommender systems: (1) in contrast to the (two-stage) re-ranking methods (e.g., MMR [12]), MDL can achieve end-to-end learning, that is, simultaneously maximizing accuracy and diversity objectives; (2) unlike other diversified SBRSs (e.g., IDSR [20]) relying on specifically calibrated diversity-aware components with a substantial amount of extra parameters, our MDL module is a model-agnostic plugin by utilizing the estimated relevance scores of items from every existing SOTA SBRS and the category information, which thus requires limited extra parameters and is efficiently comparable to the corresponding SBRS; and (3) both MMR [12] and IDSR [20] employ a greedy iterative inference algorithm to generate the final Top- N recommended lists. On the contrary, our DCA-SBRS framework directly generate a recommended list including Top- N items with the highest final scores, implying that our approach is more computationally efficient in model inferences. It is also empirically verified in table 7.

4 Experimental Settings

In this section, we introduce the selection of datasets, baselines, and evaluation metrics. The specifics of dataset preprocessing and partitioning, as well as the hyper-parameter settings for our methods and other baselines, are also provided. The source code and datasets are available online².

4.1 Datasets and Preprocessing

For the experimental purpose, we delicately select three representative public e-commerce datasets (i.e., Diginetica³, Retailrocket⁴, Tmall⁵) with item category information, following [2, 4, 8].

- **Diginetica** from CIKM Cup 2016, contains user sessions, taken from records of an e-commerce search engine with its own ‘SessionId’. We only use the data with the behavior type ‘view’.
- **Retailrocket** collects users’ interactions on an e-commerce website over a period of 4.5 months. We select interactions with the behavior type ‘view’, and a new session is created when the user’s idle time exceeds 30 minutes following [38].
- **Tmall** from the IJCAI-15 competition, includes anonymous Tmall shopping logs. We adopt interactions with the behavior type ‘buy’ and ‘view’, and partition user history into sessions by day following [39]. We pick 1/16 sessions as a sampling inspired by Yoochoose fractions [4].

For data preprocessing, following [4, 5, 6], we filter out sessions of length 1 and items occurring less than 5 times. Then we set the most recent data (i.e., the last one week) as the test set and the previous sessions as the training set. The validation set contains the final week of data from the training set. Additionally, we drop items appearing in the test set but not in the training set. The statistics of these three datasets after preprocessing are shown in Table 2. A sequence splitting preprocess, that is, generating $n - 1$ sub-sequences $([i_1], i_2), ([i_1, i_2], i_3), \dots, ([i_1, \dots, i_{n-1}], i_n)$ for a session sequence $S = [i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n]$, is required if a recommendation model is not trained in session-parallel manner [3].

²<https://github.com/qyin863/DCA-SBRS>.

³https://competitions.codalab.org/competitions/11161#learn_the_details-overview.

⁴<https://www.kaggle.com/retailrocket/ecommerce-dataset>.

⁵<https://tianchi.aliyun.com/dataset/dataDetail?dataId=42>.

4.2 Baseline Models

To explore the recommendation performance on accuracy and diversity, following [2, 8, 20], we select three categories of popular and representative baseline models for session-based recommendation, including *traditional methods*, *deep neural methods with attention mechanism* (as they are chosen as the basic predictors in our proposed framework), and *deep diversified methods*.

1. Traditional Methods.

- **Item-KNN** [25] measures cosine similarity of every two items regarding sessions in the training data. It recommends items for a session that are most similar to the last item.
- **BPR-MF** [26] performs Matrix Factorization (MF) with a pairwise ranking loss. Particularly, the session feature vector is averaged over all items in the session.

2. Deep Neural Methods with Attention Mechanism.

- **NARM** [4] is an RNN-based model with an attention mechanism, which combines the last hidden vector and the main purpose from the hidden states as the final representation to produce recommendations.
- **STAMP** [5] applies attention layers on item representations directly and captures the user’s long-term preference as well as short-term interest from the session context.
- **GCE-GNN** [8] constructs both the local (current session) and global (all sessions) graphs to obtain session- and global-level item embeddings. Then, before the soft attention, it incorporates the reversed position information into the item embedding.

3. Deep Diversified Methods.

- **MCPRN** [18] models users’ multiple purposes of the session, rather than only one purpose in common SBRs. Furthermore, it combines the above various learned purposes by the target-aware attention to get the final representation. As stated in the original paper, MCPRN can boost both accuracy and diversity.
- **NARM+MMR** [20] is a two-stage approach which in the second stage uses MMR [12] and a greedy algorithm to re-rank items provided by NARM in terms of relevance scores in the first stage.
- **IDSF** [20] is the first end-to-end deep neural network for SBRs that takes both diversity and accuracy into account. The hyper-parameter λ is used to balance the relevance score and diversification score.

4.3 Evaluation Metrics

We adopt the following metrics related to accuracy, diversity, and both to conduct a thorough evaluation. Higher metric values indicate better performance. Towards *accuracy*, we select HR (Hit Rate), MRR (Mean Reciprocal Rank), and NDCG (Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain) by following state-of-the-arts [4, 6, 8]. Specifically, **HR** depicts whether the Top- N Recommended List (abbreviated as RL, and N is the length of the RL) contains the target item; **MRR** and **NDCG** both measure the hit position and encourage the predicted item to rank ahead in the recommended list. Towards *diversity*, we choose the widely-used ILD (Intra-List Distance) [19, 20], Entropy [18, 16], and Diversity Score [17] as the evaluation metrics. Particularly, **ILD** measures the average distance between each pair of items in the recommended list,

$$\text{ILD} = \frac{\sum_{(i,j) \in RL} d_{ij}}{|RL| \times (|RL| - 1)}, \quad (6)$$

where d_{ij} represents the euclidean distance between the respective embeddings (e.g., one-hot encoding) of categories that items i and j belong to.

Entropy measures the entropy of item category distribution in the recommended list; and **Diversity Score** (shorted as **DS**) is calculated by the number of interacted/recommended categories divided by number of interacted/recommended items. Additionally, we use **F-score** [40], the harmonic mean of HR and ILD, as an aggregative indicator capturing both accuracy and diversity.

4.4 Hyper-parameter Settings

For a fair comparison, we use the Bayesian TPE⁶ [42] of Hyperopt⁷ framework to tune hyper-parameters of all methods according to their performance on the validation set (i.e., the last week of the training set). We have integrated all the codes with PyTorch framework, except for IDSR. Specifically, we adopt its official code⁸ with its own early-stopping mechanism. For all methods, Adam is utilized as the model optimizer; the dimension of item embedding is searched in the range of [100, 300] stepped by 50; the learning rate is searched in {0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05}; the size of mini-batch is searched from {64, 128, 256, 512}; the number of epochs is searched in the range of [10, 40] stepped by 5. The exceptions are made on GCE-GNN, where we set its dimension of item embedding and size of mini-batch as 100 (consistent with the original paper setting) due to memory space limitations; and set the size of mini-batch as 50 for MCPRN. For IDSR, we search λ , which balances the importance of relevance and diversification scores, in {0.2, 0.5, 0.8} on every dataset. Moreover, for NARM+MMR, we set the multiplier $\lambda = 5e - 6$ for the diversification score in MMR, so as to avoid a significant decrease (e.g., more than 20% decline) on accuracy performance in comparison with NARM. The detailed best hyper-parameter settings are shown in Table 3.

5 Experimental Results

In this section, we evaluate the performance of DCA-SBRS on the three selected real-world datasets to verify its superiority (in comparison with other SOTA methods) and the effectiveness of its respective modules. Additionally, we analyze the shortcomings of the standard comprehensive measurement to measure both accuracy and diversity (i.e., F-score), and provide remedies accordingly.

5.1 Overall Comparisons

Tables 4-6 exhibit the experimental results of the chosen baselines on the three real-world datasets, where the best result for each metric is highlighted in boldface and the runner-up is underlined; the row ‘Improvements’ indicates the average relative enhancements achieved by our DCA-SBRSs over the corresponding SBRSs on various metrics across the three datasets, as shown in Equation 7. Note that the reported performance per model in the tables is the average results via running 5 times with the best hyper-parameter settings.

$$\text{Improvements} = \frac{\frac{\text{DCA-NARM-NARM}}{\text{NARM}} + \frac{\text{DCA-STAMP-STAMP}}{\text{STAMP}} + \frac{\text{DCA-GCEGNN-GCE-GNN}}{\text{GCE-GNN}}}{3} \quad (7)$$

5.1.1 Performance on Recommendation Accuracy

The accuracy of all approaches is measured via $\text{NDCG}@N$, $\text{MRR}@N$, and $\text{HR}@N$ ($N = \{10, 20\}$) in Tables 4-6, where several observations are obtained as follows. **1)** For traditional methods, Item-KNN outperforms BPR-MF across all three datasets. Both are generally defeated by the deep neural approaches, except for Item-KNN on Tmall. **2)** Compared with our proposed framework, the existing accuracy-focused SBRSs come in first with the help of the neural network to learn more precise item embeddings and attention mechanism to denoise. Among them, GCE-GNN outperforms other methods on all three datasets, which demonstrates the expressive power of local current session graph and global session graph. **3)** The accuracy of the aforementioned SBRSs is slightly decreased under our DCA framework, with few exceptions, such as DCA-NARM vs. NARM on Diginetica and Retailrocket. While, the perturbation (e.g., with 1.6% and 2% drops on average w.r.t. $\text{NDCG}@10$ on Diginetica and Retailrocket respectively) can be tolerated given our significant enhancements in diversity and comprehensive metrics, which will be elaborated in what follows. **4)** Deep diversified SBRSs generally perform better than traditional methods whereas worse than the accuracy-oriented deep methods due to their special design for gaining higher diversity. In contrast to NARM, the accuracy of NARM+MMR drops significantly across three datasets. It’s worth noting that our DCA-SBRSs show a superior advantage over deep diversified methods, for instance, the performance of our DCA-SBRS is one time better than IDSR w.r.t. $\text{HR}@10$ on Tmall.

⁶Compared to the grid and random search, it has proven to be a more intelligent and effective technique, especially for deep methods (having more hyper-parameters) [41].

⁷<https://github.com/hyperopt/hyperopt>

⁸<https://bitbucket.org/WanyuChen/idsr/>

Table 3: The Optimal Hyper-parameter Settings by Bayesian TPE of Hyperopt.

Model	Hyper-parameter	Digi*	Retail*	Tmall	Searching Space	Description
Item-KNN	-alpha	0.9270	0.7100	0.8514	$\mathcal{U}(0.1, 1)$	Balance for normalizing items' supports
BPR-MF	-item_*_dim	300	100	200	$[min = 100, max = 300, step = 50]$	the dimension of item embedding
	-lr	0.01	0.01	0.001	$[0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05]$	learning rate
	-batch_size	64	64	512	$[64, 128, 256, 512]$	the size for mini-batch
	-epochs	20	20	40	$[min = 10, max = 40, step = 5]$	the number of epochs
NARM	-item_*_dim	200	100	250	$[min = 100, max = 300, step = 50]$	the dimension of latent vector the number of layers in RNN
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.005	$[0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05]$	
	-batch_size	512	512	256	$[64, 128, 256, 512]$	
	-epochs	35	40	25	$[min = 10, max = 40, step = 5]$	
	-hidden_size	50	150	150	$[min = 50, max = 200, step = 50]$	
DCA-NARM	-item_*_dim	100	100	200		
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.005		
	-batch_size	512	512	256		
	-epochs	20	15	20		
	-hidden_size	200	100	150		
STAMP	-item_*_dim	100	100	150	$[min = 100, max = 300, step = 50]$	
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.01	$[0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05]$	
	-batch_size	128	512	256	$[64, 128, 256, 512]$	
	-epochs	35	20	35	$[min = 10, max = 40, step = 5]$	
DCA-STAMP	-item_*_dim	100	200	200		
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.01		
	-batch_size	256	512	512		
	-epochs	35	15	40		
GCE-GNN	-item_*_dim	250	100	100	$[100]$	the number of hop dropout rate dropout rate
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.005	$[0.001, 0.005]$	
	-batch_size	128	100	100	$[100]$	
	-epochs	10	30	20	$[min = 10, max = 30, step = 5]$	
	-n_iter	1	1	2	$[1, 2]$	
	-dropout_gcn	0.4	0.4	0.2	$[0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8]$	
DCA-GCEGNN	-item_*_dim	100	100	100		
	-lr	0.001	0.001	0.005		
	-batch_size	100	100	100		
	-epochs	30	20	20		
	-n_iter	2	2	2		
	-dropout_gcn	0.0	0.2	0.4		
MCPRN	-item_*_dim	150	150	100	$[min = 100, max = 200, step = 50]$	dimension of item embedding/latent vector
	-lr	0.005	0.005	0.005	$[0.005, 0.01, 0.05]$	
	-batch_size	256	50	50	$[50]$	
	-epochs	15	30	25	$[min = 10, max = 40, step = 5]$	
	-tau	1	0.01	0.01	$[0.01, 0.1, 1, 10]$	temperature parameter in softmax
	-purposes	1	4	1	$[1, 2, 3, 4]$	The number of channels
Remark	<p>1. Digi* represents Diginetica, Retail* for Retailrocket, item_*_dim for item_embedding_dim.</p> <p>2. Omit the hyper-parameter description if exists before.</p> <p>Additionally, DCA-SBRS and the related SBRS have the same searching space, hence omit.</p> <p>3. Due to memory limit, set item_*_dim, batch_size as 100 (original setting) in GCE-GNN, and batch_size as 50 in MCPRN except Digi*.</p> <p>4. IDSR uses own official TensorFlow code with early-stopping. Tune $\lambda_e \in [0.1, 1]$ and set it as 1 for four datasets. Besides, tune the trade-off hyper-parameter λ from $\{0.2, 0.5, 0.8\}$ aiming competitive accuracy and set it as 0.8, 0.5, 0.8 for three datasets respectively.</p>					

Table 4: Model Performance on Diginetica. Best result is highlighted in boldface and the runner-up is underlined; 'Improvements' indicates the average relative enhancements achieved by our DCA-SBRSs over the corresponding SBRSs as Equation 7.

Model\Metric	NDCG		MRR		HR		ILD		Entropy		DS		F-score	
	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20
Item-KNN	0.1313	0.1438	0.0999	0.1036	0.2343	0.2814	0.1653	0.2247	0.2852	0.4353	0.1562	0.1376	0.0375	0.0635
BPR-MF	0.0799	0.0954	0.0618	0.0661	0.1397	0.2012	0.5334	0.5799	0.9490	1.2148	0.2871	0.2159	0.0676	0.1061
NARM	0.3191	0.3468	0.2578	0.2654	<u>0.5162</u>	<u>0.6256</u>	0.1811	0.2519	0.3047	0.5037	0.1575	0.1182	0.0921	0.1645
STAMP	0.3143	0.3385	0.2558	0.2624	0.5018	0.5973	0.2704	0.3923	0.4781	0.8410	0.1977	0.1783	0.1381	0.2491
GCE-GNN	0.3458	0.3723	0.2876	0.2950	0.5324	0.6373	0.1124	0.1623	0.1825	0.3096	0.1328	0.0892	0.0627	0.1145
MCPRN	0.2321	0.2610	0.1858	0.1938	0.3829	0.4972	0.2671	0.3394	0.4651	0.7106	0.1935	0.1556	0.1100	0.1867
NARM+MMR	0.2626	0.2896	0.2092	0.2167	0.4354	0.5420	0.3484	0.4574	0.6157	0.9691	0.2234	0.1909	0.1401	0.2443
IDSR($\lambda = 0.8$)	0.2681	0.2958	0.2140	0.2217	0.4438	0.5532	0.4105	0.4635	0.7464	1.0110	0.2593	0.2090	0.1814	0.2688
DCA-NARM	0.3226	0.3435	0.2641	0.2699	0.5099	0.5920	<u>0.4115</u>	<u>0.6791</u>	<u>0.7698</u>	<u>1.6254</u>	<u>0.2691</u>	<u>0.3399</u>	<u>0.2022</u>	<u>0.4017</u>
DCA-STAMP	0.3067	0.3237	0.2529	0.2577	0.4779	0.5444	0.5750	0.8713	1.1009	2.1447	0.3489	0.4418	0.2693	0.4632
DCA-GCEGNN	<u>0.3342</u>	<u>0.3554</u>	<u>0.2813</u>	<u>0.2872</u>	0.5032	0.5868	0.3090	0.5419	0.5844	1.2960	0.2304	0.2836	0.1426	0.3172
Improvements	-1.56%	-3.29%	-0.29%	-0.91%	-3.82%	-7.38%	138%	175%	168%	232%	73.6%	184%	114%	136%

Table 5: Model Performance on Retailrocket. Best result is highlighted in boldface and the runner-up is underlined; ‘Improvements’ indicates the average relative enhancements achieved by our DCA-SBRs over the corresponding SBRs as Equation 7.

Model\Metric	NDCG		MRR		HR		ILD		Entropy		DS		F-score	
	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20
Item-KNN	0.1558	0.1634	0.1267	0.1289	0.2491	0.2777	0.6868	0.7954	1.2871	1.7206	0.3749	0.3822	0.1491	0.1979
BPR-MF	0.1244	0.1369	0.1037	0.1072	0.1915	0.2407	0.8106	0.8599	1.5023	1.8863	0.4077	0.3183	0.1391	0.1899
NARM	0.3625	0.3815	0.3138	0.3190	0.5181	<u>0.5928</u>	0.4860	0.5885	0.8698	1.2658	0.2767	0.2369	0.2475	0.3507
STAMP	0.3516	0.3688	0.3068	0.3115	0.4945	0.5624	0.5313	0.6563	0.9769	1.4613	0.3046	0.2739	0.2530	0.3642
GCE-GNN	0.3917	0.4107	0.3426	0.3478	0.5481	0.6229	0.3701	0.4525	0.6312	0.9139	0.2207	0.1744	0.2143	0.3044
MCPRN	0.2363	0.2501	0.2085	0.2123	0.3252	0.3799	0.7664	0.8432	1.4931	2.0162	0.4322	0.3852	0.2293	0.2930
NARM+MMR	0.3234	0.3413	0.2785	0.2834	0.4669	0.5375	0.6247	0.7436	1.1543	1.6684	0.3424	0.3073	0.2764	0.3863
IDSR($\lambda = 0.5$)	0.2863	0.3116	0.2526	0.2596	0.3998	0.4996	1.1929	1.0939	2.4573	2.7566	0.6794	0.5506	0.4274	0.5093
DCA-NARM	0.3654	0.3804	0.3200	0.3241	0.5099	0.5688	0.7181	0.9328	1.3801	2.3049	0.4074	0.4618	0.3544	0.5053
DCA-STAMP	0.3362	0.3471	0.2929	0.2960	0.4726	0.5155	0.9061	1.1276	1.8147	2.9613	0.5230	0.6133	0.3994	0.5257
DCA-GCEGNN	<u>0.3826</u>	<u>0.3985</u>	<u>0.3364</u>	<u>0.3408</u>	<u>0.5293</u>	0.5921	0.5970	0.7813	1.1258	1.8713	0.3461	0.3754	0.3103	0.4533
Improvements	-1.97%	-3.05%	-1.45%	-1.80%	-3.15%	-5.78%	59.9%	67.7%	74.3%	96.5%	58.6%	111%	48.6%	45.8%

Table 6: Model Performance on Tmall. Best result is highlighted in boldface and the runner-up is underlined; ‘Improvements’ indicates the average relative enhancements achieved by our DCA-SBRs over the corresponding SBRs as Equation 7.

Model\Metric	NDCG		MRR		HR		ILD		Entropy		DS		F-score	
	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20
Item-KNN	0.0321	0.0349	0.0251	0.0259	0.0551	0.0655	0.8888	0.9593	1.6790	2.0452	0.4546	0.4219	0.0442	0.0573
BPR-MF	0.0096	0.0119	0.0069	0.0075	0.0186	0.0279	0.9963	1.0350	1.8716	2.3219	0.4852	0.3805	0.0168	0.0259
NARM	0.0244	0.0306	0.0174	0.0191	0.0476	0.0720	0.9453	1.0085	1.7760	2.2625	0.4689	0.3778	0.0386	0.0642
STAMP	0.0171	0.0215	0.0121	0.0133	0.0336	0.0511	1.0449	1.0959	2.0375	2.5806	0.5428	0.4494	0.0292	0.0481
GCE-GNN	<u>0.0282</u>	<u>0.0355</u>	<u>0.0187</u>	<u>0.0207</u>	0.0594	0.0886	0.8571	0.9326	1.5691	2.0340	0.4161	0.3345	<u>0.0443</u>	<u>0.0744</u>
MCPRN	0.0110	0.0142	0.0075	0.0084	0.0225	0.0354	1.0661	1.1042	2.1139	2.6437	0.5686	0.4679	0.0193	0.0326
NARM+MMR	0.0198	0.0249	0.0141	0.0154	0.0386	0.0592	1.0116	1.0634	1.9386	2.4437	0.5124	0.4155	0.0331	0.0548
IDSR($\lambda = 0.8$)	0.0083	0.0114	0.0054	0.0063	0.0179	0.0303	1.3175	1.2969	2.8725	3.4530	0.8108	0.6773	0.0192	0.0327
DCA-NARM	0.0145	0.0171	0.0106	0.0113	0.0272	0.0374	<u>1.3096</u>	1.3466	2.9308	3.8986	0.8548	0.8566	0.0274	0.0402
DCA-STAMP	0.0164	0.0192	0.0122	0.0129	0.0304	0.0414	1.2720	<u>1.3274</u>	2.7719	<u>3.7395</u>	0.7919	<u>0.7962</u>	0.0311	0.0453
DCA-GCEGNN	0.0259	0.0329	0.0165	0.0185	<u>0.0566</u>	<u>0.0843</u>	0.9647	1.0464	1.8368	2.4230	0.4894	0.4205	0.0467	0.0777
Improvements.	-17.6%	-20.7%	-16.7%	-18.16%	-19.03%	-24.0%	24.3%	22.3%	39.4%	45.4%	48.6%	76.5%	-5.70%	-12.9%

5.1.2 Performance on Recommendation Diversity

The diversity of all comparisons is measured via $ILD@N$, $Entropy@N$, and $DS@N$ ($N = \{10, 20\}$) in Tables 4-6. Three major findings can be noted. **1)** Existing SBRs benefit significantly from our proposed DCA framework. For instance, averagely, across the three datasets, the relative improvements regarding diversity on $ILD@10$ achieved by our DCA-SBRs over the corresponding SBRs (e.g., DCA-NARM vs. NARM) can reach 138%, 59.9%, and 24.3%, respectively. Besides, some of our DCA-SBRs (e.g., DCA-STAMP) outperform all other methods (including the deep diversified models) on Diginetica and Tmall. **2)** Towards diversified models, the performance of IDSR exceeds that of MCPRN on all three datasets. Meanwhile, all of them beat existing accuracy-oriented SBRs (except MCPRN vs. STAMP on Diginetica), indicating the efficacy of these diversified methods in gaining better diversity. **3)** Existing accuracy-oriented SBRs perform worst due to ignoring the demands on diversity. Among them, STAMP performs best across all three datasets. Moreover, traditional methods (led by BPR-MF), though being surpassed by these accuracy-oriented SBRs with regard to recommendation accuracy, perform slightly better when it comes to diversity.

5.1.3 Comprehensive Performance

To comprehensively assess the performance from both accuracy and diversity perspectives, we further compare them in terms of $F\text{-score}@N$ ($N = \{10, 20\}$) in Tables 4-6, and several interesting findings can be gained. **1)** Our proposed DCA-SBRs perform the best among all baselines. Specifically, a quite encouraging phenomenon is observed that some of our DCA-SBRs show effectiveness by defeating diversified models in terms of both accuracy and diversity (e.g., DCA-STAMP on Diginetica, DCA-NARM on Tmall and DCA-NARM vs. NARM+MMR on Diginetica and Retailrocket). Additionally, our framework also outperforms accuracy-oriented SBRs with significant gains on diversity while only minor drops on accuracy. **2)** Towards deep diversified models, IDSR achieves both better accuracy and diversity than MCPRN and NARM+MMR on Diginetica and Retailrocket, demonstrating the superiority of IDSR against MCPRN. **3)** Typically, traditional methods perform worse than accuracy-oriented SBRs. Comparing accuracy-oriented SBRs and diversified SBRs, the former performs better on Tmall, while worse on Diginetica. This is mainly caused by the calculation of the F-score (harmonic mean of HR and ILD). Due to the different features (e.g., distribution) of various datasets, the results achieved on different datasets regarding HR and ILD may vary a lot. For instance, the ILD values are generally higher than HR values on Diginetica, while the opposite case is held on Tmall.

Table 7: Computational Time Comparison.

Model\Time	Training(/epoch)			Inference		
	Digi*	Retail*	Tmall	Digi*	Retail*	Tmall
NARM	49s	68s	156s	560s	137s	2678s
NARM+MMR	49s	68s	156s	5173s	2082s	6075s
MCPRN	244s	3003s	1138s	2325s	1689s	3167s
IDSR	1486s	1646s	4604s	62s	29s	1928s
DCA-NARM	127s	159s	418s	8s	4s	134s

Note: Diginetica and Retailrocket are shortened as Digi* and Retail*.

Therefore, the model achieving the best result w.r.t. the weaker metric (e.g., HR on Diginetica) will gain advantages regarding the comprehensive performance, i.e., F-score.

Interestingly, we notice that all methods perform worse regarding the recommendation accuracy whilst better w.r.t. diversity on Tmall compared with the other two datasets. This might be caused by the unique data distribution of Tmall, i.e., lower RR and higher DS in Table 2. Nevertheless, our proposed DCA still exceeds other diversified SBRs, showing the stability of our DCA.

5.1.4 Performance on Time Complexity

Following the discussion in Section 3.4, we empirically verify the efficiency of our lightweight DCA. As such, we record the training and inference time for representative methods, including NARM, NARM+MMR, DCA-NARM, MCPRN, IDSR and our DCA-NARM, across three datasets shown in Table 7. Two major findings are noted. **1)** MMR is a re-ranking (two-stage) method by a greedy search for diversity-promoting based on the trained NARM from the first step (training stage). NARM+MMR hence has a substantially longer inference time than NARM. By contrast, our DCA+NARM accomplishes an end-to-end learning and avoids greedy search in the inference stage, thus being faster than NARM+MMR. **2)** Unlike other diversified SBRs (i.e., IDSR and MCPRN) relying on specifically calibrated diversity-aware components, our DCA framework performs effectively on both training and inference stages due to limited additional parameters.

5.1.5 Adaptation on F-score

We now discuss the drawbacks of the current comprehensive metric (F-score [40]), and provide remedies accordingly. First, due to different scales of HR and ILD, the weaker metric may easily dominate the final comprehensive performance, particularly on Tmall in Table 6. Therefore, it is necessary to map the two metrics into the same range before calculating F-score. Alternatively, we may replace ILD with DS (Diversity Score [17]) in F-score since HR and DS are in the same range of $[0, 1]$. Second, ***a clear decline on accuracy is generally not acceptable in real-world recommendation scenarios***. According to Tables 4-6, diversified models have apparent drops on accuracy due to the significant improvements on diversity. However, their comprehensive performance (i.e., F-score) is not the worst, even the best on Retailrocket (Table 5). That is to say, the current comprehensive performance does not match what is actually anticipated by the real-world applications. As such, we propose a generalized comprehensive metric $F_\beta(\text{ACC}, \text{DIV})$ to solve the aforementioned issue, as below:

$$F_\beta(\text{ACC}, \text{DIV}) = \frac{(1 + \beta^2)\text{ACC} \times \text{DIV}}{\beta^2\text{ACC} + \text{DIV}}, \quad (8)$$

where $\beta > 0$. Accordingly, the F-score [40] can be regarded as a special case, i.e., $F_1(\text{HR}, \text{ILD})$. For a consistent range of ACC and DIV, we recommend $F_\beta(\text{HR}, \text{DS})$. Additionally, if accuracy is prioritized over diversity, we suggest $\beta < 1$, e.g., $F_{0.5}(\text{HR}, \text{DS})$, to put more emphasis on accuracy since it is less meaningful to gain diversity without taking accuracy into account in real-world applications. Note that with the proposed $F_\beta(\text{ACC}, \text{DIV})$, our proposed DCA-SBRs rank first thanks to the satisfying performance on accuracy and superior performance on diversity, as shown in Table 8. Specifically, on Retailrocket, the ranking of our DCA-SBRs improves w.r.t. $N = 10$, while diversified models (e.g., IDSR) experience a decline in ranking by changing β from 1 to 0.5 due to its inferior accuracy performance.

Table 8: F-score vs. Adapted F-score on Retailrocket. Best result is highlighted in boldface and the runner-up is underlined; ‘Improvements’ indicates the average relative enhancements achieved by our DCA-SBRSSs over the corresponding SBRSSs as Equation 7.

Model\Metric	F-score		$F_{0.5}(\text{HR}, \text{ILD})$		$F_{0.5}(\text{HR}, \text{DS})$	
	@10	@20	@10	@20	@10	@20
Item-KNN	0.1491	0.1979	0.1618	0.2093	0.1542	0.1714
BPR-MF	0.1391	0.1899	0.1452	0.1980	0.1287	0.1418
NARM	0.2475	0.3507	0.2782	0.3960	0.2888	0.2938
STAMP	0.2530	0.3642	0.2790	0.4008	0.2859	0.3024
GCE-GNN	0.2143	0.3044	0.2439	0.3544	0.2820	0.2681
MCPN	0.2293	0.2930	0.2393	0.3059	0.2193	0.2349
NARM+MMR	0.2764	0.3863	0.3013	0.4174	0.2871	0.3110
IDS $R(\lambda = 0.5)$	0.4274	<u>0.5093</u>	<u>0.4095</u>	0.5011	<u>0.3573</u>	<u>0.4142</u>
DCA-NARM	0.3544	0.5053	0.3787	0.5180	0.3447	0.4138
DCA-STAMP	<u>0.3994</u>	0.5257	0.4122	<u>0.5128</u>	0.3606	0.4319
DCA-GCEGNN	0.3103	0.4533	0.3391	0.4838	0.3269	0.3761
<i>Improvements.</i>	48.6%	45.8%	41.0%	31.8%	20.5%	41.3%




Figure 4: The Impact of MDL in Diversity w.r.t. $\text{ILD}@10$.

5.2 The Impact of Essential Modules

5.2.1 Impact of Model-agnostic Diversified Loss (abbr. MDL)

Our proposed MDL in Equation 1 aims to improve the diversity of accuracy-oriented SBRSSs as an end-to-end plugin by punishing monotonous RL with low diversity. In Figure 4, we compare the accuracy-oriented SBRSSs (labeled as ‘SBRSSs’) and the corresponding variants with our MDL supplemented solely (labeled as ‘SBRSSs+MDL’) w.r.t. $\text{ILD}@10$. Accordingly, by adding our MDL, the diversity of all baseline SBRSSs significantly improves across the three datasets. Specifically, on Diginetica, Retailrocket, and Tmall, the average relative improvements are 100%, 56.7%, and 30.3%, respectively. Besides, among the three selected baselines (NARM, STAMP, and GCE-GNN), MDL improves NARM most (i.e., 71.46%).

It’s worth noting that, for simplicity, we set $\lambda = 1$ in Equation 3. To analyze the effect of MDL in a fine-grained manner, we select NARM as our basic predictor and vary the value of λ from 0 to 1 stepped by 0.1. Figure 5 depicts the variation w.r.t. accuracy (i.e., NDCG and HR), diversity (i.e., ILD), and comprehensive performance (i.e., F-score) with varied λ on the three datasets⁹. As noted, the *accuracy* slightly decreases with the increasing of λ on all three datasets; whilst a significant enhancements on *diversity* is noted on all datasets, showcasing the remarkable effectiveness of our MDL. Towards *comprehensive performance*, F-score climbs up when λ varies from 0 to 1 on Diginetica and Retailrocket; whereas it has a slight decline on Tmall. The possible explanation can be found in Section 5.1.3. As a whole, the recommendation accuracy drops and diversity increases by boosting the value of λ gradually. This indicates the necessity of fine-tuning λ to achieve more satisfying performance.

⁹For ease of presentation, we display the values of ‘ILD minus one’ (i.e., $\text{ILD}-1$) on Tmall to ensure all metrics in a proper scale without changing the overall trend.




Figure 5: The Impact of MDL for NARM+MDL with $N = 10$.




Figure 6: The Impact of NCA in Accuracy w.r.t. NDCG@10.

5.2.2 Impact of Non-invasive Category-aware Attention (abbr. NCA)

As indicated in Section 5.2.1, the recommendation accuracy of baseline SBRSSs may slightly drops when integrating our designed MDL. To ease this issue, we propose category-aware attention (i.e., NCA) by importing category information into the pervasive attention mechanisms in SBRSSs, with the goal of assisting item prediction. This differs from simply concatenating category information as the input of SBRSSs. For verification, we compare accuracy-oriented SBRSSs (labeled as ‘SBRSSs’) and the corresponding variants by simply substituting the attention mechanism with our category-aware attention (labeled as ‘SBRSSs+NCA’) on accuracy (i.e., NDCG@10), as depicted in Figure 6. In general, replacing the attention mechanism with our NCA facilitates the accuracy of SBRSSs. Specifically, NCA helps NARM and GCE-GNN enhance their accuracy on all datasets. A similar trend is held by STAMP on Tmall; however, on the other two datasets, the accuracy of STAMP+NCA has not improved. That is perhaps due to the straightforward design of STAMP, which employs item embeddings directly rather than hidden states from RNNs or GNNs (e.g., NARM and GCE-GNN). As a result, STAMP+NCA simply sums item embeddings and the relevant category embeddings before computing attention scores, which may introduce more noise to interfere with the final item prediction.

There’s no denying that our DCA framework aids existing accuracy-oriented SBRSSs in achieving extraordinary diversity and comprehensive performance gains while maintaining accuracy simultaneously, even without a thorough accuracy improvements for all SBRSSs+NCA on all datasets as shown in Figure 6 (this may be caused by different features of datasets or designs of baseline predictors). Alternatively stated, the efficacy of our proposed framework does not rely on NCA only.

5.3 Discussion on our proposed DCA framework

Our proposed Diversified Category-aware Attentive (DCA) framework comprises two key components: a model-agnostic diversity-oriented loss function and a non-invasive category-aware attention mechanism. To evaluate the efficacy of the DCA framework, we selected three deep neural methods with attention mechanisms as their backbone, as detailed in Section 4.2 and Section 5. Notably, these methods all rank among the top five SBRSSs in terms of accuracy [24]. In the session-based evaluation survey [24], it is evident that all of the top-performing SBRSSs in accuracy leverage attention mechanisms.

However, our DCA framework isn’t limited solely to attention-based models. Despite the original SBRS not making use of an attention mechanism, we demonstrate the seamless integration of this component for enhanced session representation. Specifically, we adopt GRU4Rec[3], an RNN-based SBRS without an attention mechanism, as our backbone model to showcase the effectiveness of our DCA framework in this context. As illustrated in Figure 7, we compare GRU4Rec with two variants: GRU4Rec with an attention mechanism and DCA-GRU4Rec, considering

accuracy, diversity, and comprehensive performance. In summary, GRU4Rec with an attention mechanism outperforms the baseline GRU4Rec in terms of accuracy but lags in terms of diversity. Our DCA-GRU4Rec, on the other hand, achieves similar accuracy to GRU4Rec with an attention mechanism while significantly enhancing diversity and delivering a satisfactory overall performance. This substantiates the effectiveness of our DCA framework when applied to backbone models without attention mechanisms.

In conclusion, our DCA framework is highly versatile and can be seamlessly integrated into common SBRs, whether they incorporate attention mechanisms or not, consistently showcasing its effectiveness in enhancing recommendation system performance.




Figure 7: Performance comparison between GRU4Rec and two variants in terms of HR, ILD, and F-score $N \in \{10, 20\}$.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have proposed a simple yet effective diversified category-aware attentive SBRs (DCA-SBRs) to improve diversity over SOTA accuracy-oriented SBRs in the meantime striving to maintain the recommendation accuracy. To fulfill the goals, our DCA-SBRs consists of two novel components: (1) a model-agnostic diversity-oriented loss function for diversity purpose; and (2) a non-invasive category-aware attention mechanism, which exploits category information for SBRs in a non-invasive way to keep accuracy of original SBRs. Our generic framework can serve as a plugin and be easily instantiated with representative accuracy-oriented SBRs. Extensive experiments on three datasets show that: (1) DCA-SBRs significantly outperform the corresponding baselines in terms of diversity and comprehensive performance while maintaining satisfying accuracy performance; (2) both the two components are effective in terms of the respective goal. Moreover, we have discussed the limitations of existing comprehensive performance metrics considering both accuracy and diversity, and offered more reasonable strategy to evaluate diversified recommenders.

References

- [1] Hui Fang, Danning Zhang, Yiheng Shu, and Guibing Guo. Deep learning for sequential recommendation: Algorithms, influential factors, and evaluations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, pages 1–42, 2020.
- [2] Shoujin Wang, Longbing Cao, Yan Wang, Quan Z Sheng, Mehmet A Orgun, and Defu Lian. A survey on session-based recommender systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, pages 1–38, 2021.
- [3] Balázs Hidasi, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Linas Baltrunas, and Domonkos Tikk. Session-based recommendations with recurrent neural networks. 2016.
- [4] Jing Li, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Zhaochun Ren, Tao Lian, and Jun Ma. Neural attentive session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 1419–1428, 2017.
- [5] Qiao Liu, Yifu Zeng, Refuoe Mokhosi, and Haibin Zhang. STAMP: short-term attention/memory priority model for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (KDD)*, pages 1831–1839, 2018.
- [6] Shu Wu, Yuyuan Tang, Yanqiao Zhu, Liang Wang, Xing Xie, and Tieniu Tan. Session-based recommendation with graph neural networks. In *The 33th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 346–353, 2019.
- [7] Chengfeng Xu, Pengpeng Zhao, Yanchi Liu, Victor S. Sheng, Jiajie Xu, Fuzhen Zhuang, Junhua Fang, and Xiaofang Zhou. Graph contextualized self-attention network for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 3940–3946, 2019.
- [8] Ziyang Wang, Wei Wei, Gao Cong, Xiao-Li Li, Xian-Ling Mao, and Minghui Qiu. Global context enhanced graph neural networks for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 169–178, 2020.
- [9] Harald Steck. Calibrated recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*, pages 154–162, 2018.
- [10] Tien T Nguyen, Pik-Mai Hui, F Maxwell Harper, Loren Terveen, and Joseph A Konstan. Exploring the filter bubble: The effect of using recommender systems on content diversity. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, pages 677–686, 2014.
- [11] Sami Khenissi, Boujelbene Mariem, and Olfa Nasraoui. Theoretical modeling of the iterative properties of user discovery in a collaborative filtering recommender system. In *14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*, pages 348–357, 2020.
- [12] Jaime Carbonell and Jade Goldstein. The use of mmr, diversity-based reranking for reordering documents and producing summaries. In *Proceedings of the 21st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 335–336, 1998.
- [13] Laming Chen, Guoxin Zhang, and Eric Zhou. Fast Greedy MAP Inference for Determinantal Point Process to Improve Recommendation Diversity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- [14] Qiong Wu, Yong Liu, Chunyan Miao, Binqiang Zhao, Yin Zhao, and Lu Guan. Pd-gan: Adversarial learning for personalized diversity-promoting recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 3870–3876, 2019.
- [15] Lu Gan, Diana Nurbakova, Léa Laporte, and Sylvie Calabretto. Enhancing recommendation diversity using determinantal point processes on knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 2001–2004, 2020.
- [16] Yu Zheng, Chen Gao, Liang Chen, Depeng Jin, and Yong Li. Dgcn: Diversified recommendation with graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021 (WWW)*, pages 401–412, 2021.
- [17] Yile Liang, Tiejun Qian, Qing Li, and Hongzhi Yin. Enhancing domain-level and user-level adaptivity in diversified recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 747–756, 2021.
- [18] Shoujin Wang, Liang Hu, Yan Wang, Quan Z. Sheng, Mehmet A. Orgun, and Longbing Cao. Modeling multi-purpose sessions for next-item recommendations via mixture-channel purpose routing networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 3771–3777, 2019.
- [19] Yukuo Cen, J. Zhang, Xu Zou, C. Zhou, Hongxia Yang, and Jie Tang. Controllable multi-interest framework for recommendation. *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (KDD)*, 2020.

- [20] Wanyu Chen, Pengjie Ren, Fei Cai, Fei Sun, and Maarten de Rijke. Improving end-to-end sequential recommendations with intent-aware diversification. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 175–184, 2020.
- [21] Qian Zhao, Jilin Chen, Minmin Chen, Sagar Jain, Alex Beutel, Francois Belletti, and Ed H Chi. Categorical-attributes-based item classification for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*, pages 320–328, 2018.
- [22] Zhu Sun, Qing Guo, Jie Yang, Hui Fang, Guibing Guo, Jie Zhang, and Robin Burke. Research commentary on recommendations with side information: A survey and research directions. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 37:100879, 2019.
- [23] Chang Liu, Xiaoguang Li, Guohao Cai, Zhenhua Dong, Hong Zhu, and Lifeng Shang. Non-invasive self-attention for side information fusion in sequential recommendation. In *The 35th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pages 4249–4256, 2021.
- [24] Qing Yin, Hui Fang, Zhu Sun, and Yew-Soon Ong. Understanding diversity in session-based recommendation. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 42(1), aug 2023.
- [25] Badrul Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph Konstan, and John Riedl. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, pages 285–295, 2001.
- [26] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. Bpr: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*, page 452–461, 2009.
- [27] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. Factorizing personalized markov chains for next-basket recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, pages 811–820, 2010.
- [28] Yong Kiam Tan, Xinxing Xu, and Yong Liu. Improved recurrent neural networks for session-based recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems (DLRS@RecSys)*, pages 17–22, 2016.
- [29] Balázs Hidasi and Alexandros Karatzoglou. Recurrent neural networks with top-k gains for session-based recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 843–852, 2018.
- [30] Ruihong Qiu, Jingjing Li, Zi Huang, and Hongzhi Yin. Rethinking the item order in session-based recommendation with graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 579–588, 2019.
- [31] Feng Yu, Yanqiao Zhu, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, and Tieniu Tan. Tagnn: Target attentive graph neural networks for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 1921–1924, 2020.
- [32] Rakesh Agrawal, Sreenivas Gollapudi, Alan Halverson, and Samuel Ieong. Diversifying search results. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM)*, pages 5–14. ACM, 2009.
- [33] Rodrygo LT Santos, Craig Macdonald, and Iadh Ounis. Exploiting query reformulations for web search result diversification. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, pages 881–890, 2010.
- [34] Alex Kulesza and Ben Taskar. Determinantal point processes for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.6083*, 2012.
- [35] Yingqiang Ge, Shuchang Liu, Zuohui Fu, Juntao Tan, Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Yunqi Li, Yikun Xian, and Yongfeng Zhang. A survey on trustworthy recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12515*, 2022.
- [36] Shoujin Wang, Xiuzhen Zhang, Yan Wang, Huan Liu, and Francesco Ricci. Trustworthy recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06265*, 2022.
- [37] Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Jing Li, Zhaochun Ren, Jun Ma, and Maarten de Rijke. Repeatnet: A repeat aware neural recommendation machine for session-based recommendation. In *The 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2019.
- [38] Anjing Luo, Pengpeng Zhao, Yanchi Liu, Fuzhen Zhuang, Deqing Wang, Jiajie Xu, Junhua Fang, and Victor S Sheng. Collaborative self-attention network for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 2591–2597, 2020.

- [39] Malte Ludewig and Dietmar Jannach. Evaluation of session-based recommendation algorithms. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction (UMUAI)*, 28(4):331–390, 2018.
- [40] Liang Hu, Longbing Cao, Shoujin Wang, Guandong Xu, Jian Cao, and Zhiping Gu. Diversifying personalized recommendation with user-session context. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 1858–1864, 2017.
- [41] Zhu Sun, Di Yu, Hui Fang, Jie Yang, Xinghua Qu, Jie Zhang, and Cong Geng. Are we evaluating rigorously? benchmarking recommendation for reproducible evaluation and fair comparison. In *Proceedings of 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*, pages 23–32, 2020.
- [42] James Bergstra, Rémi Bardenet, Yoshua Bengio, and Balázs Kégl. Algorithms for hyper-parameter optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 24, 2011.