

Tired of Plugins? Large Language Models Can Be End-To-End Recommenders

Wenlin Zhang, Chuhan Wu, Xiangyang Li, Yuhao Wang, Kuicai Dong, Yichao Wang, Xinyi Dai, Xiangyu Zhao, Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang

Abstract

Recommender systems aim to predict user interest based on historical behavioral data. They are mainly designed in sequential pipelines, requiring lots of data to train different sub-systems, and are hard to scale to new domains. Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable generalized capabilities, enabling a singular model to tackle diverse recommendation tasks across various scenarios. Nonetheless, existing LLM-based recommendation systems utilize LLM purely for a *single task* of the recommendation pipeline. Besides, these systems face challenges in presenting *large-scale* item sets to LLMs in natural language format, due to the constraint of input length. To address these challenges, we introduce an LLM-based end-to-end recommendation framework: UniLLMRec. Specifically, UniLLMRec integrates multi-stage tasks (*e.g.*, recall, ranking, re-ranking) via *chain-of-recommendations*. To deal with large-scale items, we propose a novel strategy to structure all items into an *item tree*, which can be dynamically updated and effectively retrieved. UniLLMRec shows promising zero-shot results in comparison with conventional supervised models. Additionally, it boasts high efficiency, reducing the input token need by 86% compared to existing LLM-based models. Such efficiency not only accelerates task completion but also optimizes resource utilization. To facilitate model understanding and to ensure reproducibility, we have made our code publicly available.¹

Index Terms

Recommender Systems, End-to-End Recommendation, Large Language Model

I. INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems aim to understand the preferences, historical choices, and characteristics of users and items via collected behavioral data (*e.g.*, clicks, likes, pages viewed, and etc) [1]. Given their capability to predict user interests, recommender systems are widely adopted by content and product providers. In recommender system applications, the recommendation process typically involves the following stages: (i) the retrieval of potential item candidates (*i.e.*, recall) [1], (ii) the prioritization or ranking of these potential items based on user preference or other specified factors (*i.e.*, ranking) [2], [3], and the curation of a diverse set of items for user, reflecting an amalgamation of varying interests, preferences, or needs (*i.e.*, re-ranking) [4]. Conventional recommender systems often structure the recommendation process in sequential pipelines, as illustrated in Figure 1a. These systems comprise several specialized models, each specifically designed for individual stages such as recall, ranking, and re-ranking. However, the inherent drawback of these systems lies within the substantial costs of training and maintaining multiple distinct models. In addition to this, the retraining of the entire system whenever new data is introduced, poses a challenge to their scalability and operational efficiency. For this reason, it is crucial to design a unified end-to-end model that can effectively alleviate these concerns. On the other hand, understanding human behavior presents substantial challenges to conventional recommender systems. These systems [5], [6], [7] typically model user and item information within a vector space, which may lead to the potential loss of rich contextual semantics. This solidifies the need for an advanced method that ensures accurate semantic representation of user behaviors and item characteristics.

The recent emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT [8] and Claude [9], has demonstrated robust ability to excel in a broad spectrum of Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. The inherent potential of LLMs positions them as natural zero-shot solvers, which is capable of addressing multiple recommendation challenges simultaneously. Beyond task performance, LLMs exhibit impressive capacity to assimilate human knowledge related to our physical world and society, as highlighted in recent studies [10], [11], [12]. This ability allows them to provide a level of understanding that goes beyond simple task execution. Recognizing these inherent benefits, there has been an increased interest in utilizing LLMs to boost the efficacy of recommender systems, with *strong zero-shot capability* and a more *profound understanding of human behavior*.

In recent research by [13], [14], recommendation tasks have been approached within the natural language generation framework. Their methods involve fine-tuning Language Models (LLMs) to address various recommendation scenarios through Parameter Efficient Fine Tuning (PEFT), including approaches such as LoRA and P-tuning [15], [16]. However, **challenge 1 arises**: though claiming to be efficient, these fine-tuning techniques heavily rely on substantial amounts of training data, which

Wenlin Zhang, Yuhao Wang, and Xiangyu Zhao are with City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: wl.z, yhwang25-c@my.cityu.edu.hk, xy.zhao@cityu.edu.hk

Chuhan Wu, Xiangyang Li, Kuicai Dong, Yichao Wang, Xinyi Dai, Huifeng Guo, and Ruiming Tang are with Huawei Noah's Ark Lab, Shenzhen, China. E-mail: wuchuhan1, lixiangyang34, dong.kuicai, wangyichao5, daixinyi5, huifeng.guo, tangruiming@huawei.com

¹<https://github.com/wlzhang2020/UniLLMRec>




Fig. 1: Examples of conventional pipelined and LLM-centered end-to-end recommender systems.

can be costly and time-consuming to obtain. This issue becomes more significant in dynamic recommendation environments, where frequent updates to the recommended items necessitate regular training of the LLMs.

Meanwhile, [17], [18] introduce carefully-constructed prompts and apply them to the ranking stage of recommendation. These methods take advantage of the impressive zero-shot capability of LLMs to carry out the ranking task. However, **challenge 2 arises** in these approaches, as they tend to under-utilize the strong general or multi-task capabilities of LLMs. We believe that LLMs have the potential to go beyond a single-stage application and can offer much more in other recommendation process.

Furthermore, [18], [13] have attempted to improve recall accuracy utilizing LLMs, by concatenating the entire list of items into a single prompt. These approaches typically represent items using attributes such as title, description, listing date, category, and more. However, the effectiveness of these systems is limited by a trade-off between the size of the item list and the amount of detail that can be provided for each item. When more comprehensive descriptions are included for each item, the number of items that can be incorporated in the list decreases, and vice versa. This leads to existing systems often limiting their input of each item to be either an item title or a brief description, with the item size typically constrained to a small range. Consequently, **challenge 3 arises** in effectively presenting a large-scale item corpus to LLMs in natural language format. The constraint on LLM input length limit poses difficulties in dealing with a larger number of items.

To address the aforementioned challenges, we propose UniLLMRec, a novel framework that capitalizes on a singular LLM to seamlessly perform items recall, ranking, and re-ranking within a unified end-to-end recommendation framework, as illustrated in Figure 1b. A key advantage of UniLLMRec lies in its utilization of the inherent zero-shot capabilities of LLMs, which eliminates the need for training or fine-tuning. Hence, UniLLMRec offers a more streamlined and resource-efficient solution compared to traditional systems, facilitating more effective and scalable implementations across a variety of recommendation contexts. To ensure that UniLLMRec can effectively handle a large-scale item corpus, we have developed an innovative tree-based recall strategy. Specifically, this involves constructing a tree that organizes items based on semantic attributes such as categories, subcategories, and keywords, creating a manageable hierarchy from an extensive list of items. Each leaf node in this tree encompasses a manageable subset of the complete item inventory, enabling efficient traversal from the root to the appropriate leaf nodes. Hence we can search items from the selected leaf nodes only. This approach sharply contrasts with traditional methods that require searching through the entire item list, resulting in a significant optimization of the recall process.

In summary, we highlight our contributions in three-fold:

- We propose UniLLMRec, the first LLM-centered end-to-end recommendation framework, which realizes the whole recommendation process including stages of recall, ranking, and re-ranking. This framework not only boasts greater ease of deployment compared to existing recommender systems but also eliminates the need for training.
- We design an innovative hierarchical item tree structure that can organize large-scale item lists into smaller, manageable segments contained within leaf nodes. Such item tree (i) can be dynamically updated with new recommended items, and (ii) allows for fast retrieval.

- We validate the effectiveness and efficiency of UniLLMRec on two benchmark datasets. Our zero-shot performance are comparable to that of conventional baselines trained on substantial amounts of data. Furthermore, when measured against LLM-based benchmarks, UniLLMRec achieves a significant efficiency gain by reducing the number of input tokens required by 85%.

II. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we introduce the preliminary of our proposed framework. Firstly, we introduce the definition of the whole-chain recommendation and provide our problem formulation. Afterward, we introduce large language models (LLM) and their potential in recommender systems. Finally, we introduce prompt design engineering and how to leverage them to harness the powerful capabilities of LLM.

A. Problem Formulation

Given a set of $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_M\}$ with M users, recommender system aims to recommend the k best matching items $[i_1, \dots, i_k]$ from a large-scale set $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \dots, i_N\}$ with N candidate items. Due to privacy constraints in recommendation data, user profile attributes are typically anonymized. In this paper, users are indirectly modelled based on their interaction history. Specifically, a user u can be represented as an item list $[i_1, \dots, i_{n_u}]$, where i_{n_u} indicates the number of items included in the user’s historical interactions. The whole-chain recommendation process encompasses multiple stages designed to identify potential items, with a focus on balancing accuracy and variety. This whole-chain recommendation can be divided into three stages including recall, ranking, and re-ranking, which can be defined as follows:

- **Recall** focuses on narrowing down the vast universe of potential items, \mathcal{I} , from the magnitude of billions to just a few thousand. The challenge lies in achieving efficiency to manage large-scale item corpus for each user, while still maintaining a high recall ratio. This is a crucial premise task for the subsequent effectiveness of both ranking and re-ranking stages.
- **Ranking** aims to deliver a finely sorted array of items, designated as \mathcal{I}_{ranked} , thereby filtering the selection down to a more manageable scale (*e.g.*, a few hundreds). Given the reduced number of items at this point, the recommendation system has the capacity to incorporate comprehensive information, thereby ensuring a precise and accurate ordering of the recommendations.
- **Re-ranking** is dedicated to increasing variety among the recommended items to prevent the homogenized recommendation results. During this phase, the already ranked list is further refined to produce $\mathcal{I}_{re-ranked}$, targeting an improved user experience by striking a balance between relevance and diversity. This can in turn give a positive impact on long-term user satisfaction.

B. Large Language Model (LLM)

Large Language Models (LLMs) have become a research hotspot in recent years due to their powerful language processing capabilities. Pre-trained with extensive open-world data, LLMs are equipped with general knowledge, enabling them to perform a variety of task, even with no prior specific training (zero-shot capability). Despite their outstanding performance across a spectrum of NLP challenges, LLMs encounter difficulties when applied to recommender systems due to the disparity between their stored general knowledge and the specialized knowledge required in recommendation scenarios.

To bridge this gap and effectively integrate LLMs into recommendation systems, methods such as fine-tuning with tailored recommendation prompts or leveraging prompt engineering strategies even in zero-shot scenarios are used to instill domain-specific understanding in these models. State-of-the-art LLMs, such as ChatGPT and GPT-4, have shown proficiency in adapting to new content through in-context learning, following instructions with precision, and rational step-by-step problem-solving. Thus, leveraging these inherent strengths, LLMs have the potential in tasks relevant to recommender systems: from constructing user profiles to providing comprehensive end-to-end recommendations (all within a zero-shot framework).

C. Prompt Engineering

Due to the difference between the task objective of pre-trained LLMs and the recommendation tasks, it is crucial to design suitable prompt templates so as to elicit the capabilities of LLMs in specific tasks. It is also beneficial to break down a complex task into simpler, more manageable subtasks for the LLM to solve. Consequently, creating well-thought-out prompts tailored to these individual subtasks plays a crucial role in guiding the LLM to seamlessly and effectively navigate through the entire pipeline sequence.

In this paper, we introduce the prompt template denoted as $T(\cdot)$, which incorporates the key information of the recommender system. The general prompt is described as $T(\langle user \rangle, \langle item \rangle, \langle task \rangle, \langle context \rangle, \langle style \rangle)$, where the essential components of $T(\cdot)$ are defined as follows:

- $\langle user \rangle$ denotes user information, including user profiles and interaction history.
- $\langle item \rangle$ represents item information, organized into a sentence description based on item metadata.





Fig. 2: The overview of UniLLMRec: Unified LLM-centered end-to-end recommender

- $\langle task \rangle$ describes the recommendation task, involving user profile modeling, ranking, re-ranking tasks, etc. The task formulation is also defined to make sure the LLM can generate results in the desired format.
- $\langle context \rangle$ includes some representative examples specific to task, which can be served as the few-shot demonstrations for LLM in-context learning.
- $\langle style \rangle$ is adapted based on the backbone LLM, as different LLMs necessitate tailored prompts to optimize their capabilities in specific tasks.

In addition to defining the prompt, we categorize it as either ‘hard’ or ‘soft’ based on whether the prompt template is manually crafted or tunable. ‘Soft’ prompts are further divided into discrete prompts and continuous prompts, depending on whether the tunable part involves discrete tokens or continuous token embeddings in the prompt template. In our work, we employ the ‘hard’ prompt approach for crafting our prompt designs.

III. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK


A. Framework Overview

In this section, we elaborate in detail for our proposed unified LLM-centered end-to-end recommendation framework (UniLLMRec) that can conduct all recommendation stages from recall to re-ranking. The overall framework of UniLLMRec is depicted in Figure 2. Firstly, we explain our strategy of constructing item tree in Section III-B and the detailed procedures of constructing the item tree is illustrated in Figure 3. Based on our item tree, UniLLMRec can traverse a large-scale item corpus for fast recall from leaf nodes. Next, we explain our end-to-end architecture of UniLLMRec in Section III-C. We introduce our chain-of-recommendation strategy in Section III-C1. Afterward, we introduce the search strategy of UniLLMRec in Section III-C2. Algorithm 1 elaborate on how UniLLMRec can capture user interest and conduct recommendation stages from recall to re-ranking.



1. All items start from root node



2. Create subnodes based on category



3. Create leaf nodes and add items



4. Add all candidate items on tree and obtain the final item tree




Fig. 3: An example of item tree construction.

B. Item Tree Construction

LLM-based recommender systems face challenges in recalling items from a large-scale item pools, primarily due to three key factors. Firstly, LLMs are limited by their input length, and when dealing with numerous items, the concatenated descriptions often exceed this limit. Secondly, when item descriptions are lengthy, LLMs can easily become confused, resulting in difficulties in extracting important item features. Thirdly, Memory consumption increases as the length of the text grows, bringing about a huge increase in inference costs.

To address these challenges, we propose the use of a hierarchical tree structure to organize items into leaf nodes. This approach facilitates LLMs in efficiently handling the large number of items. Figure 3 illustrates an example of the construction procedure for an item tree.

Before outlining the construction of the item tree, we will introduce the formulated definitions for both the semantic information of an item i and an item tree \mathcal{T} . The semantic information of an **item** i can be represented as $[s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{k_i}]$, where s_1, \dots, s_{k_i} indicate semantic information in various levels (e.g., categories, subcategories, keywords, and other relevant details if needed), with granularity ranging from s_1 to s_{k_i} in a coarse-to-fine manner. Here, k_i represents the total number of semantic components of item i .

The item tree structure \mathcal{T} organizes candidate items while each node in \mathcal{T} corresponds to a subset of the item set. Specifically, the root node $root$ of the tree (depicted in red color) corresponds to a set encompassing all candidate items. Starting from the root node, items are partitioned into different child nodes $node_c$ (depicted in yellow color) based on their hierarchical semantic information. Each node on the tree corresponds to a set containing items with the same semantic prefix $[s_1, \dots, s_j]$ where $j \leq k$. The leaf nodes $node_l$ (depicted in green color) of the tree correspond to the smallest subsets into which each item i can be categorized.

Then, the tree can be constructed by following steps:

- At the beginning, the root node $root$ is constructed to contain all candidate items.
- Then, each item i starts from the root node $root$ and search its child node $node_c$ according to the semantic information. In cases where the child node does not currently exist, it is dynamically generated to ensure the continuation of the downward search.
- For each item i , the search process will persist continuously until the item traverses the hierarchical structure and reaches the specific leaf node corresponding to the last semantic information s_{k_i} .
- All items will be systematically incorporated into the item tree \mathcal{T} until the predefined stopping criteria are met, which are listed as follows: (i) the attributes of the current node are semantically self-contained, (ii) the number of items belonging to the node is reasonable.

C. LLM-Centered End-to-End Recommendation Framework

Existing LLM-based systems [18], [17], [19] mainly focus on the ranking stage in the recommender system, and they rank only a small number of candidate items. In comparison, UniLLMRec is a comprehensive framework that unitizes LLM to integrate multi-stage tasks (e.g., recall, ranking, re-ranking) by chain-of-recommendation, referring to Section III-C1. Moreover, we elaborate on our effective retrieval strategy that enables UniLLMRec to recall related items among large-scale item sets in Section III-C2

1) *Chain-of-Recommendation Strategy*: With the aid of the item tree \mathcal{T} , we design a chain-of-recommendation strategy to seamlessly integrate it with our recommendation process. UniLLMRec provides an effective way for LLM to handle large-scale item sets under zero-shot setting. The recommendation chain in UniLLMRec is executed in a single session, following the steps outlined below:

a) *User Profile Modeling*: Since private user profile information (e.g., age, gender, interests) is absent from the public dataset, we use the user’s interaction history $H = [i_1, \dots, i_{n_u}]$ for each user u as LLM input for user profile modeling. Consequently, the user profile modeling function can be defined as:

$$I = \text{User_Profile_Modeling}(H), \quad (1)$$

where I is the inferred interests. In detail, the prompt template is designed as follows:

User Profile Modeling

Prompt: A user’s click items are: {item list}. Summarize the interested items topic categories, from the most important to the least important.

LLM: {Summarized Topic List}.

User profile modeling and subsequent tasks are completed within the same session. As a result, LLMs are able to capture user preferences by leveraging the context history of user interactions stored in H and the inferred interest I . This enables LLMs to successfully execute subsequent tasks in accordance with the user’s preferences.

b) *Item Tree Search*: UniLLMRec traverses the item tree from the root node to its child nodes. The search stops when the leaf node is reached. In each step, it deduces and ranks the top categories based on user interaction history and interest. More details are discussed in Section III-C2. Formally, the item tree search function can be defined as

$$[node_{c_1}, node_{c_2}, \dots, node_{c_{n_c}}] = \text{Item_Tree_Search}(H, I, node), \quad (2)$$

where $node_{c_j}$ denote the j -th child node which is indexed by semantic information, n_c denotes the retrieval number of child node and $node$ denotes the current node. LLM searches the child node list of $node$, infers based on the semantic information of child nodes, user interaction history H , and interests I to give a ranked list of child nodes. The prompt template is designed as follows:

Item Tree Search

Prompt: Rank the top k subcategories about {Category of the parent node} based on the user’s interest without any explanation. Please do not deviate from the format of subcategory names in the output. The output template is: {Subcategory1, Subcategory2, ...} Here is the provided list: {Subcategory List}.

LLM: {Ranked top n_c subcategory list}.

LLMs iteratively perform item tree searches until reaching leaf nodes $node_l$.

c) *Recall from Leaf Node*: Every leaf node corresponds to a small subset of items that cannot be further divided based on semantic information. Hence, the text describing all items in the subset can be easily fed into UniLLMRec. Then, UniLLMRec will recall top items by considering user interaction history and interest.

Formally the function is defined as

$$items = \text{Recall_From_Leaf_Node}(H, I, subset, k), \quad (3)$$

where $items$ denotes the ranked recall items, item subset $subset$ is obtained from the corresponding leaf node $node_l$, and k denotes the recall number from $subset$. The prompt template shows the detailed design:

Recall From Leaf Node

Prompt: Rank the top k items about {Semantic information of the leaf node} based on the user’s interest without any explanation. Please do not deviate from the format of subcategory names in the output. The output template is: {Item1, Item2, ...} Here is the provided list: {Item list}.

Algorithm 1: UniLLMRec

Input: User-item interaction history H
Output: Recommended item list R
Initialize: $L = \emptyset, S = \text{Stack}()$

- 1 Infer interests: $I = \text{User_Profile_Modeling}(H)$
- 2 $S.\text{push}(\text{root})$
- 3 **while** $|L| < n$ **do**
- 4 $\text{node} = S.\text{top}()$
- 5 $S.\text{pop}()$
- 6 **if** node is leaf node **then**
- 7 Get item subset from node : $\text{items} = \text{Recall_From_Leaf_Node}(H, I, \text{subset}, k)$
- 8 $L.\text{add}(\text{items})$
- 9 **else**
- 10 $\text{childnodes} = \text{Item_Tree_Search}(H, I, \text{node})$
- 11 **for** node in $\text{childnodes.reverse}()$ **do**
- 12 $S.\text{push}(\text{node})$
- 13 **end**
- 14 **end**
- 15 **end**
- 16 $R = \text{Diversity_aware_Re-ranking}(H, I, L)$

LLM: {Ranked top k item list}.

d) Diversity-aware Re-ranking.: After recalling items from various leaf nodes, we aim to enhance the diversity of the recommendation items. Therefore, UniLLMRec will re-rank all the recalled items with our well-curated prompt to ensure diversity. The definition of the re-ranking function is

$$R = \text{Diversity-aware_Re-Ranking}(H, I, L), \quad (4)$$

where R is the diversity-enhanced recommendation list, and L denotes the item list that merges the recall items from various leaf nodes. The detailed design of prompt template is illustrated as

Diversity-aware Re-ranking

Prompt: Rank these pre-selected items based on user interests. Be aware of ranking diversity and do not change the format of the title: {Item list}. **LLM:** {Re-ranked item list}.

2) *Search Strategy*: The purpose of our search strategy is to balance between the diversity and relevance of retrieved items. To achieve fast retrieval to the target leaf node, we apply Depth-first Search (DFS) on our item tree. In particular, throughout each step of the search, only the top-ranked nodes will be selected for further DFS search, allowing UniLLMRec to bypass less relevant nodes. Upon reaching a leaf node, UniLLMRec will recall the top k items from the item subset of this leaf node. The search ends if either (i) all leaf nodes are traversed, or (ii) the desired number of n items has been recalled. The parameter k effectively serves a lever to modulate the diversity of recalled items. Opting for a smaller k increases the recommendation diversity, but at the cost of increased search time. Conversely, a larger k tends to reduce diversity while expediting the search process.

The detailed pipeline of UniLLMRec is demonstrated in Algorithm 1. Specifically, given the user-item interaction history H for a user, the LLM executes the `User_Profile_Modeling` instruction to generate the inferred interest I initially. Simultaneously, we initialize an empty item list L to store the recall items and a stack S to organize the retrieval order of nodes. The root node root is pushed onto the stack S . Then, the LLM iteratively retrieves a node from the top of the stack. If the node belongs to a leaf node node_i , the LLM identifies the subset of items corresponding to the leaf node, calls the `Recall_From_Leaf_Node` function to retrieve the top- k items from subset , and adds these items to L . Otherwise, if the node has child nodes, the LLM executes the item tree search, selecting child nodes from the current node 's corresponding child node list and pushing them onto the stack in ascending order of ranking. This process repeats until the size of L reaches n . Finally, the LLM applies `Diversity-aware_Re-Ranking` to L to obtain the ultimate recommended results R .

TABLE I: The statistic detail of dataset

Dataset	Training set size	Test set size	Candidate items
MIND	51,283	500	1217
Amazon	70,728	500	6176

IV. EXPERIMENT

In this section, extensive experiments are conducted to verify the effectiveness and low resource consumption of the proposed framework UniLLMRec. We will first introduce the experiment setting in Section IV-A. Then, we display the comparison analysis of performance between UniLLMRec and conventional recommender systems in Section IV-B. Next, experimental analysis about hyper-parameter and prompt design is detailed in Section IV-C and Section IV-D respectively. Afterward, Section IV-E and Section IV-F elaborate on the analysis of token requirement and topic distribution. Finally, we summarize our case observation in Section IV-G.

A. Experiment Setting

1) *Datasets*: In the experiments, we utilized two benchmark datasets including the MIND dataset [20] and Amazon Review dataset [21] in the category of Movies and TV. The detail of dataset are as follows:

- **MIND**² is a large-scale dataset designed for research in news recommendation. It is compiled from anonymous behavioral logs on the Microsoft News website. The dataset comprises approximately 160,000 English news articles and 15 million impression logs generated by one million users. Each news article in MIND is enriched with extensive textual content, including titles, summaries, main text, categories, and entity information. Each impression log contains user click events, non-click events, and the user’s historical news click behavior leading up to that impression. In the MIND dataset, each item is characterized by category and subcategory features. As a result, the items can be organized into a two-level item tree, with all items assigned to its corresponding leaf node located at the same level.
- **The Amazon-Review**³ dataset is crawled from Amazon e-commerce platform containing not only the reviews and ratings from users but also the product information like price and category. It provides detailed category information of items in metadata. The metadata information also contains link graphs that illustrate item relationships, including the “also viewed” and “also bought” connections. We use the Movies and TV category within this dataset, which has 8,765,568 reviews and metadata for 203,970 distinct products.

Handling the extensive item subsets from some leaf nodes posed challenges for direct input into the language model using a single prompt template. Consequently, we constrained each subset in leaf node to a maximum of 50 items. Positive items were grouped into their respective subsets, and negative sampling was applied to each leaf node until reaching a size of 50. This process resulted in a candidate set of 1217 items for MIND and 6176 items for Amazon.

To ensure fair comparisons in our experiments, the length of user-item interaction sequences is truncated to 50, and all methods exclusively utilized the item titles as features. For the MIND dataset, 500 test instances are randomly sampled from the small_dev subset, while the small_train subset (51283 samples) served as the training set. For Amazon dataset, we use link information of each item as user-item interaction history. Meanwhile, 500 items were chosen from the metadata dataset for testing, with the remaining 70728 items used for training. We list the statistics of datasets in Table I.

2) *Evaluation Metrics*: We focus on evaluating the performance of the proposed framework and baseline in recall and re-ranking tasks. For each model, we primarily consider its Recall metric and the Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) in the recall task, and Intra-List Average Distance (ILAD) [22] in re-ranking tasks. We evaluate the above metrics in top- k recommendation items. The detailed metrics are listed as follows:

- **Recall@ k** evaluates the effectiveness of model in retrieving items, which can be defined as

$$Recall@k = \frac{|I_u^+ \cap I_k(u)|}{|I_u^+|}, \quad (5)$$

where I_u^+ denote ground truth item set for user u and $I_k(u)$ is the top- k recalled items.

- **NDCG@ k** is a metric that considers both the ranking of items and the relevance between items for a given user. The formulation definition can be denoted as

$$NDCG@k = \frac{DCG_k}{IDCG_k} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{|I|} \frac{(2^{r_n} - 1)}{\log_2(n+1)}}{\sum_{n=1}^{|I|} \frac{(2^{u_n} - 1)}{\log_2(n+1)}}, \quad (6)$$

where I represents the set of recommended items, r_n and u_n denote the relevance of the n -th item in the actual order and the ideal order, respectively.

²<https://msnews.github.io/>

³<https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~jmcauley/datasets.html>

- **ILAD@ k** indicates the diversity of item list, which is defined as

$$ILAD@k = \text{mean}_{u \in U} \text{mean}_{i, j \in R_u, i \neq j} (1 - S_{ij}), \quad (7)$$

where U denotes the set of users, R_u is the index set of items recalled by the model, and S_{ij} is the similarity between the i -th item and the j -th item where we employ the similarity of the item category list.

3) *Baselines*: UniLLMRec is a framework centered on the zero-shot language model, which is compared with rule-based baseline and conventional recommender models.

- **Popularity-based recommendation (Pop)** ranks items based on overall user popularity, recommending frequently chosen items. It is straightforward but lacks personalized suggestions, as it doesn't consider individual preferences. While effective for widely appealing content, it may not cater to users with specific tastes or interests.
- **Factorization Machines (FM)** [23] enhance recommendations by modeling feature interactions. Effective with high-dimensional sparse data, FM excels in capturing complex relationships for accurate user preference predictions.
- **DeepFM** [24] integrates FM (Factorization Machine) and DNN (Deep Neural Network) models, extracting low-order and high-order features for recommendations, making it a prominent recommendation model.
- **NRMS** [25] is a news recommendation model, which leverages multi-head self-attention and additive attention in the news and user encoder. The news encoder utilizes multi-head self-attention to model word interactions in news titles, while the user encoder captures user representations from browsing behavior. Additive attention mechanisms are applied to both encoders for selecting crucial words and news, enhancing the informativeness of representations.
- **SASRec** [5] is a powerful sequential recommendation model with self-attention mechanism. It employs self-attention to dynamically allocate weights to past items at each time step. Its adaptive nature prioritizes long-range dependencies in dense datasets and focuses on recent activities in sparse ones, contributing to its exceptional performance.
- **LLM-Ranker** [17] utilizes a Large Language Model (LLM) to rank a list of items within a candidate set. In experiments, a random sampling approach is employed to generate a prompt capable of accommodating as many items as possible, ensuring it stays within the prompt's constraints.

4) *Implementation Details*: UniLLMRec leverages **gpt-3.5-turbo**⁴ and **gpt-4-1106-preview**⁵ as the backbone LLM. Due to budget constraints, experiments on the UniLLMRec method with GPT-4 as the backbone were limited to the comparison of recall and NDCG metrics, which is elaborated in Section IV-B.

The constructed item tree structure shows difference in MIND and Amazon. The item tree depth in MIND dataset is 2, with all leaf nodes merely located in the second layer. There are 17 and 276 nodes in the first and second layers respectively. Consequently, the item tree search stage in MIND is simplified as a two-step ranking task. Specifically, LLM ranks the categories in the first step, followed by LLM extracting the subcategory list corresponding to the ranked top categories and selecting the leaf nodes based on the subcategories ranking. As for the Amazon dataset, items without titles or semantic information are discarded during item tree construction. Subsequently, the constructed tree has a depth of 4, and the leaf nodes may be located in all layers. The node numbers from the first layer to the fourth layer are 78, 298, 126, and 19, respectively. In the item tree search stage, we set the recall subnode number as 10. Meanwhile, in the experiments, the parameter k in the recall stage serves to limit the number of selected leaf nodes and is set to 5. In addition, the maximum number of recalled items is set at 20.

For popularity-based models, we recall the top 20 items with the highest historical click-through rates based on user click history. Unfortunately, none of these 20 items were successfully recalled within the 500 samples selected for evaluation. Therefore, we conducted experiments on the entire test set, and the results are reported in Figure 4. For LLM-Ranker, gpt-3.5-turbo is used as the backbone model. LLM-Ranker randomly samples 100 items as the candidate item set and directly generates ranking results.

For conventional models, the FM, DeepFM, NRMS, and SASRec models all adopt a two-tower structure, utilizing the Adam optimizer with learning rate of 0.001. FM uses TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) [26] of item titles as features, while in DeepFM, NRMS, and SASRec, item word embeddings are employed as features. Cross entropy is employed as the loss function, with a negative sampling ratio of 1 across all models. In the MIND dataset, all models use the item title as the input feature. However, in the Amazon dataset, using only the title feature leads to suboptimal performance for FM, DeepFM, NRMS, and SASRec. Consequently, on the Amazon dataset, we substitute the item description feature for the title as the input. For the DeepFM model, we set the embedding dimension to 300 and utilize a three-layer feedforward neural network (hidden neural numbers {256, 128, 64}) to achieve high-order feature interaction. In NRMS and SASRec, the embedding dimension is set to 300. There is one head in self-attention module and only one attention block is used. The dimension of attention query vector is set as 20. There dropout ratio of neural networks is set as 0.2. Finally, we increase the 10% training set size for each model until the model performance is equivalent to UniLLMRec. Thus, we can evaluate the performance between the capabilities of zero-shot end-to-end methods and supervised conventional recommendation models.

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5>

⁵<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-1106-preview>




Fig. 4: Performance Comparison of Recall and NDCG value on MIND and Amazon datasets.

B. Performance Comparison

The overall performance of UniLLMRec and baselines are shown in Figure 4. To be specific, the proposed end-to-end LLMRec framework is compared with the methods in two categories.

The first is the method implemented without training. The popularity-based method, hampered by the absence of user-specific information, demonstrated an exceedingly low recall of items. LLM-Ranker outperforms popularity-based methods in both Recall and NDCG metrics, yet it lags behind UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) and UniLLMRec (GPT-4). UniLLMRec is capable of refining the candidate set based on user interests and item trees, resulting in a smaller candidate set compared to LLM-Ranker, thereby leading to improved performance.

The other is the conventional recommendation model. Our main focus lies in evaluating how the performance of UniLLMRec is competitive with conventional recommendation models with varying amounts of training data. The performance comparison is shown in Figure 4 where x axis denotes the training dataset ratio and y axis denotes the $Recall@20$ and $NDCG@20$. The comparative analysis of results between UniLLMRec using GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 as the backbone proceeds as follows:

- **UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5):** While the training dataset ratio increases, FM excels UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) when r reaches 0.3 in $Recall@20$ on MIND but fails to outperform UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) on Amazon. DeepFM, NRMS, and SASRec outperform UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) in $Recall@20$ on both MIND and Amazon under a small ratio of training datasets. UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) outperforms baselines in $NDCG@20$ on MIND, which means it can recall the most relevant items in higher rank.
- **UniLLMRec (GPT-4):** Centered with GPT-4, Both $Recall@20$ and $NDCG@20$ exhibit significant improvements compared to UniLLMRec with GPT-3.5. On the MIND dataset, GPT-4 relative to GPT-3.5 brings about almost a doubling of performance to UniLLMRec for both metrics. When compared to conventional recommendation models, UniLLMRec demonstrates competitive capabilities against smaller-scale NRMS models. Regarding $Recall@20$, UniLLMRec (GPT-4) is competitive with NRMS under the setting of $r = 0.2$ on MIND and $r = 0.3$ on Amazon. For the $NDCG@20$ metric, UniLLMRec (GPT-4) achieves nearly optimal performance across settings where $r \leq 0.5$.

After completing the recall task, UniLLMRec performs diversity-aware re-ranking. We evaluate the effect of re-ranking on the diversity of items and record the $ILAD@5$ and $ILAD@10$ based on item category in Figure 5. The figure shows that (1) Both UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) and UniLLMRec (GPT-4) have effectively improved diversity through re-ranking. (2) UniLLMRec (GPT-4) achieves high diversity in both datasets, while UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) demonstrates higher diversity in the Amazon dataset and a tendency to recommend more homogeneous items in the MIND dataset.




Fig. 5: The impact of the re-rank stage on the recommendation diversity.

In summary, the observation of UniLLMRec can be concluded as:

- Both UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) and UniLLMRec (GPT-4), which do not require training, achieve competitive performance compared with conventional recommendation models that require training.
- UniLLMRec (GPT-4) significantly outperforms UniLLMRec (GPT3.5). The enhanced semantic understanding and language processing capabilities of UniLLMRec (GPT-4) make it proficient in utilizing project trees to complete the entire recommendation process.
- UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) exhibits a performance decrease in the Amazon dataset due to the challenge of addressing the imbalance in the item tree and the limited information available in the item title index. However UniLLMRec (GPT-4) continues to have superior performance on Amazon.
- UniLLMRec with both backbones can effectively enhance the recommendation diversity. UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) tends to provide more homogeneous items than UniLLMRec (GPT-4).

C. Hyper-parameter Analysis

The recall number k in leaf nodes is the only hyper-parameter in UniLLMRec. We conducted a study on the impact of k on the recall task, and illustrate the results in Figure 6. As the value of k increases, the number of items recalled by our model from different leaf nodes steadily rises. We observe a phenomenon where both recall rate and NDCG initially rise and then decline with the increasing k . Clearly, with the continuous increment of k , the number of items recalled from each node also increases, indicating that the model tends to recommend items from subsets that are of higher interest to the user. When k decreases, the model recalls items from more leaf nodes, resulting in higher diversity in the retrieved results. In summary, the parameter k plays a crucial role in the model by influencing the trade-off between diversity and the quantity of recalled items under different categories.

D. Prompt Study

UniLLMRec utilizes prompts to adapt the LLM to recommendation tasks, where the design of prompt templates plays a crucial role in fully leveraging the capabilities of LLM in recommendation tasks. Therefore, we craft prompt templates from four different perspectives including interest, relevance, action, and recommendation tailored to the news recommendation as in Prompt4NR [27]. The prompts designed from various perspectives are detailed in Table II where the blue variant prompts are changed based on perspective. The performance of models under these four types of prompt settings is shown in Figure 7 from which we can see that prompt design significantly impacts the model performance. Using a relevance-based prompt yielded a recall rate of only 1.24% and an NDCG of 0.0183. By contrast, models using prompts of action and recommendation achieve approximately 2% recall rate. Besides, the best performance is observed under the interest-based prompt design, where the recall rate and NDCG were twice that of the relevance prompt model.




Fig. 6: The impact of k on recall performance.




Fig. 7: The impact of various perspective prompt design on recall performance.

These results underscore the significance of prompt design on non-fine-tuned LLMs in recommendation tasks. The interest-based prompt design can effectively leverage the LLM’s ability to uncover user interests, thereby enhancing the personalization and precision of recommendations.

E. Token Requirement Analysis

UniLLMRec recalls items from subsets based on the item tree, which effectively reduces the model’s token requirement in the recall stage. We conduct a statistical analysis on the size of the candidate item set and the average token length for each item. After sampling, the MIND dataset comprises 1,217 items, while the Amazon dataset has 6,167 items, with an average token length of 14 and 10, respectively. The total tokens needed to input all items into the LLM exceed ten thousand. Consequently, an LLM recalling items from candidate sets faces inherent challenges in handling such large-scale item datasets.

However, by employing the UniLLMRec with item tree-based search, the token requirement can be effectively reduced. Figure 8 illustrates average token consumption in each framework stage. Regarding input consumption, Stage 3 (*Recall From Leaf Node*) of UniLLMRec inputs the item IDs of all the retrieved leaf nodes into the LLM, resulting in high token consumption, accounting for over 50% of the total. As for output consumption, Stage 3 only recalls a limited number of items, so all four stages have only a small token consumption. Based on the comparative statistics, the item tree-based search consumes minimal tokens, making UniLLMRec a cost-efficient retrieval method. The token consumption of the entire process still remains concentrated in the *Recall From Leaf Node* stage.

In conclusion, Figure 8 illustrates that UniLLMRec effectively minimizes the token consumption across all four stages. For a set of items with a size of n , our model reduces the token requirement from $O(n)$ to $O(\log(n))$, enabling LLM to process large-scale item sets.

F. Topic Analysis

We conduct a statistical analysis on the distribution of topics from UniLLMRec, user interaction history, and ground truth. Next, we reformulate the topic distribution into vectors, and then calculate the similarity in topic distribution between ground truth and user-item interaction history, as well as ground truth and UniLLMRec. These values are 0.8091 and 0.6239,

TABLE II: Prompt design from 4 perspectives.

Perspective	User Profile Modeling	Item Tree Search	Recall from Leaf Node	Diversity-aware Re-rank
Prompt template	A user’s click items are: <Item List>. <Perspective-Variable Prompt>, from the most important to the least important.	Rank the top <k>subcategories about <Category Name>based on <Perspective-Variable Prompt> from the following candidates without any explanation. The output template is: {1. Subcategory1, 2. Subcategory2, ...} Here is the provided list: <Subcategory List>.	Rank the top <k>items about <Semantic Information>based on <Perspective-Variable Prompt> from the candidates about <Topic>without any explanation. The output template is: {1. Item1, 2. Item2, ...} Here is the provided list: <Item list>.	Rank these pre-selected items based on <Perspective-Variable Prompt>. Be aware of ranking diversity and do not change the format of the title: <Item list>.
interest	Summarize the interested items topic categories	the user’s interest	the user’s interest	the user’s interest
relevance	Summarize the news topic categories related to users	the relevance related to the user	the relevance related to the user	the relevance related to the user
action	Summarize the news topic that the user are likely to click on	the probability that the user is likely to click	the probability that the user is likely to click	the probability that the user is likely to click
recommendation	Summarize the news topic worth recommending to the user	the degree of recommendation to the user	the degree of recommendation to the user	the degree of recommendation to the user

respectively, in the MIND dataset, and 0.8524 and 0.6157 on Amazon. UniLLMRec can summarize user interest from user history to understand user preference. The topics generated by UniLLMRec demonstrate a high degree of relevance with the ground truth. Figure 9 illustrates the top 10 most frequently occurring topics in the ground truth. For the top 5 most frequent topics in the ground truth, UniLLMRec also demonstrates a high frequency in generating these topics. Meanwhile, UniLLMRec generates content from a broader range of topics, thereby enhancing the diversity of results. In summary, UniLLMRec can generate topics aligned with the ground truth, while simultaneously improving the diversity of the recommendation results.

G. Case Study

UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) or UniLLMRec (GPT-4) can smoothly complete the entire pipeline procedure in most cases. However, both have a few bad cases in the experiment: (1) Even if the output format is clarified in the prompt template, but LLM does not strictly follow the instructions to output the item, resulting in the item not being indexed correctly. (2) The challenge of hallucinations. In the user profile modeling stage, LLM captures and summarizes user interests, providing representative examples of interest-related items. However, there is a risk of hallucinations, where these examples might be erroneously included during the recall from leaf node and diversity-aware re-rank stages.

In addition to bad cases, we also found an interesting phenomenon when comparing the cases of GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 on the Amazon data set. There are problems in the Amazon data set such as the imbalance of the item tree structure and the limited semantic information contained in the item title, which brings challenges to the search of UniLLMRec in the tree. This phenomenon results in both GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 having a higher probability of heading to the wrong child node during the tree search process. An interesting phenomenon is: that when GPT-3.5 reaches the wrong node, it always continues to complete the subsequent process; and when GPT-4 reaches the wrong node, GPT-4 may proactively give out that all candidate answers do not meet the requirements (e.g., "Based on the user’s interest in UFC and combat sports, none of the provided subcategories about Character & Series are relevant"). This phenomenon shows that GPT-4 captures more accurate user preferences than GPT-3.5.

H. Online Performance

We compare UniLLMRec with baseline model in online Huawei recommender systems to perform seven days A/B test. This scenario belongs to infomercial recommendations, where thousands of items are recalled from the library and eventually displayed in the user’s terminal. The compared results are reported in Table III. UniLLMRec (backbone Huawei LLM) has




Fig. 8: Consumption of tokens for each stage.




Fig. 9: Illustration on the topic distribution.

achieved a substantial improvement in $NDCG@10$, reaching 0.725 compared to the baseline’s 0.577, resulting in a significant gain of 25.64%. The online A/B test results have validated the superior performance of UniLLMRec. It provides an efficient solution for handling large-scale items in LLM without the need for fine-tuning the model.

V. RELATED WORK

In this section, we provide an overview of the related research and advancements in conventional recommendation models and large language model for recommendation.

A. Conventional Recommendation Models

Conventional recommendation model (CRM) [28] usually consists of the following procedures. It takes historical user behaviors, user profile features, and item features as input. Then, the embedding layer maps the sparse feature into dense vectors. Next, the feature interaction component is explicitly designed. Finally, after the feature interaction, the output layer

TABLE III: Performance comparison in Huawei recommender system

Baseline	UniLLMRec	Improvement
0.577	0.725	25.64%

generates the prediction result of the recommendation task. Due to the computational cost and time latency constraint, the complex model with higher recommendation accuracy is not able to process the large-scale items. To tackle this challenge, the recommendation procedure is divided into three stages including *Recall*, *Ranking*, and *Re-ranking*. *Recall* focus on retrieving candidate items from large-scale items with high efficiency. In general, the separate towers are designed for user embedding and item embedding in the model so that the inference stage can be finished efficiently by processing the user and item independently. For example, DSSM [29] encodes the user and item into semantic space separately and calculates their similarity by cosine similarity. To enhance the embedding quality, Item2Vec [30] and EGES [31] construct an item graph based on the user-item interaction sequences and encode items via graph embedding. *Ranking* aims to give the most accurate prediction results. Learning feature interaction is a fundamental problem in the recommendation model. For example, DeepFM [24] adopts the linear model, factorization machine, and fully connected network to capture the low and high-order interactions among different feature fields. Additionally, PNN [32], IntTower [33], DeepCrossing [34], and Wide&Deep [35] similarly utilize fully connected networks to model the feature interactions, leading to limited capability of feature interaction. Consequently, AutoInt [7] adopts a self-attention network to implement the high-order feature interactions and demonstrate superior performance and good model explainability. *Re-ranking* concentrates on optimizing the user experience and promoting recommendation diversity and fairness [36].

However, these methods are explicitly proposed for one specific stage of recommendation, and thus can not be simultaneously deployed in different stages (from recall to re-ranking) in an end-to-end manner. By contrast, in this paper, we are the first to propose an LLM-centered end-to-end framework that leads to easy deployability with high efficiency.

B. Large Language Model for Recommendation

In recent years, large language models (LLMs) have shown their great potential and strong capability in handling different tasks like computer vision [37]. In the recommendation community, existing methods [38] incorporating LLMs can be categorized into two groups. On the one hand, some works directly generate the recommendation result of item ID [39], [40], [41]. For example, P5 [39] reformulates recommendation tasks to natural language processing tasks utilizing personalized prompts and conducts conditional text generation. Hua *et al.* examine various item IDs based on P5 [41]. Although the strong language understanding ability of LLMs can promote the exploitation of text features in recommendation, LLMs that merely utilize the item embedding underexploit the collaborative information. Item ID alignment with conventional recommender systems has received widespread attention recently. For example, CTRL and FLIP [42], [43] encode the information of user-item pair by two embedding towers including a semantical model that encodes the textual feature and a collaborative model that processes the same sample in tabular form. Subsequently, the embeddings from two embedding towers are aligned via contrastive learning.

Nonetheless, they require fine-tuning the LLMs which results in high computation costs even if some parameter-efficient fine-tuning techniques are adopted [15], [16], [44]. On the other hand, some approaches [18], [45], [17] adopt a straightforward strategy of inputting the candidate set directly into the LLM to generate the recommended item list using hard prompts, without fine-tuning the LLM. Since LLMs inherently lack the specific knowledge required for recommendation tasks, they often yield inferior performance in zero-shot settings. In-context learning can provide several samples as the recommendation knowledge reference [45].

However, all the existing methods primarily focused on one specific recommendation stage, and they also face challenges related to input token limitations and susceptibility to noise information. By contrast, by introducing the item tree structure and search strategy, our proposed framework can tackle these problems and it also supports large-scale dynamically updated item corpus free from fine-tuning the LLM.

VI. LIMITATIONS

Our proposed UniLLMRec can effectively work on large-scale item corpus in a zero-shot manner. It mainly leverages the semantic item tree, by dynamically updating its structure in real-time. Therefore, there is no need for LLM fine-tuning to cater dynamic item updates. Nevertheless, the tree is manually constructed based on item semantic information, similar items with subtle semantic differences can be assigned to different subcategories, thus introducing noises to our model. Additionally, issues such as structural imbalance and uneven item set sizes in leaf nodes exist in the constructed item tree. For instance, in the MIND dataset, a majority of news concentrates on a few subcategories. Similar issues arise in the Amazon dataset, exhibiting the imbalanced distribution of the constructed tree. We leave it for future work to construct a balanced item tree with accurate semantic information.

VII. CONCLUSION

We propose UniLLMRec, the first end-to-end LLM-centered recommendation framework to execute multi-stage recommendation tasks (*e.g.*, recall, ranking, re-ranking) through chain-of-recommendations. To deal with large-scale item sets, we design a novel strategy to structure all items into a hierarchical tree structure, *i.e.*, *item tree*. The item tree can be dynamically updated to incorporate new items and effectively retrieved according to user interests. Based on the item tree, LLM effectively reduces the candidate item set by utilizing this hierarchical structure for search. UniLLMRec achieves end-to-end recommendation from recall to re-rank. It serves as an efficient solution for handling large-scale items while ensuring recommendation diversity. Extensive experiments on MIND and Amazon datasets indicate that even under the zero-shot setting, UniLLMRec achieves competitive performance compared to conventional recommendation models. Hence, UniLLMRec not only simplifies the recommendation process but reduces the reliance on large-scale training datasets as well. This enables more efficient and scalable deployment in various recommendation scenarios.

VIII. FUTURE WORK

UniLLMRec effectively achieves end-to-end recommendation based on the item tree in zero-shot setting. In this paper, we constructed an item tree based on manually labeled category information. To extend UniLLMRec to a broader range of recommendation tasks, we plan to investigate how to leverage LLM to optimize the semantic information of items. This will enable LLM to analyze and construct item trees based on item metadata, even when explicit category information is lacking. By incorporating item metadata analysis into the framework, we aim to enhance the versatility and effectiveness of UniLLMRec in various recommendation scenarios. During the construction process of the item tree, we will explore approaches to ensure that the item tree has a reasonable depth and a balanced structure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is partially supported by Huawei (Huawei Innovation Research Program), Research Impact Fund (No.R1015-23), APRC - CityU New Research Initiatives (No.9610565, Start-up Grant for New Faculty of City University of Hong Kong), CityU - HKIDS Early Career Research Grant (No.9360163), Hong Kong ITC Innovation and Technology Fund Midstream Research Programme for Universities Project (No.ITS/034/22MS), Hong Kong Environmental and Conservation Fund (No. 88/2022), and SIRG - CityU Strategic Interdisciplinary Research Grant (No.7020046, No.7020074).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bobadilla, F. Ortega, A. Hernando, and A. Gutiérrez, “Recommender systems survey,” *Knowledge-based systems*, vol. 46, pp. 109–132, 2013.
- [2] H. Wang, F. Wu, Z. Liu, and X. Xie, “Fine-grained interest matching for neural news recommendation,” in *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, 2020, pp. 836–845.
- [3] T. Qi, F. Wu, C. Wu, and Y. Huang, “Personalized news recommendation with knowledge-aware interactive matching,” in *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2021, pp. 61–70.
- [4] C. Pei, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, F. Sun, X. Lin, H. Sun, J. Wu, P. Jiang, J. Ge, W. Ou *et al.*, “Personalized re-ranking for recommendation,” in *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on recommender systems*, 2019, pp. 3–11.
- [5] W.-C. Kang and J. McAuley, “Self-attentive sequential recommendation,” in *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 197–206.
- [6] F. Sun, J. Liu, J. Wu, C. Pei, X. Lin, W. Ou, and P. Jiang, “Bert4rec: Sequential recommendation with bidirectional encoder representations from transformer,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, 2019, pp. 1441–1450.
- [7] W. Song, C. Shi, Z. Xiao, Z. Duan, Y. Xu, M. Zhang, and J. Tang, “Autoint: Automatic feature interaction learning via self-attentive neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, 2019, pp. 1161–1170.
- [8] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei, “Language models are few-shot learners,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 1877–1901. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf
- [9] Y. Bai, S. Kadavath, S. Kundu, A. Askell, J. Kernion, A. Jones, A. Chen, A. Goldie, A. Mirhoseini, C. McKinnon *et al.*, “Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [10] V. Sanh, A. Webson, C. Raffel, S. H. Bach, L. Sutawika, Z. Alyafeai, A. Chaffin, A. Stiegler, T. L. Scao, A. Raja *et al.*, “Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*, 2021.
- [11] J. Wei, M. Bosma, V. Y. Zhao, K. Guu, A. W. Yu, B. Lester, N. Du, A. M. Dai, and Q. V. Le, “Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [12] Y. Wang, S. Mishra, P. Alipoormolabashi, Y. Kordi, A. Mirzaei, A. Arunkumar, A. Ashok, A. S. Dhanasekaran, A. Naik, D. Stap *et al.*, “Supernaturalinstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07705*, 2022.
- [13] S. Dai, N. Shao, H. Zhao, W. Yu, Z. Si, C. Xu, Z. Sun, X. Zhang, and J. Xu, “Uncovering chatgpt’s capabilities in recommender systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02182*, 2023.
- [14] A. V. Petrov and C. Macdonald, “Generative sequential recommendation with gptrec,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11114*, 2023.
- [15] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, “Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [16] X. Liu, K. Ji, Y. Fu, W. L. Tam, Z. Du, Z. Yang, and J. Tang, “P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602*, 2021.
- [17] Y. Hou, J. Zhang, Z. Lin, H. Lu, R. Xie, J. McAuley, and W. X. Zhao, “Large language models are zero-shot rankers for recommender systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08845*, 2023.
- [18] Y. Gao, T. Sheng, Y. Xiang, Y. Xiong, H. Wang, and J. Zhang, “Chat-rec: Towards interactive and explainable llms-augmented recommender system,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14524*, 2023.

- [19] L. Wang and E.-P. Lim, “Zero-shot next-item recommendation using large pretrained language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03153*, 2023.
- [20] F. Wu, Y. Qiao, J.-H. Chen, C. Wu, T. Qi, J. Lian, D. Liu, X. Xie, J. Gao, W. Wu *et al.*, “Mind: A large-scale dataset for news recommendation,” in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020, pp. 3597–3606.
- [21] R. He and J. McAuley, “Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering,” in *proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*, 2016, pp. 507–517.
- [22] M. Zhang and N. Hurley, “Avoiding monotony: improving the diversity of recommendation lists,” in *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, 2008, pp. 123–130.
- [23] S. Rendle, “Factorization machines,” in *2010 IEEE International conference on data mining*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 995–1000.
- [24] H. Guo, R. Tang, Y. Ye, Z. Li, and X. He, “Deepfm: a factorization-machine based neural network for ctr prediction,” in *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017, pp. 1725–1731.
- [25] C. Wu, F. Wu, S. Ge, T. Qi, Y. Huang, and X. Xie, “Neural news recommendation with multi-head self-attention,” 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)*, 2019, pp. 6389–6394.
- [26] G. Salton and C. Buckley, “Term-weighting approaches in automatic text retrieval,” *Information processing & management*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 513–523, 1988.
- [27] Z. Zhang and B. Wang, “Prompt learning for news recommendation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05263*, 2023.
- [28] J. Lin, X. Dai, Y. Xi, W. Liu, B. Chen, X. Li, C. Zhu, H. Guo, Y. Yu, R. Tang *et al.*, “How can recommender systems benefit from large language models: A survey,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05817*, 2023.
- [29] P.-S. Huang, X. He, J. Gao, L. Deng, A. Acero, and L. Heck, “Learning deep structured semantic models for web search using clickthrough data,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 2013, pp. 2333–2338.
- [30] O. Barkan and N. Koenigstein, “Item2vec: neural item embedding for collaborative filtering,” in *2016 IEEE 26th International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [31] J. Wang, P. Huang, H. Zhao, Z. Zhang, B. Zhao, and D. L. Lee, “Billion-scale commodity embedding for e-commerce recommendation in alibaba,” in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, 2018, pp. 839–848.
- [32] Y. Qu, H. Cai, K. Ren, W. Zhang, Y. Yu, Y. Wen, and J. Wang, “Product-based neural networks for user response prediction,” in *2016 IEEE 16th international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1149–1154.
- [33] X. Li, B. Chen, H. Guo, J. Li, C. Zhu, X. Long, S. Li, Y. Wang, W. Guo, L. Mao, J. Liu, Z. Dong, and R. Tang, “Inttower: the next generation of two-tower model for pre-ranking system,” 2022.
- [34] Y. Shan, T. R. Hoens, J. Jiao, H. Wang, D. Yu, and J. Mao, “Deep crossing: Web-scale modeling without manually crafted combinatorial features,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2016, pp. 255–262.
- [35] H.-T. Cheng, L. Koc, J. Harmsen, T. Shaked, T. Chandra, H. Aradhye, G. Anderson, G. Corrado, W. Chai, M. Ispir *et al.*, “Wide & deep learning for recommender systems,” in *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on deep learning for recommender systems*, 2016, pp. 7–10.
- [36] W. Liu, Y. Xi, J. Qin, F. Sun, B. Chen, W. Zhang, R. Zhang, and R. Tang, “Neural re-ranking in multi-stage recommender systems: A review,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06602*, 2022.
- [37] Z. Yang, L. Li, K. Lin, J. Wang, C.-C. Lin, Z. Liu, and L. Wang, “The dawn of Imms: Preliminary explorations with gpt-4v (ision),” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17421*, 2023.
- [38] J. Lin, X. Dai, Y. Xi, W. Liu, B. Chen, H. Zhang, Y. Liu, C. Wu, X. Li, C. Zhu, H. Guo, Y. Yu, R. Tang, and W. Zhang, “How can recommender systems benefit from large language models: A survey,” 2024.
- [39] S. Geng, S. Liu, Z. Fu, Y. Ge, and Y. Zhang, “Recommendation as language processing (rlp): A unified pretrain, personalized prompt & predict paradigm (p5),” in *RecSys*, 2022, pp. 299–315.
- [40] Z. Cui, J. Ma, C. Zhou, J. Zhou, and H. Yang, “M6-rec: Generative pretrained language models are open-ended recommender systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.08084*, 2022.
- [41] W. Hua, S. Xu, Y. Ge, and Y. Zhang, “How to index item ids for recommendation foundation models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06569*, 2023.
- [42] X. Li, B. Chen, L. Hou, and R. Tang, “Ctrl: Connect tabular and language model for ctr prediction,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02841*, 2023.
- [43] H. Wang, J. Lin, X. Li, B. Chen, C. Zhu, R. Tang, W. Zhang, and Y. Yu, “Flip: Towards fine-grained alignment between id-based models and pretrained language models for ctr prediction,” 2023.
- [44] K. Bao, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, W. Wang, F. Feng, and X. He, “Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00447*, 2023.
- [45] J. Liu, C. Liu, R. Lv, K. Zhou, and Y. Zhang, “Is chatgpt a good recommender? a preliminary study,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10149*, 2023.

APPENDIX

A case of UniLLMRec (GPT-3.5) is shown here. The ground truth of this case is

- Some believe Mason Rudolph, hit in head with his own helmet, isn’t getting enough blame
- Opinion: NFL should suspend Browns’ Myles Garrett for rest of season at minimum for helmet swing
- This was uglier than a brawl. And Myles Garrett deserves suspension for rest of year after helmet attack.

The ground truth item is colored in red and the detailed case log is shown as follows:

User Profile Modeling

Input: A user’s click news are:

Patrick Day in coma after suffering brutal knockout
 Cincinnati Bengals claim offensive lineman Fred Johnson
 High school soccer: Chloe DeLyser sets record for most goals scored
 Contractor claims video shows structural flaws prior to Hard Rock
 Hotel collapse
 Bengals release RB Samaje Perine, per report
 Winless Bengals bench Andy Dalton for rookie QB
 ‘When I smelled that smoke ... here we go again’: Weary Californians
 seek shelter amid latest wildfire outbreak

Obama calls out call-out culture: "That's not activism"

The world's largest nuclear power producer is melting down

Former NBA first-round pick Jim Farmer arrested in sex sting operation Bengals News (10/31): Rough deadline drama

Joe Flacco to miss four to six weeks with neck injury

DOJ sues Walmart for allegedly discriminating against a Navy reserve officer

Cleveland Casino, Thistledown Sold: This Week's Must Read Stories Best Ski Resorts in the US

Cause determined in Jessi Combs' fatal speed record crash

New Mexico game vs. Air Force rescheduled after lineman Nahje

Flowers' death

How the Panthers will approach their breakup with Cam Newton before 2020 season

Summarize the interested news topic categories, from the most important to the least important.

LLM: Based on the provided news articles, the interested news topic categories can be summarized as follows, from the most important to the least important:

1. Sports: This category includes news about various sports events, such as boxing (Patrick Day's coma), football (Cincinnati Bengals signings and releases, Joe Flacco's injury), high school soccer records, and NBA player arrests.
2. Natural Disasters: This category includes news about wildfires in California and the collapse of the Hard Rock Hotel due to structural flaws.
3. Social Issues: This category includes news about former President Obama's criticism of call-out culture and the Department of Justice suing Walmart for alleged discrimination.
4. Nuclear Power: This category includes news about the world's largest nuclear power producer facing a meltdown.
5. Miscellaneous: This category includes news about the sale of a casino, the rescheduling of a football game after a player's death, and the breakup between the Carolina Panthers and Cam Newton.
6. Travel and Leisure: This category includes news about the best ski resorts in the US.

It's important to note that the importance of news topics can vary depending on individual interests and perspectives.

Item Tree Search

Input: Rank some topic categories from the following candidates to recommend to the user based on interests, from the most important to the least important without explanation: video, movies, food and drink, tv, finance, autos, entertainment, lifestyle, sports, weather, music, health, news, travel.

LLM: Based on the limited information provided, the recommended topic categories for the user, from the most important to the least important, are as follows:

1. Sports
2. Entertainment
3. News
4. Travel
5. Music
6. Movies
7. Food and Drink
8. TV
9. Autos
10. Finance
11. Lifestyle
12. Health
13. Weather
14. Video

Please note that these recommendations are based solely on the given list of topic categories and may not reflect the user's specific interests.

Input: Provide a ranked list of top 10 subcategories based on the user's interest, without offering any explanations. Format your answer as follows: {1. First Subcategory, 2. Second Subcategory, 3. Third Subcategory, ...}. Here is the category and subcategory list: football_ncaa, tennis, baseball_mlb_videos, soccer, basketball_nba, outdoors, football_nfl, football_nfl_videos, icehockey_nhl, more_sports, baseball_mlb, golf, soccer_epl, basketball_ncaavideo, entertainment-celebrity, humor, entertainment-books, gaming, news, celebritynewsworld, yearinoffbeatgoodnews, newstechnology, newspolitics, newsopinion, newsphotos, newsscienceandtechnology, newsgoodnews, newsus, causes-disaster-relief, newsoffbeat, newsfactcheck, newsscience, newscrime, factcheck, elections-2020-usvideo, traveltrivia, traveltripideas, voices, internationaltravel, travelnews, ustravel, travelarticle, traveltipsmusic-celebrity, music-gallery, musicnews, cma-

awards, musicvideos, ads-latingrammys

- LLM:** 1. football_ncaa
 2. tennis
 3. baseball_mlb_videos
 4. soccer
 5. basketball_nba
 6. outdoors
 7. football_nfl
 8. football_nfl_videos
 9. icehockey_nhl
 10. more_sports

Recall From Leaf Node

Input: Rank top 5 news from the following candidate news about football_ncaa to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

College football Week 12 primer: Heisman Watch, upset picks, predictions and more

Marshall marks 49th anniversary of tragic football team plane crash

Saban suspended unnamed player for Miss. St. game for not going to class

2-game suspensions for La. Tech's starting QB, star WR

No. 2 Ohio State heads to Rutgers as 51-point favorite

Opinion: Baylor football back on top four years after sexual assault scandal rocked campus

Five games in Week 12 that will impact the College Football Playoff race

Here's how Michigan State football can beat Michigan on Saturday

LSU's Ed Orgeron Is College Football's Best Head Coach Right Now — McMurphy's Law

5 young players who could lead Huskies down season's final stretch

High school football: Can Clover football continue its special run against Mauldin?

H.S. PLAYOFFS: Clemens offense in good hands with DiDomenico at the controls

Top 10 storylines for college football Week 12

SC president: Muschamp 'will be my coach through end of season'

LSU's Mighty Joe Brady is making Mickey Mouse money in the college football world

The Best Photos of College Football

Kentucky's Bowden gets Wildcats fans intrigued with tweet at Calipari

From Temple to Baylor, Matt Rhule wins in hopeless places. His secret? People skills.

A surprising 9-0, Baylor's rise to a showdown with Oklahoma was three years in the making

Bold predictions for Week 12 in college football

Archrivals Furman, Wofford meet Saturday with SoCon title hopes on the line

Notre Dame sellout streak of 273 games dating to 1973 likely to end this week against Navy

Report: Butch Jones being considered for Arkansas job

McMurphy's musings and college football picks for Week 12

LLM: 1. College football Week 12 primer: Heisman Watch, upset picks, predictions and more

2. Marshall marks 49th anniversary of tragic football team plane crash

3. Saban suspended unnamed player for Miss. St. game for not going to class

4. 2-game suspensions for La. Tech's starting QB, star WR

5. No. 2 Ohio State heads to Rutgers as 51-point favorite

Input: Rank top 3 news from the following candidate news about tennis to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

ATP Cup will be a 'great start' to year, says Becker

Zverev denies illegal phone use at ATP Finals

Andy Murray targets Australian Open after bouncing back from 'rough year'

LLM: 1. Andy Murray targets Australian Open after bouncing back from 'rough year'

2. ATP Cup will be a 'great start' to year, says Becker

3. Zverev denies illegal phone use at ATP Finals

Input: Rank top 2 news from the following candidate news about baseball_mlb_videos to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

Cody Bellinger earns NL MVP after leading LAD to 106 wins

Bud Light Ads Honor Nats Fan

LLM: 1. Cody Bellinger earns NL MVP after leading LAD to 106 wins

2. Bud Light Ads Honor Nats Fan

Input: Rank top 3 news from the following candidate news about soccer to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

Dest makes quick impact as US rebounds to beat Canada 4-1

Jorge Vergara, former owner of Chivas USA, dies at 64

Realio's Ratings: Seattle wins their second, this time at home

LLM: 1. Jorge Vergara, former owner of Chivas USA, dies at 64

2. Dest makes quick impact as US rebounds to beat Canada 4-1

3. Realio's Ratings: Seattle wins their second, this time at home **Input:** Rank top 5 news from the following candidate news about basketball_nba to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

Charania: Aron Baynes positioning himself for well over \$10 million per year in free agency

Lakers' Avery Bradley sidelined by hairline fracture in right leg; Davis expected to return

Knicks fans welcome Porzingis back with hearty round of boos

LeBron James on he and Tom Brady: 'We're gonna play until we can't walk'

Warriors on pace for worst drop in winning percentage in NBA history

Bronny James Jr. and Sierra Canyon to have 15 games streaming on ESPN

LeBron James: 'Everyone had doubt' whether an NBA team would sign Carmelo Anthony

Porzingis forgets which locker room to go to at Madison Square Garden

Hawks' Young with filthy move on Rubio

Paul felt 'stabbed in the back' by trade from Rockets

Daryl Morey wonders if MVP voters will again 'rob' James Harden

Bill Russell finally accepts Basketball Hall of Fame ring

Cam Johnson, the Suns' surprise first-round pick, is the standout among Phoenix's revamped wing rotation

Report: Carmelo Anthony returning to NBA with Trail Blazers

Solomon: Too many minutes for Rockets' Harden?

Plumlee, bench help Nuggets rally past Nets 101-93

Lakers' Avery Bradley suffers hairline fracture, to be re-evaluated in one to two weeks

Report: Knicks thought Pelicans' trade asking price for Anthony Davis was too high

NBA dynamic duos: What pairings are rocking, struggling?

Holiday's 36 points push Pelicans past Clippers 132-127

Carmelo Anthony reportedly won't debut for Portland before Tuesday, missing early Houston reunion

Same Old Clippers: Paul George Returns, Clippers Struggle, and Melo Goes to Blazers

LLM: 1. Charania: Aron Baynes positioning himself for well over \$10 million per year in free agency

2. Lakers' Avery Bradley sidelined by hairline fracture in right leg; Davis expected to return

3. LeBron James: 'Everyone had doubt' whether an NBA team would sign Carmelo Anthony

4. Report: Carmelo Anthony returning to NBA with Trail Blazers

5. Same Old Clippers: Paul George Returns, Clippers Struggle, and Melo Goes to Blazers

Input: Rank top 1 news from the following candidate news about outdoors to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

2020 Barletta E24QC

LLM: 2020 Barletta E24QC

Input: Rank top 5 news from the following candidate news about football_nfl to recommend to the user from the most important to the least important without explanation:

Arian Foster calls out NFL fans for being hypocrites over Myles Garrett attack

Garrett will lose at least \$1.139 million

Opinion: NFL should suspend Browns' Myles Garrett for rest of season at minimum for helmet swing

Brady on Kaepernick workout: 'Pretty cool that he's getting that opportunity'

This was uglier than a brawl. And Myles Garrett deserves suspension for rest of year after helmet attack.

Hue Jackson will run Colin Kaepernick's passing drills, 11 teams have said they'll attend

Report: Police investigating woman's death after Redskins' player Montae Nicholson took her to hospital

Police not getting involved in Myles Garrett-Mason Rudolph incident

Maurkice Pouncey suspended three games

Freddie Kitchens: I'm embarrassed and Myles Garrett is embarrassed

Police not getting involved in Myles Garrett-Mason Rudolph incident

Belichick mocks social media in comments on Garrett incident
 Sports betting: Vegas Vic's top plays are Cowboys on the road, Eagles at home and some Zach Ertz props
 Colin Kaepernick heads to Atlanta for workout
 New York Jets receiver Quincy Enunwa rips team, calls fines 'excessive'
 Myles Garrett on attacking Mason Rudolph: 'I made a mistake, I lost my cool'
 Receivers Collin Johnson, Devin Duvernay form Longhorns' most dynamic duo
 Opinion: Kitchens unqualified to lead undisciplined Browns
 Garrett-Rudolph fight invokes memories of other helmet incidents, Cowboys involved
 Antonio Brown offers to play catch with Colin Kaepernick in private workout
 Report: At least 24 teams expected to attend Kaepernick's workout
 Opinion: NFL had no choice but to send a clear message with Garrett punishment
 It's not just the Browns vs. Steelers. NFL has memorable history of fighting on the gridiron
 Report: Rudolph won't take legal action against Garrett
 Antonio Brown completes interview with NFL
 Prosecuting Garrett is overkill, Rudolph got off light, Pouncey is a folk hero but he deserved 3 games
 'He could have killed him:' Reaction pouring in after Browns DE hits Steelers QB with helmet
 Colin Kaepernick to the Broncos? Chances aren't great, oddsmaker says.
 Ex-Browns receiver Antonio Callaway gets 10-game drug ban
 Browns, Steelers brawl at end of Cleveland's 21-7 win
 Attorney: Garrett's actions against QB to be 'reviewed thoroughly'
 Do the Broncos have a second round curse?
 How Nick Williams went from being out of the NFL to leading the Bears in sacks
 Wilson deletes tweet of him standing over concussed Smith-Schuster
 Eagles-Patriots Week 11 Predictions: Do Birds Have Chance Against Defending Super Bowl Champs?
 Mason Rudolph's agent doesn't rule out potential legal action after Myles Garrett incident
 Myles Garrett, helmet a 'weapon,' banned for rest of season
 NFL world stunned by Myles Garrett attack on Mason Rudolph: Calls for season-long ban, jail
 Eagles' Jordan Howard not cleared for contract as Jay Ajayi visits team
 Browns apologize to Mason Rudolph, call Myles Garrett's actions 'unacceptable'
 Mason Rudolph: Myles Garrett's actions 'cowardly' and 'bush league'
 Opinion: Colin Kaepernick is about to get what he deserves: a chance
 ROAD TO THE SUPER BOWL: Portsmouth runs on Evans brothers
 Matthew Stafford will not play against Cowboys with back injury
 Myles Garrett bashes Mason Rudolph with helmet in Browns-Steelers fight
 Police not pursuing charges against Browns' Myles Garrett
 Myles Garrett issues statement apologizing for 'terrible mistake'
 Some believe Mason Rudolph, hit in head with his own helmet, isn't getting enough blame
 Baker Mayfield quick to condemn teammate Myles Garrett for brawl, attack on Mason Rudolph
 Report: Myles Garrett facing lengthy suspension, could be five games
LLM: 1. Myles Garrett bashes Mason Rudolph with helmet in Browns-Steelers fight
 2. Opinion: NFL should suspend Browns' Myles Garrett for rest of season at minimum for helmet swing
 3. Myles Garrett, helmet a 'weapon,' banned for rest of season
 4. Baker Mayfield quick to condemn teammate Myles Garrett for brawl, attack on Mason Rudolph
 5. Some believe Mason Rudolph, hit in head with his own helmet, isn't getting enough blame

Diversity-aware Re-rank

Input: Rank these pre-selected news based on user interests. Be aware of ranking diversity.

- 1: College football Week 12 primer: Heisman Watch, upset picks, predictions and more
- 2: Marshall marks 49th anniversary of tragic football team plane crash
- 3: Saban suspended unnamed player for Miss. St. game for not going to class
- 4: 2-game suspensions for La. Tech's starting QB, star WR
- 5: No. 2 Ohio State heads to Rutgers as 51-point favorite
- 6: Andy Murray targets Australian Open after bouncing back from 'rough year'
- 7: ATP Cup will be a 'great start' to year, says Becker
- 8: Zverev denies illegal phone use at ATP Finals

- 9: Cody Bellinger earns NL MVP after leading LAD to 106 wins
 - 10: Bud Light Ads Honor Nats Fan
 - 11: Jorge Vergara, former owner of Chivas USA, dies at 64
 - 12: Dest makes quick impact as US rebounds to beat Canada 4-1
 - 13: Realio's Ratings: Seattle wins their second, this time at home
 - 14: Charania: Aron Baynes positioning himself for well over \$10 million per year in free agency
 - 15: Lakers' Avery Bradley sidelined by hairline fracture in right leg; Davis expected to return
 - 16: LeBron James: 'Everyone had doubt' whether an NBA team would sign Carmelo Anthony
 - 17: Report: Carmelo Anthony returning to NBA with Trail Blazers
 - 18: Same Old Clippers: Paul George Returns, Clippers Struggle, and Melo Goes to Blazers
 - 19: 2020 Barletta E24QC
 - 20: **Opinion: NFL should suspend Browns' Myles Garrett for rest of season at minimum for helmet swing**
 - 21: Myles Garrett bashes Mason Rudolph with helmet in Browns-Steelers fight
 - 22: Myles Garrett, helmet a 'weapon,' banned for rest of season
 - 23: Baker Mayfield quick to condemn teammate Myles Garrett for brawl, attack on Mason Rudolph
 - 24: **Some believe Mason Rudolph, hit in head with his own helmet, isn't getting enough blame**
- LLM:** Based on user interests and ranking diversity, the pre-selected news can be ranked as follows:
- 1. Andy Murray targets Australian Open after bouncing back from 'rough year'
 - 2. Dest makes quick impact as US rebounds to beat Canada 4-1
 - 3. Cody Bellinger earns NL MVP after leading LAD to 106 wins
 - 4. LeBron James: 'Everyone had doubt' whether an NBA team would sign Carmelo Anthony
 - 5. Report: Carmelo Anthony returning to NBA with Trail Blazers
 - 6. Lakers' Avery Bradley sidelined by hairline fracture in right leg; Davis expected to return
 - 7. Same Old Clippers: Paul George Returns, Clippers Struggle, and Melo Goes to Blazers
 - 8. **Opinion: NFL should suspend Browns' Myles Garrett for rest of season at minimum for helmet swing**
 - 9. Myles Garrett, helmet a 'weapon,' banned for rest of season
 - 10. Baker Mayfield quick to condemn teammate Myles Garrett for brawl, attack on Mason Rudolph
 - 11. **Some believe Mason Rudolph, hit in head with his own helmet, isn't getting enough blame**
 - 12. Myles Garrett bashes Mason Rudolph with helmet in Browns-Steelers fight
 - 13. College football Week 12 primer: Heisman Watch, upset picks, predictions and more
 - 14. Marshall marks 49th anniversary of tragic football team plane crash
 - 15. Saban suspended unnamed player for Miss. St. game for not going to class
 - 16. 2-game suspensions for La. Tech's starting QB, star WR
 - 17. No. 2 Ohio State heads to Rutgers as 51-point favorite
 - 18. ATP Cup will be a 'great start' to year, says Becker
 - 19. Zverev denies illegal phone use at ATP Finals
 - 20. Charania: Aron Baynes positioning himself for well over \$10 million per year in free agency
 - 21. Bud Light Ads Honor Nats Fan
 - 22. Jorge Vergara, former owner of Chivas USA, dies at 64
 - 23. Realio's Ratings: Seattle wins their second, this time at home
 - 24. 2020 Barletta E24QC

Please note that this ranking is subjective and can vary based on individual interests and preferences.