

Personalized Music Recommendation with a Heterogeneity-aware Deep Bayesian Network

ERKANG JING, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology, China

YEZHENG LIU, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Process Optimization and Intelligent Decision-Making, Ministry of Education, China

YIDONG CHAI*, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Philosophy and Social Sciences for Cyberspace Behaviour and Management, China

SHUO YU, Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University, U.S.

LONGSHUN LIU, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology, China

YUANCHUN JIANG, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Philosophy and Social Sciences for Cyberspace Behaviour and Management, China

YANG WANG, School of Computer Science and Information Engineering, Hefei University of Technology, China

Music recommender systems are crucial in music streaming platforms, providing users with music they would enjoy. Recent studies have shown that user emotions can affect users' music mood preferences. However, existing emotion-aware music recommender systems (EMRSs) explicitly or implicitly assume that users' actual emotional states expressed by an identical emotion word are homogeneous. They also assume that users' music mood preferences are homogeneous under an identical emotional state. In this article, we propose four types of heterogeneity that an EMRS should consider: emotion heterogeneity across users, emotion heterogeneity within a user, music mood preference heterogeneity across users, and music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. We further propose a Heterogeneity-aware Deep Bayesian Network (HDBN) to model these assumptions. The HDBN mimics a user's decision process to choose music with four components: personalized prior user emotion distribution modeling, posterior user emotion distribution modeling, user grouping, and Bayesian neural network-based music mood preference prediction. We constructed a large-scale dataset called EmoMusicLJ to validate our method. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms baseline approaches on widely used HR and NDCG recommendation metrics. Ablation experiments and case studies further validate the effectiveness of our HDBN. The source code is available at <https://github.com/jingrk/HDBN>.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning**; • **Information systems**;

*Corresponding author

Authors' Contact Information: [Erkang Jing](mailto:jingerkang@mail.hfut.edu.cn), jingerkang@mail.hfut.edu.cn, School of Management, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, Anhui, China; [Yezheng Liu](mailto:liyuzheng@hfut.edu.cn), School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Process Optimization and Intelligent Decision-Making, Ministry of Education, Hefei, Anhui, China, liyuzheng@hfut.edu.cn; [Yidong Chai](mailto:chaiyd@hfut.edu.cn), School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Philosophy and Social Sciences for Cyberspace Behaviour and Management, Hefei, Anhui, China, chaiyd@hfut.edu.cn; [Shuo Yu](mailto:Shuo.Yu@ttu.edu), Rawls College of Business, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, U.S., Shuo.Yu@ttu.edu; [Longshun Liu](mailto:longshun.liu@mail.hfut.edu.cn), School of Management, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, Anhui, China, longshun.liu@mail.hfut.edu.cn; [Yuanchun Jiang](mailto:ycjiang@hfut.edu.cn), School of Management, Hefei University of Technology and Key Laboratory of Philosophy and Social Sciences for Cyberspace Behaviour and Management, Hefei, Anhui, China, ycjiang@hfut.edu.cn; [Yang Wang](mailto:yangwang@hfut.edu.cn), School of Computer Science and Information Engineering, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei, Anhui, China, yangwang@hfut.edu.cn.

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

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Personalized music recommendation, emotion heterogeneity, music mood preference heterogeneity, deep learning, generative model

1 INTRODUCTION

Music plays a vital role in people’s lives, offering enjoyment, emotional fulfillment, self-expression, and social bonding [14, 18, 38, 48]. With the advances in information technology, music became one of the first products to be digitalized and sold online. Today, subscription and streaming services are the major business models for music platforms such as Apple Music, Spotify, and NetEase Cloud. According to the 2024 International Federation of Phonographic Industry Global Music Report ¹, global revenue from music streaming reached \$19.3 billion in 2023, a 10.4% increase from the previous year. These platforms aim to boost user engagement by introducing new music users will enjoy. However, with millions of tracks available, users often face information overload when exploring music libraries [44, 53]. To address this, music recommender systems (MRSs) have been widely used to facilitate the matching between users and music pieces [47]. MRSs reduce users’ information overload on music exploration [9, 33] and help platforms improve user loyalty and retention, thereby strengthening their competitiveness in the music streaming market [46].

Early MRSs followed the design of general recommender systems, focusing on collaborative filtering (user-music interactions, such as listening and rating behaviors), music features (e.g., rhythm), and contextual information (e.g., weather and location) [32, 50, 56]. Later, researchers recognized that user emotions may largely influence music preferences [35, 51, 57]. For example, when a person is happy, they may tend to listen to a song with positive moods, such as joyful activation [16, 28]. As a result, emotion-aware music recommender systems (EMRSs) have been proposed to integrate emotional information into music recommendations [19, 35]. Emotional information includes two parts: *user emotion*, such as happy, sad, or angry feelings of users, and *music mood*, such as joyful activation, nostalgia, or tension contained in the music. EMRSs improve users’ experience and their willingness to use the music streaming platform [3, 26]. The existing EMRSs either included emotional information as additional features into the EMRS [13, 19, 48] or focused on the matching between user emotions and music moods (e.g., users who are happy or want to be happy are recommended music with joyful activation) [4, 52] under the following assumptions (explicit or implicit):

- (1) *Across different users*, their actual emotional states represented by an emotion word (e.g., “happy”) are homogeneous [11]. For instance, in Figure 1(a), if both Jack and Jill describe their current emotion as “happy,” their actual emotional states are identical.
- (2) *Within a user*, their actual emotional states represented by an emotion word (e.g., “fear”) are homogeneous [11]. For instance, in Figure 1(b), if Jill describes her current emotion as “fear” at two different times, her actual emotional states are identical at those times.
- (3) *Across different users*, their preferences for music moods under a given emotional state are homogeneous [4, 52]. For instance, in Figure 1(c), if Jack and Jill are both happy, their preferences for music moods are identical (e.g., they both like music with joyful activation).
- (4) *Within a user*, their preferences for music moods under a given emotional state are homogeneous [4, 52]. For instance, in Figure 1(d), if Jill is happy at two different times, her preferences for music moods are identical at those times.

However, psychological research and common sense suggest that the above assumptions may not always hold [6–8, 17, 27, 37, 38, 57].

¹<https://globalmusicreport.ifpi.org>




Fig. 1. Toy examples of the assumptions of existing EMRSs and our proposed assumptions (four types of heterogeneity).

- (1) Regarding Assumption 1, studies [6, 7] have shown that people's perception, interpretation, and classification of emotions are influenced by the conceptual knowledge of emotions learned from everyday language, social activities, culture, and other factors, which yields differences in emotion cognition and expression across different individuals. We describe such phenomena as *emotion heterogeneity across users* (see Figure 1(e)).
- (2) Regarding Assumption 2, we often use the same emotion word to describe different emotional states. For example, the fear of starving in the woods is different from the fear of facing a bee sting [8]. We describe such phenomena as *emotion heterogeneity within a user* (see Figure 1(f)).
- (3) Regarding Assumption 3, many studies have indicated that not everyone tends to select music with moods that match their emotions and that different users may prefer different music moods even if they are in the same emotional state [17, 37, 57]. We describe such phenomena as *music mood preference heterogeneity across users* (see Figure 1(g)).
- (4) Regarding Assumption 4, a user's music mood preference may change over time even if they report that their emotional states do not change [27, 38]. We describe such phenomena as *music mood preference heterogeneity within a user* (see Figure 1(h)).

To the best of our knowledge, no existing EMRSs have explicitly adopted the above four types of heterogeneity as underlying assumptions in their design, which can lead to suboptimal results in personalized music recommendation.

To address the above gaps, we propose a generative model called Heterogeneity-aware Deep Bayesian Network (HDBN) that specifically models the four types of heterogeneity for personalized music recommendation. Research has demonstrated that generative models can flexibly and intuitively embed psychological and behavioral theories into the process of modeling user decision-making, more precisely model the conditional dependencies between variables and the joint probability distribution of users and items, and also improve model interpretability [54, 59]. Hence, our




Fig. 2. Conceptual framework of HDBN. The contents in the dotted boxes correspond to our approaches to address the four types of heterogeneity. After obtaining the predicted user’s preferred music mood, combined with the user interaction history and the true music mood label, the user’s rating score of the music can be generated.

HDBN adopts the generative approach. The HDBN models the joint distribution of users, music, and latent emotional variables by mimicking the decision process of the user’s selection of music. Figure 2 shows the conceptual framework of our HDBN. First, to address emotion heterogeneity across users, we design an inference network that learns a personalized prior emotion distribution for each user from the user’s music listening history. Second, to address emotion heterogeneity within a user, we design another inference network to learn the posterior emotion distribution of a user while listening to a music track. The learning of the posterior emotion distribution is based on the user’s personalized prior emotion distribution and the user’s self-reported emotion tag. The posterior emotion distributions can be different for the same user even if they report the same emotion tag when listening to different pieces of music. Third, to address music mood preference heterogeneity across users, we cluster users into groups based on their music listening history and design a Bayesian neural network (BNN) for each group to model their preferred music moods. Users in the same group share similar music mood preferences. Fourth, BNNs employ distributions instead of fixed values as model weights, which means that we get a different neural network each time we apply the model to predict music mood preferences for a user. This behavior allows more diverse predictions on music moods to account for music mood preference heterogeneity within a user.

To validate our proposed model’s effectiveness, we strive to seek a dataset containing users’ self-reported emotion words preceding their music choices. Specifically, the dataset should ensure that users’ emotional states affect their music choices, not the music they listened to that affects their emotional states. Unfortunately, to the best of our knowledge, no existing dataset meets this requirement. As a result, we construct a large-scale dataset called EmoMusicLJ based on LJ2M [37]. LJ2M ensures that users provide self-reported emotions before selecting the music to listen to. LJ2M includes the users’ IDs and the music tracks’ IDs, titles, and artists. Based on this, we crawl meta information such as music audio from 7Digital², music genre, and released year from Musicoverly³. Then, We tag the music with mood tags based on music audio and Emotify [2]. The above information forms our EmoMusicLJ dataset, which contains 129,104 listening events from 12,557 users and 6,095 music tracks. Each listening event specifies the user’s unique ID, the music track’s unique ID, and the user’s self-reported emotion tag when listening to the music track, as well as other features, including the genre, release year, and artist of the music track. Under common metrics for recommender systems

²<https://us.7digital.com/>

³<https://musicoverlyb2b.mystrickinglu.com>

such as Hit Rate (HR) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) [22], we compared our model against several state-of-the-art baseline models in a series of experiments. Results show that our proposed model significantly outperforms the baseline models. Finally, we conducted case studies to demonstrate how our model effectively captures emotion heterogeneity and music mood preference heterogeneity.

The main contributions of our work are summarized as follows:

- First, we propose an HDBN to consider the four types of heterogeneity in personalized music recommendation. Our model comprises four components: an inference network to learn personalized prior emotion distributions for emotion heterogeneity across users, an inference network to learn posterior emotion distributions for emotion heterogeneity within a user, and a user group-specific BNN for music mood preference heterogeneity across users and within a user.
- Second, we constructed a large-scale EmoMusicLJ dataset comprising 129,104 interactions from 12,557 users and 6,095 music tracks. EmoMusicLJ can work as a benchmark dataset for future studies on EMRSs.
- Third, we conducted extensive experiments to compare our model against state-of-the-art baseline models. Experimental results show that our model significantly outperforms the baseline models on the metrics of HR and NDCG. In addition, ablation experiments suggested the effectiveness of the four components.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the related works and identify research gaps. In Section 3, we describe our model in detail. In Section 4, we show the extensive experiments we conducted against baseline models to validate the effectiveness of our method. In Section 5, we conclude this work.

2 RELATED WORKS

In this section, we review the literature streams of emotion-aware music recommendations to form the basis of our research.

2.1 Emotion-aware music recommendation

Emotion is an important factor in users' music-listening decisions [43]. A music recommender system that explicitly considers information such as user emotion and music mood is called an emotion-aware music recommender system [16, 43]. With advancements in technologies enabling emotion recognition from facial images, speech, social media footprints, and more, many researchers have integrated user emotion and music mood into personalized music recommender systems to provide better music recommendation services. Table 1 summarizes the main studies on emotion-aware music recommendation.

Depending on the way to use emotion, existing methods can be divided into two types: emotion-matching methods and emotion-as-a-feature methods. In emotion-matching methods, a user's emotion is inferred from analyses of his or her behavioral data (e.g., facial images, online footprints) or self-reports. Simultaneously, a music mood recognition model is developed to detect the mood of music. Then, the similarity between the user's emotion and the music mood is computed, and music recommendations are generated accordingly. For instance, Kang et al. [29] mapped user emotions and music moods into the valence-arousal space using mobile phone message texts and acoustic features of music, respectively. Music recommendations were then generated based on the distance between user emotions and music moods. Moscato et al. [41] initialized user emotions by encoding their personality traits into the pleasure-arousal-dominance (PAD) space and updated them based on the moods of the most recently listened to music represented in the same PAD space. Subsequently, they conducted music retrieval based on the Euclidean distance between user emotions

Table 1. Main Research on Emotion-aware Music Recommender Systems

Year	Author	Emotion source	Method description	Method category in terms of emotion usage
2024	Han et al. [20]	physiological indicators	User emotion and music mood were mapped to three-dimension space: tension-arousal, energy-arousal, and valence. Then, recommendations were given based on the similarity between user emotion and music mood.	Emotion-matching
2024	Annam et al. [4]	Facial image	A pre-trained VGG-16 model was used to predict user facial emotion and recommend music based on a predefined relationship between music mood and user emotion.	Emotion-matching
2023	Tran et al. [52]	Facial image	DRViT and InvNet50 were trained to predict the user's valance and arousal, and the top-5 closet songs were provided to the user.	Emotion-matching
2022	Bontempelli et al. [11]	Self-report	Six random forest binary classifiers were trained to predict music mood, and the similarity score between music mood and user self-report emotion was computed and used for music recommendation.	Emotion-matching
2022	Li et al. [34]	Smart bracelets	User emotion prediction based on data from smart bracelets was regarded as the sub-task of music rating prediction. The predicted user emotion was used to predict the user's music rating.	Emotion-as-a-feature
2021	Polignano et al. [43]	Footprints on social media	The recommendation was given based on the affective coherence score between the affective user profile (emotion) and not-affective music features (e.g., genre, lyrics).	Emotion-matching
2020	Shen et al. [48]	Posts on WeChat	A hierarchical attention mechanism modeled interactions between music and user emotion and personality. The wide and deep structure was also adopted to learn more interaction modes.	Emotion-as-a-feature
2020	Moscato et al. [41]	Online social network logs	The user's emotion was initialized from his big five traits based on Mehrabian's PAD method and updated according to the initial emotion and recent emotion. Finally, the recommendation was given based on the distance between user emotion and music mood.	Emotion-matching
2019	Andjelkovic et al. [3]	Listening history	In the first stage, the recommendation was given based on the similarity between user emotion and music mood. In the second stage, the recommendation was given based on the similarity of the music's content.	Emotion-matching
2019	Kang and Seo [29]	Text on smart phone	User emotion was estimated from text on his phone. The recommendation was given based on the similarity between user emotion and music mood in valence and arousal space.	Emotion-matching
2017	Iyer et al. [25]	Face image	Fisherfaces classifier was used to detect user's emotion. The first few pieces of music on the recommended list are in tune with the user's emotions. And the following ones will be happier.	Emotion-matching
2015	Deng et al. [16]	Microblogs	The similarity between users (items) is calculated based on the user's emotions when listening to songs, and then the collaborative filtered music recommendation is implemented based on the similarity.	Emotion-matching

and music moods. Similarly, Tran et al. [52] measured the similarity between user emotions and music moods in the valence-arousal space to make recommendations, although they identified user emotions through facial recognition.

In emotion-as-a-feature methods, user emotions and music moods are integrated into a music rating score prediction model (e.g., neural network) together with other information, such as music meta-features. Then, the recommendations are given based on the predicted scores. For example, Shen et al. [48] proposed the Personality and Emotion Integrated

Attentive (PEIA) model, which employs hierarchical attention to capture both the long-term and short-term effects of personality and emotion on music preferences. Li et al. [34] proposed a multi-task framework in which music rating prediction serves as the primary task while predicting the user’s emotion before and after listening to music is treated as two sub-tasks.

While valuable, both types of methods still have four limitations. First, they fail to consider the problem of emotion heterogeneity across users. This problem refers to that the prior emotion distributions vary across different users. For instance, some people are more likely to be irritated than the other group of people [60]. Existing methods use the same emotion tags or high-dimensional vectors to represent the same emotions among users. Second, they fail to consider the problem of emotion heterogeneity within a user, which refers to the variation in a user’s emotions expressed using the same emotion tag at different times. As highlighted by Barrett’s Conceptual Act model [7], the emotions a user expresses using the same emotion tag may vary depending on different combinations of conceptual instances in various contexts and experiences. Similarly, existing methods fail to consider this problem since they model user emotion using the same tag or vectors. Third, they fail to consider the problem of music mood preference heterogeneity across users, which refers to that different users under the same emotion may prefer different music moods. This type of heterogeneity has also been validated by many studies. For example, Shiffriss et al. [49] found that when people were in a bad emotion (e.g., sad, depressed), they chose happy music or sad music differently depending on the purpose they set out. However, existing methods share an identical music mood preference model, whether using emotion matching or emotion-as-a-feature approaches and thus fail to consider the problem of music mood preference heterogeneity across users. Fourth, they fail to consider the problem of music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. This problem refers to that a user under a given emotion at different times may prefer different music moods. Research has indicated that factors such as context can influence users’ music selections, regardless of their inherent music preferences, leading to this heterogeneity [27, 34]. Existing methods rely on a fixed prediction model that represents users’ inherent music preference patterns to predict their music mood preferences, thereby overlooking the music mood preference heterogeneity within a user.

In summary, although many emotion-aware recommendation methods have been proposed to leverage user emotion and music mood, these methods fail to consider 1) emotion heterogeneity across users, 2) emotion heterogeneity within a user, 3) music mood preference heterogeneity across users, and 4) music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. Given these limitations, this study aims to design a novel emotion-aware recommendation method that addresses them, thereby improving recommendation outcomes.

3 THE PROPOSED HETEROGENEITY-AWARE DEEP BAYESIAN NETWORK (HDBN)

In this section, we introduce our proposed Heterogeneity-aware Deep Bayesian Network (HDBN). We begin by defining the music recommendation task, followed by a detailed description of our method.

3.1 Problem Formulation

Given the user set $\mathbb{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_U\}$, where U represents the number of users, and $u_i \in \mathbb{U}$ denotes a user. Given the music set $\mathbb{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_V\}$, where V represents the number of music, and $v_i \in \mathbb{V}$ denotes a music track. Given the users’ emotion tag set $\mathbb{e} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_M\}$, where M represents the number of emotion tags, and $e_i \in \mathbb{e}$ denotes an emotion tag. There are a series of user-emotion-music triplets, which form the dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(u, e, v)_i\}_{i=1}^N$. N denotes the size of the dataset. Each triplet means a user u , under an emotion e , chooses to listen to music v . In this study, the

personalized music recommendation aims to predict a user’s preference for music based on his or her emotions and then generate a top-K recommendation list. Table 2 lists the main notations used in the following content.

Table 2. Notations and Their Descriptions

Notation	Description	Type	Notation	Description	Type
\mathcal{S}	The general latent emotion distribution for all users	Vector	σ_ψ	Standard deviation values of ψ	Vector
μ	Mean values of \mathcal{S}	Vector	g	The group to which user u belongs	Scalar
σ	Standard deviation values of \mathcal{S}	Vector	ψ_g	The music mood preference prediction model for the g -th group	BNN parameters
\mathcal{S}_u	The personalized prior latent emotion distribution of a user u	Vector	$l_{u,v}$	The predicted music mood label that u prefers when listening to music v	Vector
$\mathcal{S}_{u,v}$	The posterior latent emotion distribution of a user u when listening to music v	Vector	r_u	The representation of user u	Vector
$s_{u,v}$	A representation of u ’s self-report emotion generated from $\mathcal{S}_{u,v}$	Vector	r_v	The representation of music v u	Vector
ψ	The global music mood preference prediction model for all groups	BNN parameters	o_v	The true mood label of music v u	Vector
μ_ψ	Mean values of ψ	Vector	$m_{u,v}$	The ground-truth that whether user u has listened to music v	Scalar

3.2 Method

3.2.1 An overview of HDBN. HDBN includes four key components to address the four limitations that we have identified in the literature review. First, we design a personalized prior emotion distribution for each user to address emotion heterogeneity across users; second, we design a posterior emotion distribution for a specific user’s self-reported emotion tag (e.g., happy) to address emotion heterogeneity within a user; third, we cluster users into different groups and design a BNN for each group to address the music mood preference heterogeneity across users; fourth, BNN exhibits diverse music mood preference predictions to address the music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. Figure 3 shows the key components and the corresponding limitations being solved. Next, we detail the generative process of HDBN.

3.2.2 The generative process. According to Conceptual Act Model [7], user emotions are not simple points described by emotion words such as happy and fear but are composed of more fundamental primitive psychological elements, thus forming a shape (e.g., roughly circular or circumplex shape) in the psychological space [5, 6]. Hence, we assume the observed user self-report emotion is from a latent emotion distribution (LED), which reflects how various emotions such as happy, sad, and afraid are distributed [23, 60, 61]. Influenced by cultural and social attributes, there are some commonalities in emotion cognition across different users [6]. Hence, we assume that there is a general LED for all users, denoted as \mathcal{S} . As suggested by Zeng et al. [61], we treat \mathcal{S} as a standard Gaussian distribution, i.e., $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}; \mu, \sigma^2)$ where $\mu = \mathbf{0}$ and $\sigma = 1$.

As aforementioned, different people have different emotion patterns. For instance, some extraverted users are more likely to become happy while neurotic ones are more likely to be worried [24]. Hence, different users should have personalized LEDs. We call the personalized LED of a user u the prior LED and denote it as \mathcal{S}_u . \mathcal{S}_u is also a Gaussian distribution. We treat the general LED \mathcal{S} as the prior for a prior LED \mathcal{S}_u . Formally, $\mathcal{S}_u = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}_u; \mu_u, \sigma_u^2)$ where μ_u is




Fig. 3. The limitations and corresponding key components of HDBN

from the distribution \mathcal{S} , i.e., $\mu_u \sim \mathcal{S}_u$. Since different users have their own prior LED \mathcal{S}_u , we address the problem of emotion heterogeneity across users.

User self-report emotion, denoted as $s_{u,v}$, is regarded as an observed sample drawn from the posterior LED $\mathcal{S}_{u,v}$, i.e., $s_{u,v} \sim \mathcal{S}_{u,v}$. This study adopts the reparameterization trick to generate samples of $\mathcal{S}_{u,v}$ [30]. Formally, we first draw a random variable ϵ from the standard Gaussian distribution $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$, and then generate a sample of $s_{u,v}$ based on $s_{u,v} = \mu_{u,v} + \sigma_2 \cdot \epsilon$.

As mentioned above, under the same emotion (i.e., under the same posterior LED), different users may still prefer to listen to music with different moods, which we refer to as music mood preference heterogeneity across users. For instance, users who scored high on openness and agreeableness were more likely to choose music with higher activating moods (such as high loudness), while highly neurotic users preferred music with lower activating moods [40]. Hence, users are clustered into different groups. Across groups, the music mood preference prediction model varies significantly to account for the music mood preference heterogeneity across users. Meanwhile, a user may prefer different music moods under the same self-report emotion at different times, which we refer to as music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. Hence, the music mood preference prediction model should be flexible to accommodate for the heterogeneity. Motivated by the above points, we set the music mood preference prediction model as Bayesian neural networks (BNN) and create different BNNs for different groups. The last layer of the BNNs is a softmax layer, which makes the sum of the probability for each music mood equal to 1. As the prediction model (i.e., BNN) differs in different groups, users in different groups exert different music mood preference patterns. In this way, we address the problem of music mood preference heterogeneity across users. Meanwhile, as BNN assumes that the model parameters are distributions rather than fixed values, the prediction results vary even given the same emotion input. In this way, we account for music mood preference heterogeneity within a user in the music selection process. Particularly, assuming there are G groups of users and the group ID of user u as $g(u)$. $g(u)$ can be inferred from the user's listening history with clustering algorithms such as K-means. The music mood preference prediction model of group g is a function parameterized by ψ_g , denoted as \mathcal{F}_{ψ_g} .

Although music mood preferences in different user groups are different, some universal preference patterns exist. For instance, through the analysis of 765 million music-listening events from users in 51 countries, Park et al. [42] found that people prefer more relaxing and less intense music late at night. Hence, we assume each ψ_g is generated from a common shared BNN, parameterized by ψ . Following previous studies [10, 55], we assume ψ is a standard Gaussian distribution, i.e., $\psi \sim \mathcal{N}(\psi; \mu_\psi, \sigma_\psi^2)$ where $\mu_\psi = \mathbf{0}$ and $\sigma_\psi = \mathbf{1}$. ψ_g is also a Gaussian distribution with ψ as the expectation, i.e., $\psi_g \sim \mathcal{N}(\psi_g; \psi, \sigma_3^2)$. Then the user-preferred music mood is generated based on the observed emotion $s_{u,v}$, i.e., $l_{u,v} = \mathcal{F}_{\psi_g(u)}(s_{u,v})$.

A music track is more likely to be selected if its actual music mood o_v is close to the user-preferred music mood $l_{u,v}$. In addition, a user may generally prefer a certain type of music, such as a certain genre or a certain singer. Such factors can be reflected in the user's listening history (i.e., user-music interaction). We employ a neural network (i.e., embedding layer) to learn interaction-based user representation, denoted as r_u , and music representation, denoted as r_v , from the rich user-music interaction data. Then, the matching score, $m_{u,v}$, is generated by a dot product, i.e., $m_{u,v} = [l_{u,v}, r_u][o_v, r_v]^T$.

The generative process is given by Algorithm 1 and visualized in Figure 4. The shaded circles represent the observable variables from the data, and the blank circles represent hidden variables. Note that music representation r_v and user representation r_u are extracted by an existing external neural network, and hence their values are observable in the generative process. Each user's group ID g is obtained with K-means and is also observed in the generative process.




Fig. 4. The graphical representation of the generative process

3.2.3 Variational inference. The generative process can be reached by maximizing the logarithmic likelihood of the observed $m_{u,v}$ and $s_{u,v}$, $\forall u \in \mathbb{U}, v \in \mathbb{V}$, which is given by (See Appendix A.1.1 for details),

$$\begin{aligned} \log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) = & \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\}) - \log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\}) \right] \\ & + \text{KL} \left(q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\}) \parallel p(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\}) \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Algorithm 1 The Generative Process

for a user $u \in \mathbb{U}$:

 Get the user's representation $\mathbf{r}_u = NN_u(u)$

 Get the user's personalized prior latent emotion distribution $\mathcal{S}_u = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}_u; \boldsymbol{\mu}_u, \sigma_1^2), \boldsymbol{\mu}_u \sim \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$

 Get user specific posterior latent emotion distribution $\mathcal{S}_{u,v} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}_{u,v}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}, \sigma_2^2), \boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} \sim \mathcal{S}_u$

 Draw user-specific emotion $s_{u,v} \sim \mathcal{S}_{u,v}$

 Get user's group $g = g(u)$

 Draw music mood preference prediction model for u $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g; \boldsymbol{\psi}, \sigma_3^2)$

 Get u 's preferred music mood $\mathbf{l}_{u,v} = \mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g}(s_{u,v})$

 for a music $v \in \mathbb{V}$:

 Get music representation $\mathbf{r}_v = NN_v(v)$

 Get music mood \mathbf{o}_v

 for u 's preference score to v :

$$m_{u,v} = [\mathbf{l}_{u,v}, \mathbf{r}_u][\mathbf{o}_v, \mathbf{r}_v]^T$$

where $\{m_{u,v}\}$ is the collection of all $m_{u,v}$ and similar notations for others. $p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\})$ and $q(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\})$ are the posterior and variational distributions of $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}$, respectively. Since the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence is non-negative, we have,

$$\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) \geq \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) - \log q(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) \right] \quad (2)$$

Hence, we obtain a lower bound for $\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\})$. This is called evidential lower bound (ELBO), and we denote it as $\text{ELBO}(q)$. $\text{ELBO}(q)$ can be further transformed as (See Appendix A.1.2 for details),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO}(q) = & \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\} \mid \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) \right] \\ & - \text{KL} \left(q(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) \parallel p(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $p(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\})$ is the prior distribution for $\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}$. According to the conditional independence relationship in the generative process, $p(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\})$ can be factorized as,

$$p(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) = p(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \prod_g p(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \mid \boldsymbol{\psi}) \prod_u \left(p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}) \prod_v p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}_u) \right) \prod_u \prod_v p(\mathbf{l}_{u,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{g(u)}}(s_{u,v})) \quad (4)$$

As described in the generative process, $p(\boldsymbol{\psi})$, $p(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \mid \boldsymbol{\psi})$, $p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u \mid \boldsymbol{\mu})$, and $p(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}_u)$ are all Gaussian distributions that have been introduced. $p(\mathbf{l}_{u,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{g(u)}}(s_{u,v}))$ follows the distribution in line with \mathbf{o}_v . We assume $q(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\})$ has the same factorization property as the prior distribution, i.e.,

$$q(\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g\}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}, \{\mathbf{l}_{u,v}\}) = q(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \prod_g q(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \mid \boldsymbol{\psi}) \prod_u \left(q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}) \prod_v q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}_u) \right) \prod_u \prod_v q(\mathbf{l}_{u,v} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{g(u)}}(s_{u,v})) \quad (5)$$

For $q(\boldsymbol{\psi})$, the goal is to obtain parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ of BNNs. Hence, the inference process is the same as learning the parameters of the BNNs. Hence, we can adopt existing methods such as Bayes by Backprop [10] to learn the Bayesian parameters $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. For $q(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \mid \boldsymbol{\psi})$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$ is generated based on $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Hence, we initialize $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$ as $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and then update $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$. The update

process is the same as learning BNN parameters. For $q(\mu_u | \mu)$, $q(\mu_{u,v} | \mu_u)$ and $q(l_{u,v} | \mathcal{F}_{\psi_{g(u)}}(s_{u,v}))$, we adopt neural networks for inference. Next, we describe the inference networks in our study.

a) *Inference networks for μ_u and $\mu_{u,v}$.* Since the user self-reported emotion $s_{u,v}$ contains rich hues about $\mu_{u,v}$ we adopt an inference network to infer $\mu_{u,v}$ based on $s_{u,v}$. Similarly, since user representation r_u is closely related to μ_u , we infer μ_u based on user representation r_u . Since $\mu_{u,v}$ is generated from μ_u , we simultaneously infer $\mu_{u,v}$ and μ_u with a structured process. The first network is used to infer μ_u while the second one is used to infer $\mu_{u,v}$ based on μ_u . Figure 5 visually represents the inference networks.




Fig. 5. The inference networks for μ_u and $\mu_{u,v}$. The dashed arrows represent the regulations from the prior distribution.

As mentioned above, \mathcal{S}_u follows a standard Gaussian distribution. Hence, there are two parameters, i.e. the mean vector μ_u and the standard deviation vector σ_1 , to be inferred. We encode the variational distribution of \mathcal{S}_u from r_u using a shared multi-layer neural network with parameters of θ_1 . This process is denoted as:

$$\mu_u = NN_{\theta_1}(r_u) \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma_1 = NN_{\theta_1}(r_u) \quad (7)$$

$$q(\mu_u | \mu) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_u, \sigma_1^2) \quad (8)$$

Similarly, we encode the variational distribution of $\mathcal{S}_{u,v}$ which consists of the mean vector $\mu_{u,v}$ and standard deviation vector σ_2 from $s_{u,v}$ using a shared multi-layer neural network with parameters of θ_2 . This process is denoted as:

$$\mu_{u,v} = NN_{\theta_2}(s_{u,v}) \quad (9)$$

$$\sigma_2 = NN_{\theta_2}(s_{u,v}) \quad (10)$$

$$q(\mu_{u,v} | \mu_u) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_{u,v}, \sigma_2^2) \quad (11)$$

b) *Inference networks for $l_{u,v}$.* Since the generation process for $l_{u,v}$ is deterministic, it can be determined given $s_{u,v}$ and the BNN parameterized by ψ_g , i.e., $l_{u,v} = \mathcal{F}_{\psi_g}(s_{u,v})$.

After obtaining the value of hidden variables including $\{\psi_g\}$, ψ , $\{\mu_{u,v}\}$, $\{\mu_u\}$, and $\{l_{u,v}\}$, we can compute the probability $p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\} | \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\})$. Since $m_{u,v}$ and $s_{u,v}$ are conditionally independent given the hidden variables, we can factor the probability and compute each. For $\{m_{u,v}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\{m_{u,v}\} | \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{l_{u,v}\}) &= \log \left(\prod_u \prod_v p(m_{u,v} | \psi_{g(u)}, \psi, \mu_{u,v}, \mu_u, l_{u,v}) \right) \\ &= \sum_u \sum_v \log p(m_{u,v} | \psi_{g(u)}, \psi, \mu_{u,v}, \mu_u, l_{u,v}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For $\{s_{u,v}\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\{s_{u,v}\} | \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) &= \log \left(\prod_u \prod_v p(s_{u,v} | \psi_{g(u)}, \psi, \mu_{u,v}, \mu_u, I_{u,v}) \right) \\ &= \sum_u \sum_v \log p(s_{u,v} | \psi_{g(u)}, \psi, \mu_{u,v}, \mu_u, I_{u,v}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

After obtaining the value of ELBO, we can update parameters to maximize ELBO. Three parts of the parameters need to be updated: 1) ψ , 2) ψ_g , 3) θ_1 and θ_2 .

a) *Learning ψ* . As mentioned above, ψ is the BNN parameter. Holding other parameters fixed and removing the irrelevant items, Equation (3) can be simplified as,

$$\text{ELBO}_1 = \mathbb{E}[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\} | \psi)] - \text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi)) \quad (14)$$

This is equivalent to learning BNN parameters that are supposed to perform well on maximizing the prediction of $m_{u,v}$ while also regulated by the prior distribution (i.e., the second term). Since $m_{u,v} = I_{u,v} \cdot \mathbf{o}_v^T + \mathbf{r}_v \cdot \mathbf{r}_u^T$, maximizing the first term is equivalent to making the $I_{u,v}$ close to \mathbf{o}_v as much as possible. To this end, we compute their KL divergence to minimize the KL divergence $\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| I_{u,v})$. Maximizing the second term, $-\text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi))$, is equivalent to minimizing $\text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi))$. Hence, maximizing the ELBO_1 is equivalent to minimizing the $-\text{ELBO}_1$, which is called the cost function and denoted as,

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathbb{E}[\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| I_{u,v})] + \alpha \text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi)) \quad (15)$$

where α is a hyperparameter that represents the trade-off between the generation of user-preferred music mood and the weight prior constraint.

The first term in equation (15) can be computed as,

$$\mathbb{E}[\{\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| I_{u,v})\}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^d \left(o_{v,i} \frac{\log o_{v,i}}{I_{u,v,i}} \right) \quad (16)$$

where N is the data size, d is the dimensional size of \mathbf{o}_v .

For the second term in equation (15), since $q(\psi) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_\psi, \sigma_\psi)$ and $p(\psi) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$, it can be calculated as,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi)) &= \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \text{KL}(q(\psi) \| p(\psi)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi} \left(\mu_\psi^2 + \sigma_\psi^2 - \log(\sigma_\psi^2) - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Suggested by prior studies [10], we draw a sample of weights (denoted as $\tilde{\psi}$) from the distribution, i.e., $\tilde{\psi} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\psi, \sigma_\psi)$. Since the sampling process is not derivable, the re-parameterization trick is introduced. We first sample the random variable ϵ from the standard Gaussian, i.e., $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$, and then get $\tilde{\psi}$ by shifting ϵ by μ_ψ and scaling it by σ_ψ , i.e., $\tilde{\psi} = \mu_\psi + \sigma_\psi \circ \epsilon$ where \circ denotes the point-wise multiplication operation. Then, based on $\tilde{\psi}$, we can predict $I_{u,v}$ and compute the cost function to update the variational parameters μ_ψ and σ_ψ with gradient descent.

b) *Learning ψ_g* . The parameter learning process is similar to the above except that the prior distribution is the learned ψ . Formally, the KL divergence becomes $\text{KL}(q(\psi_g | \psi) \| p(\psi_g))$ where $p(\psi_g)$ is the Gaussian distribution with ψ as the expectation. Similarly, the simplified version of $\text{ELBO}(q)$ is:

$$\text{ELBO}_2 = \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\} | \psi_g)] - \text{KL}(q(\psi_g | \psi) \| p(\psi_g)) \quad (18)$$

For $q(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g | \boldsymbol{\psi})$, we treat the fine-tuning as the inference process. We input $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ as an initialization to obtain $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$ via fine-tuning, i.e., the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$ is first initialized as $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\boldsymbol{\psi})$ and then updated to maximize the ELBO₂ on data of the g -th group. The output is the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$, which is also a Gaussian distribution, denoted as $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g})$. Similarly, maximizing the first term is equivalent to minimizing the KL divergence between \mathbf{o}_v and $\mathbf{l}_{u,v}$ for users in the g -th group, denoted as $\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| \mathbf{l}_{u,v})$. Maximizing ELBO₂ is equivalent to minimizing $-\text{ELBO}_2$, denoted as,

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathbb{E}_q[\{\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| \mathbf{l}_{u,v})\}] + \alpha \text{KL}(q(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g | \boldsymbol{\psi}) \| q(\boldsymbol{\psi})) \quad (19)$$

Similarly, the first term and the second term can be calculated as,

$$\mathbb{E}_q[\{\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \| \mathbf{l}_{u,v})\}] = \frac{1}{N_g} \sum_{n=1}^{N_g} \sum_{i=1}^d \left(o_{v,i} \frac{\log o_{u,v}}{l_{u,v,i}} \right) \quad (20)$$

$$\text{KL}(q(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g | \boldsymbol{\psi}) \| q(\boldsymbol{\psi})) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g \in \boldsymbol{\psi}_g} \left(\log \frac{\sigma_\boldsymbol{\psi}^2}{\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g}^2}{\sigma_\boldsymbol{\psi}^2} + \frac{(\mu_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_g} - \mu_\boldsymbol{\psi})^2}{\sigma_\boldsymbol{\psi}^2} - 1 \right) \quad (21)$$

where N_g is the data size in the g -th group. With a similar sampling process, the parameters are also updated with gradient descent.

c) *Learning parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$.* As mentioned above, we adopt inference networks parametrized by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ to infer the personalized prior LED and the posterior LED of user self-report emotion based on the observed \mathbf{r}_u and $\mathbf{s}_{u,v}$. Holding other parameters fixed and removing the irrelevant items, ELBO(q) is simplified as,

$$\text{ELBO}_3 = \mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\{\mathbf{s}_{u,v}\} | \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\})] - \text{KL}(q(\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}) \| p(\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\})) \quad (22)$$

For the first term $\mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\{\mathbf{s}_{u,v}\} | \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\})]$, we introduce a reconstruction network based on the posterior distribution in Equation (11), and then draw a sample of $\mathbf{s}'_{u,v}$ from the reconstruction network. Formally, assuming the parameters of the reconstruction network is $\boldsymbol{\phi}_2$, and then $\mathbf{s}'_{u,v}$ is obtained by $\mathbf{s}'_{u,v} = \text{NN}_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_2}(\mathbf{z}_{u,v})$, $\mathbf{z}_{u,v} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)$. Then, maximizing the $\mathbb{E}_q[\log p(\{\mathbf{s}_{u,v}\} | \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\})]$ equals to minimizing the mean square error (MSE) between the ground truth $\mathbf{s}_{u,v}$ and the reconstructed $\mathbf{s}'_{u,v}$. We denote the MSE as follows,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE1}} = \mathbb{E}_q \left[\text{MSE}(\mathbf{s}_{u,v}, \mathbf{s}'_{u,v}) \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J J(s_{u,v,j} - s'_{u,v,j}) \quad (23)$$

where J is the dimensional size of $\mathbf{s}_{u,v}$; $s_{u,v,j}$ and $s'_{u,v,j}$ are the j -th values of $\mathbf{s}_{u,v}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{u,v}$, respectively.

The second term $\text{KL}(q(\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}) \| p(\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}, \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}))$ is denoted as \mathcal{L}_{KL} and can be transformed to (see Appendix A.1.3 for details),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL}} = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u \in \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_u\}} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\mu_{u,j}^2 + \sigma_{1,j}^2 - \log(\sigma_{1,j}^2) - 1 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} \in \{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}\}} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\log \frac{\sigma_{1,j}^2}{\sigma_{2,j}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{2,j}^2}{\sigma_{1,j}^2} + \frac{(\mu_{u,v,j} - \mu_{u,j})^2}{\sigma_{1,j}^2} - 1 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}$ is also hidden and its value is inferred by the neural network that takes $\boldsymbol{\mu}_u$ as its input (see above), we hope $\boldsymbol{\mu}_u$ to be high-quality (e.g., keeping rich information about \mathcal{S}_u as much as possible). Hence, we introduce a reconstruction network parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1$ that takes $\boldsymbol{\mu}_u$ as input and hope it can reconstruct \mathbf{r}_u , which contains

the user's personalized information. Formally, we denote the reconstructed sample as \mathbf{r}'_u , then, $\mathbf{r}'_u = NN_{\phi_1}(z_u)$, $z_u \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1)$. We minimize the MSE between \mathbf{r}'_u and \mathbf{r}_u through the following,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE2}} = \mathbb{E}_q(\text{MSE}[\mathbf{r}_u, \mathbf{r}'_u]) = \frac{1}{U} \sum_{u=1}^U \sum_{k=1}^K (r_{u,k} - r'_{u,k})^2 \quad (25)$$

where K is the dimensional size of \mathbf{r}_u . $r_{u,k}$ and $r'_{u,k}$ are the k -th values of \mathbf{r}_u and \mathbf{r}'_u , respectively.

We update the parameters including θ_1 , θ_2 , ϕ_1 , and ϕ_2 by minimizing the sum of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE1}}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE2}}$ and \mathcal{L}_{KL} with gradient descent.

d) *Iterative learning*. In addition to maximizing the likelihood of the observation whose lower bound is given by Equation (3), we also adopt the Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) loss [45] to train our model. BPR loss is commonly used for recommendation tasks, assuming that users prefer an item (music in our case) that they have chosen over an item that they have not. Formally, for a user $u \in \mathbb{U}$ chooses a music $v \in \mathbb{V}$ under emotion $e \in \mathbf{e}$. We randomly sample a music $\neg v \in \mathbb{V} \setminus v$ that u has not chosen, where $\mathbb{V} \setminus v$ represents the set of all music except v . We get a pairwise data record $(u, e, v, \neg v)$ and u 's preference score $m_{u,\neg v} = \mathbf{I}_{u,\neg v} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\neg v}^T + \mathbf{r}_{\neg v} \cdot \mathbf{r}_u^T$ for music $\neg v$. As aforementioned, user u prefers music v over $\neg v$, i.e., $m_{u,v}$ is expected to be higher than $m_{u,\neg v}$. Thus, we have the cost function for the recommendation, denoted as \mathcal{L}_{rec} ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_S|} \sum_{(u,e,v,\neg v) \in \mathcal{D}_S} -\ln \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-(m_{u,v} - m_{u,\neg v})}} \right) \quad (26)$$

where \mathcal{D}_S is the data set $(u, e, v, \neg v)$ constructed by random sampling, and $|\mathcal{D}_S|$ is the size of \mathcal{D}_S .

We combine Equations (15), (19), (23), (24), (26), and (26) to get the final cost function, denoted as \mathcal{L}_3 ,

$$\mathcal{L}_3 = \mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL1}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{KL2}} + \lambda_3 \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE2}} + \lambda_4 \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE1}} + \lambda_5 \mathcal{L}_1 + \lambda_6 \mathcal{L}_2 \quad (27)$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5$, and λ_6 are hyperparameters. \mathcal{L}_{KL1} and \mathcal{L}_{KL2} are the first and second terms in \mathcal{L}_{KL} , respectively. By minimizing the cost function \mathcal{L}_3 , we can update the parameters of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$, θ_1 , θ_2 , ϕ_1 , ϕ_2 , \mathbf{r}_u , and \mathbf{r}_v by backpropagation.

Since there are a large number of parameters to learn, considering the efficiency and stability of model training, we combine a two-phase approach with the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm [15] to learn these parameters. In the first phase, we learn the user music mood preference prediction models $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_g$. In the second phase, we learn the parameters of θ_1 , θ_2 , ϕ_1 , ϕ_2 , \mathbf{r}_u , and \mathbf{r}_v following the EM algorithm. In the E-step, we fix the inference networks and obtain the hidden variables, including $\boldsymbol{\mu}_u$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}$, and $\mathbf{I}_{u,v}$. In the M-step, we fix the generative networks and compute the cost function \mathcal{L}_3 , updating the parameters of inference networks by maximizing $-\mathcal{L}_3$. We iterate the E- and M-steps until convergence. Algorithm 2 provides the learning process.

4 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULT ANALYSIS

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate our proposed method. We are primarily concerned with answering the following research questions:

- **RQ1.** What is the performance of our method compared to existing music recommendation methods?
- **RQ2.** Does the incorporation of emotion heterogeneity across users and within a user and music mood preference heterogeneity across users and within a user improve recommendation performance?
- **RQ3.** How do key hyperparameters influence the performance of our method?
- **RQ4.** Can our method learn meaningful representations of emotion distributions?

Algorithm 2 Learning Process of HDBN

Input: User set \mathbb{U} , music set \mathbb{V} , user emotion set \mathbf{e} , user-music interaction history $\{(u, e, v)\}$, and music mood $\{\mathbf{o}_v\}$.

Hyper-parameters: $\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5$, and λ_6 ;

Output: $\psi, \{\psi_g\}_{g=1}^G, \theta_1, \phi_1, \theta_2, \phi_2, \{\mathbf{r}_u\}$, and $\{\mathbf{r}_v\}$;

Phase I:

Initialize ψ ;

for epoch in range(Epochs) **do**

for each batch input in $\{(u, e, v)\}$ **do**

 Compute the preferred music mood: $\mathbf{l}_{u,v} = \text{softmax}(\mathcal{F}_\psi(\mathbf{s}_{u,v}))$;

 Compute \mathcal{L}_1 and update ψ by gradient descent;

for g in range(G) **do**

 Initialize ψ_g by ψ ;

for epoch in range(Epochs) **do**

for each batch input in $\{(u, e, v)\}_g$ **do**

 Compute the user-preferred music mood: $\mathbf{l}_{u,v} = \text{softmax}(\mathcal{F}_{\psi_g}(\mathbf{s}_{u,v}))$;

 Compute \mathcal{L}_2 and update ψ_g by gradient descent;

Phase II:

Initialize $\theta_1, \phi_1, \theta_2, \phi_2, \{\mathbf{r}_u\}$, and $\{\mathbf{r}_v\}$;

while not convergence **do**

for all $u \in \mathbb{U}$ **do** **for all** $v \in \{(u, e, v)\}_g$ **do**

 Obtain data \mathcal{D}_S by randomly sampling $\neg v$ from $\mathbb{V} \setminus v$;

E-step:

for each batch input $\{(u, e, v, \neg v)\} \in \mathcal{D}_S$ **do**

 Generate the user's prior LED $q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u | \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_u, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1)$

 Generate the user's posterior LED $q(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v} | \boldsymbol{\mu}_u) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)$;

 Draw user latent emotion $\mathbf{z}_{u,v} \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{u,v}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)$;

 Obtain user-preferred music mood $\mathbf{l}_{u,v}(\mathbf{l}_{u,\neg v}) = \text{softmax}(\mathcal{F}_{\psi_g}(\mathbf{z}_{u,v}))$;

M-step:

 Calculate $m_{u,v} = \mathbf{l}_{u,v} \cdot \mathbf{o}_v^T + \mathbf{r}_v \cdot \mathbf{r}_u^T$ and $m_{u,\neg v} = \mathbf{l}_{u,\neg v} \cdot \mathbf{o}_{\neg v}^T + \mathbf{r}_{\neg v} \cdot \mathbf{r}_u^T$;

 Calculate \mathcal{L}_3 and update $\theta_1, \phi_1, \theta_2, \phi_2, \{\mathbf{r}_u\}$, and $\{\mathbf{r}_v\}$ by gradient descent; // $\lambda_5 = 0$ and $\lambda_6 = 0$

4.1 Dataset

The data used to evaluate our method's effectiveness should meet the following requirements: users' emotions should be acquired before they listen to music such that music selections are influenced by users' emotions rather than music influencing users' emotions. However, at present, no public data conforms to the above requirement. Hence, we constructed a dataset named EmoMusicLJ to evaluate our method and support future related research.

The construction process of EmoMusicLJ is as follows. **Step (1):** User filtering. We take the LiveJournal two-million post (LJ2M) dataset collected from LiveJournal⁴ by Liu et al. [37] as the basis for constructing EmoMusicLJ. LiveJournal allows users to share their experiences and emotions through emotion tags⁵ and then provide the music they like at that moment. Figure 6 shows an example of a post on LiveJournal. From LJ2M, we extracted valuable information, including user IDs, user self-reported emotions, titles, artists, and corresponding 7Digital IDs of music tracks. To ensure adequate data for behavior modeling, we retained users who posted at least ten entries. As a result, we obtained 12,557 users. **Step (2):** Music alignment. Since some music IDs correspond to multiple titles, we split the different titles into separate

⁴<https://www.livejournal.com/>

⁵<https://www.livejournal.com/moodlist.bml>

music tracks and assigned them new IDs, resulting in 6,095 distinct music tracks. **Step (3)**: Music meta-information supplement. We collected meta-information for music, including genre, year of release, and audio files. For genre and release year, we crawl them from the well-known commercial web service Musicoverly based on the music title and artist name. For audio files, we retrieved candidates from 7Digital based on the music title and artist name. Then, we matched the IDs of the candidate files to the target music. If a match was found, we saved the corresponding audio file. Otherwise, we saved the first candidate audio file with the same title and artist as the target music. **Step (4)**: Music mood labeling. To get music mood, we trained a Bi-LSTM-based music mood recognition model on the Emotify dataset [2]. Emotify comprises 400 one-minute-long music pieces. In total, 1,778 annotators were asked to assign up to three of nine mood tags (including amazement, solemnity, tenderness, nostalgia, calmness, power, joyful activation, tension, and sadness) to a music track. On average, each music track received approximately 40 annotations. During model training and mood annotation, we utilized 35 audio features related to five music aspects: energy, rhythm, temporal, spectrum, and melody [58]. The loss of the Bi-LSTM model was measured by the KL divergence between the ground truth and predicted music mood distributions, with a final loss of 0.2673 upon model convergence.




Fig. 6. An example of a post on LiveJournal. The username and post content in this example have been hidden for privacy reasons.

As a result, EmoMusicLJ consists of 12,557 users and 6,095 music tracks, resulting in a total of 129,104 user-music interactions. It also includes 132 user emotion tags, 17 music genres, 49 release years, and 727 artists. Following a previous study [62], EmoMusicLJ was randomly split into training, validation, and test sets in a ratio of 8:1:1.

4.2 Baselines

We compare our method against three types of baseline methods: 1) emotion-free methods, 2) emotion-matching methods, and 3) emotion-as-a-feature methods.

- 1) Emotion-free methods: These methods are widely employed in recommendation systems and can be adopted for music recommendation, but they do not consider emotional information.
 - **Random** and **ItemPop**: In the Random method, music recommendations are made by randomly selecting tracks from the database. ItemPop recommends music based on its overall popularity.
 - **UCF** [1]: The user-based collaborative filtering (UCF) method generates recommendations for a target user by considering items interacted with by users who share similar music preferences to the target user.
 - **ICF** [1]: The item-based collaborative filtering (ICF) generates recommendations by assessing the similarity between the target item and the items in the target user’s interaction history.
 - **NCF** and **NeuMF** [22]: Neural collaborative filtering (NCF) leverages neural networks to capture the implicit interactions between users and items, replacing the traditional inner product of user and item vectors. Neural matrix factorization (NeuMF) integrates NCF with generalized matrix factorization to learn more adaptable and nonlinear interactions between user and item representations.

- **BPR-MF** [45]: BPR-MF is a traditional and renowned method for modeling item recommendation based on implicit user-item interactions. It learns a matrix factorization model using Bayesian personalized ranking.
- 2) Emotion matching methods: These methods recommend music by computing the similarity score between users' emotions or mood similarity between music.
- **UCFE** [16]: User-based collaborative filtering with emotion (UCFE) calculates user similarity by considering users' emotional contexts. (See Appendix A.2.1 for details)
 - **ICFE** [16]: Similar to UCFE, item-based collaborative filtering with emotion (ICFE) computes the similarity between music pieces by considering users' emotional contexts. (See Appendix A.2.2 for details)
 - **UCF+E**: Different from UCFE, which considers only the user emotions when calculating user similarity, in combination with traditional UCF, UCF+E incorporates user emotions as auxiliary information for computing user similarity.
 - **ICF+E**: ICF+E combines user emotions as auxiliary information with the traditional ICF when computing the similarity between music pieces.
- 3) Emotion-as-a-feature methods: These methods are deep learning-based techniques that incorporate user emotion and music mood as features.
- **PEIA** [48]: The personality and emotion integrated attentive (PEIA) model uses hierarchical attention to learn the influence of users' personalities and emotions on their music preferences. Due to the lack of user personality-related data, we remove the personality component of PEIA while retaining all other modules.
 - **Wide&Deep** [14]: An approach for jointly training wide linear models and deep neural networks. Wide&Deep combines the ability of generalized linear models to handle sparse features with the advantages of deep neural networks to learn generalized feature combinations.
 - **DeepFM** [19]: An approach that can simultaneously learn low-order and high-order feature interactions from the input raw features.

4.3 Evaluation metrics and experimental setting

We adopt two widely used metrics in recommendation systems [22, 48]: Hit Rate (HR) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG).

Given a music v , its predicted rating is computed alongside all other music that the user has not listened to. The top-K recommendation list is obtained by sorting the predicted ratings in descending order and selecting the first K music. HR@K is calculated as follows,

$$\text{HR@K} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \text{ in the top - K list} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

While HR@K solely assesses whether music v is present in the top-K list, NDCG@N considers the relative position of v within the top-K list. NDCG@K is computed as follows,

$$\text{NDCG@K} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{2^{\mathbb{I}(v)}}{\log_2(k+1)} \quad (29)$$

where k denotes the position of v in the top-K list. $\mathbb{I}(v)$ acts as an indicator, equaling 1 if v is in the top-K list, and 0 otherwise. Higher values of both HR@K and NDCG@K indicate better performance. We report their average values across all test samples. The length of the recommendation list K is set to 5, 10, 15, and 20.

We use TensorFlow with Python 3.7.2 to implement all methods and conduct experiments on a workstation equipped with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2620 v4 @ 2.10 GHz and an NVIDIA Titan X graphic card and a PC featuring an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-7700 CPU @ 3.60GHz. Grid search is employed to optimize hyperparameters for our method and baseline approaches. We initialize all model weights randomly. For our method, the size of latent emotion space is set to 16, which follows [60]. Additionally, we use 64 as the embedding dimensions for users and music tracks. Initial learning rates are set to 0.005 for music mood preference prediction and 0.05 for recommendation. The coefficients of α , λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_3 , and λ_4 are set to $1e-5$, 0.01, 0.05, $1e-6$, and $1e-4$, respectively. We use a batch size of 512 and adopt the Adam optimizer. During training, we randomly sample 10 negative instances for each positive instance per iteration. The number of user groups is set to 50.

4.4 Overall performance (RQ1)

In this section, we outline the recommendation performances of our method and baseline approaches. Table 3 summarizes the overall performances on metrics of HR@K and NDCG@K. The best performances are highlighted in bold, and the second-best results are underlined.

Table 3. Recommendation Performance of Different Methods on Test Set

Method	Hit Rate				Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain			
	HR@5	HR@10	HR@15	HR@20	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	NDCG@15	NDCG@20
Random	0.0009	0.0022	0.0022	0.0026	0.0006	0.0011	0.0009	0.0009
ItemPop	0.0225	0.0376	0.0502	0.0621	0.0143	0.0191	0.0224	0.0252
UCF	0.0832	0.1217	0.10451	0.1603	0.0533	.0657	0.0719	0.0755
ICF	0.0265	0.0418	0.0524	0.0621	0.0169	0.0219	0.0247	0.0270
NCF	0.0792	0.1066	0.1228	0.1340	0.0567	0.0655	0.0698	0.0724
NeuMF	0.0833	0.1074	0.1225	0.1338	0.0590	0.0668	0.0708	0.0735
BPR-MF	<u>0.1229</u>	<u>0.1593</u>	<u>0.1806</u>	<u>0.1974</u>	<u>0.0966</u>	<u>0.1073</u>	<u>0.1139</u>	<u>0.1179</u>
UCFE	0.0296	0.0373	0.0445	0.0503	0.0228	0.0253	0.0272	0.0285
ICFE	0.0057	0.0088	0.0103	0.0136	0.0034	0.0044	0.0048	0.0056
UCF+E	0.0812	0.1167	0.1396	0.1552	0.0053	0.0647	0.0708	0.0744
ICF+E	0.0261	0.0422	0.0535	0.0620	0.0169	0.0220	0.0250	0.0271
PELA	0.0863	0.1169	0.1385	0.1541	0.0613	0.0711	0.0766	0.0805
Wide&Deep	0.0678	0.0981	0.1221	0.1414	0.0472	0.0570	0.0633	0.0679
DeepFM	0.1001	0.1314	0.1502	0.1650	0.0737	0.0838	0.0887	0.0922
HDBN	0.1383	0.1660	0.1853	0.2006	0.1136	0.1227	0.1283	0.1313
Improvement	↑ 12.53%	↑ 4.21%	↑ 2.60%	↑ 1.62%	↑ 17.60%	↑ 14.35%	↑ 11.76%	↑ 11.37%

Based on Table 3, the following observations can be made:

- (1) HDBN achieves superior performance across all metrics compared to all baseline approaches. Our method outperforms the best-performing baseline by 12.53% and 17.60% on HR@5 and NDCG@5, respectively. This underscores the effectiveness of HDBN, enabling effective modeling of the problems of emotion heterogeneity and music mood preference heterogeneity across users and within a user, resulting in substantial enhancements in recommendation performance.

- (2) In comparing UCF, UCF+E, and UCFE, UCF demonstrates the best performance, followed by UCF+E. UCFE performs significantly worse than UCF and UCF+E. UCF+E uses user emotion as auxiliary information, while UCFE only considers user emotion similarity. This suggests that simply assuming similarity in music preferences among users with similar emotions may potentially impair recommendation performance. A similar trend is observed when comparing ICF, ICF+E, and ICFE. These observations underscore the importance of accounting for emotion heterogeneity and music mood preference heterogeneity in emotion-aware music recommendation, as UCF+E, UCFE, ICF+E, and ICFE fail to address these critical heterogeneity issues.
- (3) PEIA and DeepFM exhibit superior performance compared to UCF, suggesting that deep learning-based methods can effectively utilize information beyond user emotion similarity. However, these methods do not adequately address emotion heterogeneity and music mood preference heterogeneity across users and within a user, as their performances significantly lag behind HDBN. Interestingly, we can observe that deep learning-based methods perform worse than BPR-MF, which aligns with findings by Klingler et al. [31]. Klingler et al. noted that matrix factorization methods generally outperform neural network approaches on high-sparsity data, such as the EmoMusicLJ dataset used in our experiments with a sparsity of 99.83%. This further highlights the effectiveness of our method on sparse data.

4.5 Ablation study (RQ2)

To validate the effectiveness of the four components in HDBN, we individually ablate each component of HDBN and get the variants.

- **w/o emotion heterogeneity across users (w/o EHAU)**: This variant replaces the prior of posterior LED (i.e., \mathcal{S}_u) with standard Gaussian distributions.
- **w/o emotion heterogeneity within a user (w/o EHWU)**: This variant replaces the posterior LED with fixed emotion representation.
- **w/o music mood preference heterogeneity across users (w/o PHAU)**: This variant replaces the group-specific music mood preference prediction model (i.e., $\{\psi_g\}$) with the global model (i.e., ψ).
- **w/o music mood preference heterogeneity within a user (w/o PHWU)**: This variant replaces the BNNs (i.e., $\{\psi_g\}$) with traditional neural networks with fixed weights.

Table 4. Recommendation Results of the Ablation Experiment

Method	Hit Rate				Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain			
	HR@5	HR@10	HR@15	HR@20	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	NDCG@15	NDCG@20
w/o EHAU	0.1345 (↓ 2.75%)	0.1614 (↓ 2.77%)	0.1802 (↓ 2.75%)	0.1952 (↓ 2.69%)	0.1092 (↓ 3.87%)	0.1178 (↓ 3.99%)	0.1230 (↓ 3.38%)	0.1266 (↓ 3.58%)
w/o EHWU	0.1351 (↓ 2.37%)	0.1635 (↓ 1.53%)	0.1824 (↓ 1.59%)	0.1981 (↓ 1.26%)	0.1105 (↓ 2.81%)	0.1197 (↓ 2.51%)	0.1246 (↓ 2.17%)	0.1283 (↓ 2.34%)
w/o PHAU	0.1289 (↓ 6.80%)	0.1605 (↓ 3.31%)	0.1794 (↓ 3.18%)	0.1968 (↓ 0.89%)	0.1026 (↓ 9.68%)	0.1131 (↓ 7.82%)	0.1179 (↓ 7.38%)	0.1120 (↓ 7.08%)
w/o PHWU	0.1337 (↓ 3.44%)	0.1633 (↓ 1.65%)	0.1831 (↓ 1.20%)	0.1989 (↓ 0.85%)	0.1080 (↓ 5.19%)	0.1176 (↓ 4.34%)	0.1229 (↓ 3.58%)	0.1265 (↓ 3.79%)
HDBN	0.1383	0.1660	0.1853	0.2006	0.1136	0.1127	0.1273	0.1313

Notes: Best results are highlighted in **bold**. Values in parentheses indicate the extent of performance decline compared to our method.

Table 4 presents the results of the ablation experiments. From Table 4, we have the following observations:

- (1) After removing each component, the recommendation performances show a decrease, indicating that each of the four components contributes positively to the recommendation performance.
- (2) Model variant w/o PHAU exhibits the most significant performance decrease, with HR@5 and NDCG@5 dropping by 6.80% and 9.68%, respectively. This suggests that considering the differences in music mood preferences across users is crucial in emotion-aware music recommendation.
- (3) Model variant w/o PHWU exhibits the second highest degree of performance degradation, with HR@5 and NDCG@5 decreasing by 3.44% and 5.19%, respectively. This indicates that considering the music mood preference heterogeneity within a user under the same emotion improves recommendation performance.
- (4) The performance degradation of w/o EHAU and w/o EHWU is not significantly different. For w/o EHAU, HR@5 and NDCG@5 decrease by 2.75% and 3.87%, respectively, while for w/o EHWU, HR@5 and NDCG@5 decrease by 2.37% and 2.81%, respectively. This indicates that considering emotion heterogeneity across users has a greater impact on recommendation performance. This may be due to the greater diversity in emotion expressions among different users.

4.6 Sensitivity analysis (RQ3)

In this section, we analyze the influences of key hyperparameters, including the number of user groups G , the number of layers in music mood preference prediction model, hyperparameter α , the dimensions of user and music embeddings, learning rate and training batch size, the number of negative samples, and hyperparameters λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_3 , and λ_4 .

4.6.1 The number of user groups G . we apply the K-means algorithm to cluster users based on the genres of their listening histories. The optimal number of groups, G , is determined using the Elbow method [36]. Denote the sum of the distances of all users to the center of their respective groups as ‘‘Inertia’’. The Elbow method suggests that as G increases, Inertia decreases. As G approaches the optimal value, the rate of decrease in Inertia diminishes and tends to plateau. Consequently, the relationship between Inertia and G exhibits an elbow-shaped curve, with the optimal value of G corresponding to this inflection point. Figure 7 illustrates the relationship between Inertia and G . We set G to 50 based on this analysis.




Fig. 7. The change trend of Inertia with G .

4.6.2 The number of layers and α for music mood preference prediction model. After obtaining user groups, we train the BNNs with parameters of ψ and $\{\psi_g\}$ for the inference of user-preferred music mood $I_{u,v}$. We search the layer numbers

of the BNN within $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and the number of neurons of each layer within $\{32, 64, 128, 256\}$ to identify the optimal parameter configuration. Figure 8 presents the prediction performance of user-preferred music mood under different configurations. ultimately, we determine that setting the number of layers to 2 and the neuron number of each layer to 64 yields the best performance.




Fig. 8. The influence of the number of layers and neurons in each layer.

Figure 9 shows the influence of α in Equation (15) on the prediction performance of user music mood preference. We can see that, as α increases, the prediction performance decreases. This observation suggests a deviation between the posterior distribution and the standard Gaussian prior of ψ . We finally set α to $1e-4$.




Fig. 9. The influence of α on user music mood preference prediction.

After determining ψ , we initialize $\{\psi_g\}$ with ψ and fine-tune it on data for specific user groups. In comparison to the BNN ψ with $\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \parallel \mathbf{l}_{u,v}) = 0.0935$, the average value of $\text{KL}(\mathbf{o}_v \parallel \mathbf{l}_{u,v})$ with the fine-tuned BNNs $\{\psi_g\}$ is 0.0844. This indicates that user grouping can enhance the prediction performance of user music mood preferences.

4.6.3 The dimensions of user and music embeddings. The dimension of embeddings is an important factor affecting recommendation performance, while it also impacts the efficiency of the recommendation model [53]. A large embedding dimension can adequately capture the features of users and music, but it also requires more computational resources and time. We search for the dimension value within $\{8, 16, 32, 64, 128\}$. Figure 10 illustrates the recommendation performance across various embedding dimensions.

We can observe that smaller dimensions (e.g., 8 and 16) lead to poorer recommendation performance, likely due to inadequate capture of user and music features. The recommendation performance improves as the embedding dimension increases. However, beyond a certain threshold (e.g., 64 and 128), the enhancement in recommendation performance becomes marginal. Considering both the validity and computational complexity, we opt for an embedding dimension of 64.




Fig. 10. HR and NDCG with different embedding dimensions.

4.6.4 *Learning rate and training batch size.* We explore the influence of learning rate within $\{0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03, 0.05, 0.1\}$. Figure 11 displays the result. We can observe that recommendation performance initially improves and then declines with increasing learning rates. We determine the optimal learning rate to be 0.05.




Fig. 11. HR and NDCG with different learning rates.

Figure 12 shows the influence of batch size on recommendation performance. We search the training batch size in $\{64, 128, 256, 512, 1204\}$. We can observe that with the increase in batch size, the recommendation performance initially improves and then declines. This could be because a small batch size may make model training unstable, while a large batch size may hinder model generalization [21]. Finally, we set the optimal batch size to be 512.

4.6.5 *Number of negative samples.* We adopt the sampling-based BPR pairwise loss learning strategy to train our method, making the number of negative samples an important factor influencing recommendation performance. We search the number of negative samples per positive sample within $\{1, 4, 7, 10\}$. Figure 13 shows the impact of the number of negative samples on recommendation performance. We can observe that, consistent with previous findings [12], sampling more negative samples is more beneficial. However, the marginal benefit diminishes as the number of negative samples increases. Considering computational efficiency, we set the number of negative samples to 10.




Fig. 12. HR and NDCG with different training batch sizes.





Fig. 13. HR and NDCG with different negative sample sizes.

4.6.6 *Hyperparameters λ_1 , λ_2 , λ_3 , and λ_4 .* λ_1 and λ_2 are the relative weights of \mathcal{L}_{KL1} and \mathcal{L}_{KL2} , respectively. In Figure 14, we investigate the influence of λ_1 and λ_2 on recommendation performance. We can observe that both HR@K and NDCG@K first increase and then decrease with the increase of λ_1 and λ_2 . We finally set $\lambda_1=0.01$ and $\lambda_2=0.05$. We also observe that λ_2 is greater than λ_1 . This is might because λ_1 corresponds to inferring the personalized prior LED from user representations, while λ_2 corresponds to inferring the posterior LED from user self-reported emotion tags. User self-reported emotion tags better reflect the posterior LED, so the constraint of λ_2 is stronger than that of λ_1 .

λ_3 and λ_4 are the relative weights of \mathcal{L}_{MSE2} and \mathcal{L}_{MSE1} , respectively. Figure 15 shows the influences of λ_3 and λ_4 on recommendation performance. We can observe that both HR@K and NDCG@K initially increase and then decrease with the increase of λ_3 and λ_4 . We set $\lambda_3=1e-6$, and $\lambda_4=1e-4$. Similarly, we can see that λ_4 is greater than λ_3 . This might be due to λ_4 controls the constraint on reconstructing user self-reported emotion tags from the posterior LED, while λ_3 controls the constraint on reconstructing user representations from the personalized prior LED. It is difficult to reconstruct user representation from the prior LED, so the value of λ_3 is relatively smaller than λ_4 .

Fig. 14. HR and NDCG with different λ_1 and λ_2 .


4.7 Interpreting the meaning of LED

Following Ma et al. [39], we interpret the dimensions of the learned posterior LED by gradually varying the value of a specific dimension and observing its impact on predicting the user’s music mood preference. As noted by Ma et al., not all dimensions are readily interpretable. In this context, we analyze a user with ID 273,937 under the emotion of *Sad*, and Figure 16 provides the influence of representative dimensions.

From Figure 16, we have the following observations:

- (1) In Figure 16(a) and Figure 16(b), as the value of the first dimension in posterior LED increases, there is an increase in the predicted preference for *Calmness* while *Joyful Activation* decreases. This suggests that the first dimension likely represents the user’s inclination towards low-activity music moods.
- (2) In Figure 16(c) and Figure 16(d), the second dimension in the posterior LED appears to represent the user’s preference for high-activity music moods.
- (3) Notably, the 8th dimension in the posterior LED shows a U-shape impact on the user’s music mood preference (see Figure 16(e) and Figure 16(f)). Initially, as this dimension increases, the user’s preference for low-activity music mood decreases, while the preference for high-activity music mood increases. However, beyond a certain point, this trend reverses.

These observations suggest that our method can learn a posterior LED with a degree of interpretability.

Fig. 15. HR and NDCG with different λ_3 and λ_4 .

4.8 Case study

To assess whether our method can effectively capture user music mood preference heterogeneity within a user, we randomly select a user with ID 274,637 from the test set and analyze the user’s listening history and the top-5 recommendation list. From Figure 17(a), we can observe that user #274,637 has listened to three music under the emotion of *Bored*, which is akin to *Sleepy*. Notably, two of these tracks share a similar mood distribution, while the third one exhibits a distinct mood distribution. In Figure 17(b), we present the music mood distributions of the recommended top-5 tracks. It can be observed that the recommended tracks cater to the heterogeneous music mood preferences of user #274,637 under similar emotions.

In Figure 18(a), we observe another user with ID 269,990, who has listened to two tracks while experiencing emotions of *Angry* and *Aggravated*, both exhibiting similar mood distributions. Figure 18(b) shows the top-5 recommendation for user #269,990 in the emotion of *Cynical*, akin to *Angry* and *Aggravated*. It can be observed that our method can learn the user’s stable music mood preference. Meanwhile, our method demonstrates the capability to recommend music that deviates from the user’s historical music mood preference (illustrated by the green track in Figure 18(b)).

We also conduct an experiment to evaluate whether our method could capture the music mood preference heterogeneity across users with the same self-reported emotion. We randomly select two users with IDs 273,937 and 272,298, both in the emotion of *Depressed*. Figure 19(a) and Figure 19(c) illustrate their respective listening histories in different emotions. We can see that user #273,937 shows more variation in the distribution of music mood listened to compared to user #272,298. Similarly, Figure 19(b) and Figure 19(d) depict the mood distributions of the top-5 recommended tracks




Fig. 16. The influence of the dimensional value of the posterior LED on music mood preference prediction.




Fig. 17. Listening history and top-5 recommendation of user #274,637.

for each user. We can observe that the mood distributions for user #273,937's top-5 recommendations display more significant fluctuations compared to user #272,298.




Fig. 18. Listening history and top-5 recommendation of user #269990.




Fig. 19. Listening histories and top-5 recommendations of user #273,937 and user #272,298.

5 CONCLUSION

In this study, we propose a novel Heterogeneity-aware Deep Bayesian Network (HDBN) for emotion-aware music recommendation. HDBN comprises four components to cope with the problems of emotion heterogeneity across users and within a user and music mood preference heterogeneity across users and within a user. Specifically, we design an inference network for personalized prior LED modeling for emotion heterogeneity across users; we design another

Manuscript submitted to ACM

inference network for posterior LED modeling for emotion heterogeneity within a user; we group users for music mood preference heterogeneity across users, and design BNN-based music mood preference prediction models for music mood preference heterogeneity within a user. To validate the effectiveness of our model, we construct a large-scale dataset for emotion-aware music recommendation, named EmoMusicLJ, and conduct extensive experiments. Experimental results demonstrate that our method outperforms all baseline methods. Furthermore, case studies show our method's ability to effectively utilize user emotion and music mood for recommendation, and interpretability analysis shows that our method can learn meaningful latent emotion space for humans to understand.

Our study has several limitations that merit consideration in future research. First, the current method uses relatively simple Gaussian priors to represent the personalized prior LED. Future studies could delve into more sophisticated priors, drawing inspiration from relevant theories in psychology. Second, due to data limitations, our study relies on learning the posterior LED from user self-report emotion tags. More nuanced user emotion modeling could be explored in future studies if richer user behavior data, such as post-text content, becomes accessible. Third, limited by the datasets, this study does not account for the influence of music on user emotion. Future research can explore how users' emotions change after listening to music and how they further select music based on these changes.

REFERENCES

- [1] Charu C. Aggarwal. 2016. *Recommender systems*. Vol. 1. Springer, Berlin.
- [2] Anna Aljanaki, Frans Wiering, and Remco C. Veltkamp. 2016. Studying emotion induced by music through a crowdsourcing game. *Information Processing & Management* 52, 1 (Jan. 2016), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2015.03.004>
- [3] Ivana Andjelkovic, Denis Parra, and John O'Donovan. 2019. Moodplay: Interactive music recommendation based on Artists' mood similarity. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 121 (Jan. 2019), 142–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2018.04.004>
- [4] Sai Teja Annam, Jyostna Devi Bodapati, and RajaSekhar Konda. 2024. Emotion-aware music recommendations: A transfer learning approach using facial expressions. In *International Conference on Data & Information Sciences (ICDIS 2023)*. Springer, Singapore, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-6906-7_1
- [5] Lisa Feldman Barrett. 2006. Are emotions natural kinds? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 1, 1 (2006), 28–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00003.x>
- [6] Lisa Feldman Barrett. 2006. Solving the emotion paradox: Categorization and the experience of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10, 1 (Feb. 2006), 20–46. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1001_2
- [7] Lisa Feldman Barrett. 2009. Arousal is the spice of life: A psychological construction approach to understanding variability in emotion. *Cognition and Emotion* 23, 7 (Sept. 2009), 1284–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930902985894>
- [8] Lisa Feldman Barrett. 2022. Context reconsidered: Complex signal ensembles, relational meaning, and population thinking in psychological science. *American Psychologist* 77, 8 (Nov. 2022), 894–920. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001054>
- [9] Christine Bauer, Marta Kholodylo, and Christine Strauss. 2017. Music recommender systems challenges and opportunities for non-superstar artists. In *30th Bled eConference (BLED 2017)*. 21–32. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/bled2017/48>
- [10] Charles Blundell, Julien Cornebise, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Daan Wierstra. 2015. Weight uncertainty in neural network. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (PMLR, Vol. 37)*. ACM, New York, 1613–1622. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/blundell15.html>
- [11] Théo Bontempelli, Benjamin Chapus, François Rigaud, Mathieu Morlon, Marin Lorant, and Guillaume Salha-Galvan. 2022. Flow moods: Recommending music by moods on deezer. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '22)*. ACM, New York, 452–455. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3523227.3547378>
- [12] Chong Chen, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Chenyang Wang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2023. Revisiting negative sampling vs. non-sampling in implicit recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 1 (Feb. 2023), 12:1–12:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3522672>
- [13] Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishu Aradhya, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, and Mustafa Ispir. 2016. Wide & deep learning for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems (DLRS 2016)*. ACM, New York, 7–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2988450.2988454>
- [14] Zhiyong Cheng and Jialie Shen. 2016. On effective location-aware music recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 34, 2 (April 2016), 13:1–13:32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2846092>
- [15] Arthur P. Dempster, Nan M. Laird, and Donald B. Rubin. 1977. Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 39, 1 (1977), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1977.tb01600.x>
- [16] Shuiguang Deng, Dongjing Wang, Xitong Li, and Guandong Xu. 2015. Exploring user emotion in microblogs for music recommendation. *Expert Systems with Applications* 42, 23 (Dec. 2015), 9284–9293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2015.08.029>

- [17] Ronald S. Friedman, Elana Gordis, and Jens Förster. 2012. Re-exploring the influence of sad mood on music preference. *Media Psychology* 15, 2 (Sept. 2012), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2012.693812>
- [18] Fabian Greb, Wolff Schlotz, and Jochen Steffens. 2023. Personal and situational influences on the functions of music listening. *Psychology of Music* 46, 6 (May 2023), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735617724883>
- [19] Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang, Yunming Ye, Zhenguo Li, and Xiuqiang He. 2017. DeepFM: a factorization-machine based neural network for CTR prediction. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-17)*, Carles Sierra (Ed.). AAAI Press, 1725–1731. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/239>
- [20] Xiao Han, Fuyang Chen, and Junrong Ban. 2024. A gai-based multi-Scale convolution and attention mechanism model for music emotion recognition and recommendation from physiological data. *Available at SSRN* (Jan. 2024), 114382:1–114382:16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4665538>
- [21] Fengxiang He, Tongliang Liu, and Dacheng Tao. 2019. Control batch size and learning rate to generalize well: Theoretical and empirical evidence. In *33rd Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*. NeurIPS Proceedings, 1141–1150. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019
- [22] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web (WWW'17)*. ACM, 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3038912.3052569>
- [23] Kun-Yi Huang, Chung-Hsien Wu, Ming-Hsiang Su, and Hsiang-Chi Fu. 2017. Mood detection from daily conversational speech using denoising autoencoder and LSTM. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 5125–5129. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2017.7953133>
- [24] David J. Hughes, Ioannis K. Kratsiotis, Karen Niven, and David Holman. 2020. Personality traits and emotion regulation: A targeted review and recommendations. *Emotion* 20, 1 (2020), 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000644>
- [25] Aurobind V. Iyer, Viral Pasad, Smita R Sankhe, and Karan Prajapati. 2017. Emotion based mood enhancing music recommendation. In *2017 2nd IEEE International Conference on Recent Trends in Electronics, Information & Communication Technology (RTEICT)*. IEEE, 1573–1577. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RTEICT.2017.8256863>
- [26] Nicolas Jones and Pearl Pu. 2008. *User acceptance issues in music recommender systems*. Technical Report. Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne.
- [27] Patrik N. Juslin, Simon Liljeström, Daniel Västfjäll, Gonçalo Barradas, and Ana Silva. 2008. An experience sampling study of emotional reactions to music: listener, music, and situation. *Emotion* 8, 5 (2008), 668–683. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013505>
- [28] Patrik N. Juslin and John Sloboda. 2011. *Handbook of music and emotion: Theory, research, applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford NY.
- [29] Dongwann Kang and Sanghyun Seo. 2019. Personalized smart home audio system with automatic music selection based on emotion. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 78 (Feb. 2019), 3267–3276. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-018-6733-7>
- [30] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. 2014. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *the 2nd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. 1–14. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6114>
- [31] Yasamin Klingler, Claude Lehmann, João Pedro Monteiro, Carlo Saladin, Abraham Bernstein, and Kurt Stockinger. 2022. Evaluation of algorithms for interaction-sparse recommendations: Neural networks don’t always win. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT 2022)*. OpenProceedings, 475–486. <https://doi.org/10.48786/edbt.2022.42>
- [32] Peter Knees and Markus Schedl. 2013. A survey of music similarity and recommendation from music context data. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications* 10, 1 (Dec. 2013), 2:1–2:21. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2542205.2542206>
- [33] Peter Knees, Markus Schedl, Bruce Ferweda, and Audrey Laplante. 2019. *User awareness in music recommender systems*. De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110552485-009>
- [34] Jiayu Li, Zhiyu He, Yumeng Cui, Chenyang Wang, Chong Chen, Chun Yu, Min Zhang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2022. Towards ubiquitous personalized music recommendation with smart bracelets. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies* 6, 3 (Sept. 2022), 125:1–125:34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3550333>
- [35] Yu Liang and Martijn C. Willemsen. 2021. Interactive music genre exploration with visualization and mood control. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI'21)*. ACM, 175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397481.3450700>
- [36] Fan Liu and Yong Deng. 2020. Determine the number of unknown targets in open world based on elbow method. *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* 29, 5 (Jan. 2020), 986–995. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TFUZZ.2020.2966182>
- [37] Jen-Yu Liu, Sung-Yen Liu, and Yi-Hsuan Yang. 2014. LJ2M dataset: Toward better understanding of music listening behavior and user mood. In *2014 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICME.2014.6890172>
- [38] Zhiyuan Liu, Wei Xu, Wenping Zhang, and Qiqi Jiang. 2023. An emotion-based personalized music recommendation framework for emotion improvement. *Information Processing and Management* 60, 3 (May 2023), 103256:1–103256:12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2022.103256>
- [39] Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Peng Cui, Hongxia Yang, and Wenwu Zhu. 2019. Learning disentangled representations for recommendation. In *33rd Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)*. NeurIPS Proceedings, 1–12. https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2019
- [40] Alessandro B. Melchiorre and Markus Schedl. 2020. Personality correlates of music audio preferences for modelling music listeners. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (UMAP'20)*. ACM, New York, 313–317. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3340631.3394874>
- [41] Vincenzo Moscato, Antonio Picariello, and Giancarlo Sperli. 2020. An emotional recommender system for music. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 36, 5 (Sept. 2020), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2020.3026000>

- [42] Minsu Park, Jennifer Thom, Sarah Mennicken, Henriette Cramer, and Michael Macy. 2019. Global music streaming data reveal diurnal and seasonal patterns of affective preference. *Nature human behaviour* 3, 3 (2019), 230–236. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0508-z>
- [43] Marco Polignano, Fedelucio Narducci, Marco de Gemmis, and Giovanni Semeraro. 2021. Towards emotion-aware recommender systems: an affective coherence model based on emotion-driven behaviors. *Expert Systems with Applications* 170 (May 2021), 114382:1–114382:16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.114382>
- [44] Hédi Razgallah, Michalis Valchos, Ahmad Ajalloeian, Ninghao Liu, Johannes Schneider, and Alexis Steinmann. 2024. Using neural and graph neural recommender systems to overcome choice overload: evidence from a music education platform. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 42, 4 (Feb. 2024), 92:1–92:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637873>
- [45] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. ACM, New York, 452–461. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.2618>
- [46] J. Ben Schafer, Joseph Konstan, and John Riedl. 1999. Recommender systems in e-commerce. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM conference on Electronic commerce (EC'99)*. ACM, New York, 158–166. <https://doi.org/10.1145/336992.337035>
- [47] Markus Schel, Peter Knees, Brian McFee, Dmitry Bogdanov, and Marius Kaminskas. 2015. *Music recommender systems*. Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-7637-6_13
- [48] Tiancheng Shen, Jia Jia, Yan Li, Yihui Ma, Yaohua Bu, Hanjie Wang, Bo Chen, Tat-Seng Chua, and Wendy Hall. 2020. PEIA: personalized and emotion integrated attentive model for music recommendation on social media platforms. In *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-20, Vol. 34)*. AAAI Press, Palo Alto, CA, 206–213. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i01.5352>
- [49] Roni Shifriess, Ehud Bodner, and Yuval Palgi. 2015. When you're down and troubled: Views on the regulatory power of music. *Psychology of Music* 43, 6 (2015), 793–807. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735614540360>
- [50] Yading Song, Simon Dixon, and Marcus Pearce. 2012. A survey of music recommendation systems and future perspectives. In *9th International Symposium on Computer Music Modeling and Retrieval (CMMR 2012)*. Springer, 395–410. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:15258254>
- [51] Christa L. Taylor and Ronald S. Friedman. 2015. Sad mood and music choice: Does the self-relevance of the mood-eliciting stimulus moderate song preference? *Media Psychology* 18, 1 (2015), 24–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2013.826589>
- [52] Hieu Tran, Tuan Le, Anh Do, Tram Vu, Steven Bogaerts, and Brain Howard. 2023. Emotion-aware music recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 37th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2023, Vol. 37)*. AAAI Press, Washington, DC, 16087–16095. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i13.26911>
- [53] Dongjing Wang, Xin Zhang, Yuyu Yin, Dongjin Yu, Guandong Xu, and Shuiguang Deng. 2023. Multi-view enhanced graph attention network for session-based music recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 42, 1 (Aug. 2023), 16:1–16:30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3592853>
- [54] Qiang Wei, Yao Mu, Xunhua Guo, Weijie Jiang, and Guoqing Chen. 2023. Dynamic Bayesian network-based product recommendation considering consumers' multistage shopping journeys: A marketing funnel perspective. *Dynamic Bayesian network-based product recommendation considering consumers' multistage shopping journeys: A marketing funnel perspective* Article In Advance (2023), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2020.0277>
- [55] Andrew G. Wilson and Pavel Izmailov. 2020. Bayesian deep learning and a probabilistic perspective of generalization. In *34th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2020)*, 4697–4708. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020
- [56] Le Wu, Xiangnan He, Kun Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2022. A survey on accuracy-oriented neural recommendation: From collaborative filtering to information-rich recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35, 5 (May 2022), 4425–4445. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2022.3145690>
- [57] Chao Xue, Tian Li, Shufei Yin, Xinyi Zhu, and Yuxin Tian. 2018. The influence of induced mood on music preference. *Cognitive processing* 19 (July 2018), 517–525. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-018-0872-7>
- [58] Yi-Hsuan Yang and Homer H. Chen. 2011. *Music emotion recognition*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- [59] Mao Ye, Xingjie Liu, and Wang-Chien Lee. 2012. Exploring social influence for recommendation: a generative model approach. In *Proceedings of the 35th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '12)*. ACM, 671–680. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2348283.2348373>
- [60] John M. Zelenski and Randy J. Larsen. 2000. The distribution of basic emotions in everyday life: A state and trait perspective from experience sampling data. *Journal of Research in Personality* 34, 2 (June 2000), 178–197. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1999.2275>
- [61] Xueqiang Zeng, Qifan Chen, Xuefeng Fu, and Jiali Zuo. 2021. Emotion wheel attention-based emotion distribution learning. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 2169–3536. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3119464>
- [62] Lin Zheng, Naicheng Guo, Weihao Chen, Jin Yu, and Dazhi Jiang. 2020. Sentiment-guided sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR'20, July)*. ACM, New York, 1957–1960. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401330>

A APPENDICES

A.1 Equation Derivation

A.1.1 *The Derivation of $\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\})$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) &= \log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) \int (q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) d(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \\
&= \int q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) d(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q [\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log \left(\frac{p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\})}{p(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\})} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log \left(\frac{p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \cdot q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\})}{p(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) \cdot q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\})} \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) - \log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&\quad + \text{KL} \left(\log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \parallel p(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

A.1.2 *The Derivation of ELBO(q).*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ELBO}_q &= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) - \log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \cdot p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&\quad - \left(\mathbb{E}_q \left[\log q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \right] - \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] \right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_q \left[\log p(\{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\} \mid \{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right] \\
&\quad - \text{KL} \left(q(\{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}, \{I_{u,v}\}) \parallel p(\{m_{u,v}\}, \{s_{u,v}\}, \{\psi_g\}, \psi, \{\mu_{u,v}\}) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

A.1.3 *The derivation of* $\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}))$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\})) &= \int q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \log \frac{q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\})} d(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \\
&= \int q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) q(\{\mu_u\}) \log \frac{q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) q(\{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) p(\{\mu_u\})} d(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \\
&= \int q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) q(\{\mu_u\}) \left(\log \frac{q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\})} + \log \frac{q(\{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_u\})} \right) d(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \\
&= \int q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) \left(\int q(\{\mu_u\}) \log \frac{q(\{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_u\})} d\{\mu_u\} \right) d\{\mu_{u,v}\} \\
&\quad + \int q(\{\mu_u\}) \left(\int q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) \log \frac{q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\})}{p(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\})} d\{\mu_{u,v}\} \right) d\{\mu_u\} \\
&= \text{KL}(q(\{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_u\})) + \text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}))
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_{u,v}$ is generated from μ_u , the posterior distribution of μ_u is used as the prior of $\mu_{u,v}$. Above Equation can be written as,

$$\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\})) = \text{KL}(q(\{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_u\})) + \text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) \parallel q(\{\mu_u\}))$$

Since $q(\mu_u) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_u, \sigma_1)$, $p(\mu_u) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$, and $q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_{u,v}, \sigma_2)$, the first and the second term in above Equation can be calculated as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(q(\{\mu\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_u\})) &= \sum_{\mu_u \in \{\mu_u\}} \text{KL}(q(\mu_u) \parallel p(\mu_u)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu_u \in \{\mu_u\}} \sum_{j=1}^J (\mu_{u,j}^2 + \sigma_{1,j}^2 - \log(\sigma_{1,j}^2) - 1) \\
\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\} \mid \{\mu_u\}) \parallel q(\{\mu_u\})) &= \sum_{\mu_{u,v} \in \{\mu_{u,v}\}} \text{KL}(q(\mu_{u,v} \mid \mu_u) \parallel q(\mu_u)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu_{u,v} \in \{\mu_{u,v}\}} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\log \frac{\sigma_{1,j}^2}{\sigma_{2,j}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{2,j}^2}{\sigma_{2,j}^2} + \frac{(\mu_{u,v,j} - \mu_{u,v})^2}{\sigma_{1,j}^2} - 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where J is the dimensional size of μ_u .

Thus, $\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}))$ can be computed as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{KL}(q(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\}) \parallel p(\{\mu_{u,v}\}, \{\mu_u\})) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu_u \in \{\mu_u\}} \sum_{j=1}^J (\mu_{u,j}^2 + \sigma_{1,j}^2 - \log(\sigma_{1,j}^2) - 1) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu_{u,v} \in \{\mu_{u,v}\}} \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\log \frac{\sigma_{1,j}^2}{\sigma_{2,j}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{2,j}^2}{\sigma_{2,j}^2} + \frac{(\mu_{u,v,j} - \mu_{u,v})^2}{\sigma_{1,j}^2} - 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

A.2 Details of UCFE and ICFE

In this part, we provide the detailed calculation process of UCFE and ICFE.

A.2.1 UCFE.

For two users u_1 and u_2 , the similarity is computed as,

$$sim(u_1, u_2) = \frac{\sum_{v \in \mathbb{V}_{u_1} \cap \mathbb{V}_{u_2}} \cos(\mathbf{e}_{u_1, v}, \mathbf{e}_{u_2, v})}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{V}_{u_1}| \times |\mathbb{V}_{u_2}|}}$$

where \mathbb{V}_{u_1} and \mathbb{V}_{u_2} are music set listened by u_1 and u_2 respectively. Then the first m users $\mathbb{U}_{u, m}$ for the target user u can be obtained based on the user similarity. The target user u 's interest in music v can be computed as,

$$r_{u, v} = \sum_{u' \in \mathbb{U}_{u, m} \cap \mathbb{U}_v} sim(u, u') \times \cos(\mathbf{e}_{u_1, v}, \mathbf{e}_{u_2, v})$$

where \mathbb{U}_v is the set of users who listened to music v . \mathbf{e}_u is the current emotion of u , and $\mathbf{e}_{u', v}$ is the emotion of user u' when listening to music v .

A.2.2 ICFE.

For two music v_1 and v_2 , the similarity is computed as,

$$sim(v_1, v_2) = \frac{\sum_{u \in \mathbb{U}_{v_1} \cap \mathbb{U}_{v_2}} \cos(\mathbf{e}_{u, v_1}, \mathbf{e}_{u, v_2})}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{U}_{v_1}| \times |\mathbb{U}_{v_2}|}}$$

where \mathbb{U}_{v_1} is the set of users who listened to music v_1 . \mathbb{U}_{v_2} is the set of users who listened to music v_2 . \mathbf{e}_{u, v_1} and \mathbf{e}_{u, v_2} are emotion of user u when listening to music v_1 and v_2 , respectively. Then the first m music pieces $\mathbb{V}_{v, m}$ for the target music v can be obtained based on the similarity. The target user u 's interest in music v can be computed as,

$$r_{u, v} = \sum_{v' \in \mathbb{V}_{v, m} \cap \mathbb{V}_u} sim(v, v') \times \cos(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_{u, v'})$$

where \mathbb{V}_u is the set of music that had been listened by u . $\mathbf{e}_{u, v'}$ is the emotion of user u when listening to music v' .