

HAM: Hybrid Associations Models for Sequential Recommendation

Bo Peng, Zhiyun Ren, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, *Member, IEEE*, and Xia Ning*, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Sequential recommendation aims to identify and recommend the next few items for a user that the user is most likely to purchase/review, given the user's purchase/rating trajectories. It becomes an effective tool to help users select favorite items from a variety of options. In this manuscript, we developed hybrid associations models (HAM) to generate sequential recommendations using three factors: 1) users' long-term preferences, 2) sequential, high-order and low-order association patterns in the users' most recent purchases/ratings, and 3) synergies among those items. HAM uses simplistic pooling to represent a set of items in the associations, and element-wise product to represent item synergies of arbitrary orders. We compared HAM models with the most recent, state-of-the-art methods on six public benchmark datasets in three different experimental settings. Our experimental results demonstrate that HAM models significantly outperform the state of the art in all the experimental settings, with an improvement as much as 46.6%. In addition, our run-time performance comparison in testing demonstrates that HAM models are much more efficient than the state-of-the-art methods, and are able to achieve significant speedup as much as 139.7 folds.

Index Terms—Recommender Systems, Machine Learning, Sequential Recommendation

1 INTRODUCTION

SEQUENTIAL recommendation aims to identify and recommend the next few items for a user that the user is most likely to purchase/review, given the user's purchase/rating trajectories (e.g., sequences of purchased items, and time stamps of the purchases if available). It becomes an effective tool to help users select favorite items from a variety of options. A key challenge in sequential recommendation is to identify, learn or represent the patterns and dynamics in users' purchase/rating sequences that are most pertinent to inform their future interactions with other items, and also to capture the relations between such patterns and future interactions. With the prosperity of deep learning, many deep models, particularly based on recurrent neural networks [1], [2] and with attention mechanisms, have been developed for sequential recommendation purposes. These methods typically model users' sequential behaviors and their long-term/short-term preferences, and have significantly improved recommendation performance.

However, given the notoriously sparse nature of data in recommendation problems, a question on these deep learning methods, particularly those with attention mechanisms, is that whether the sparse recommendation data are

sufficient to enable well-learned attention weights or any hypothesized recurrent patterns with many parameters, and whether these learned weights and patterns can play effective roles in identifying important information leading to accurate recommendations. Recent studies [3], [4] bring such concerns on recommendation algorithms in general, demonstrating that complicated deep recommendation methods may not always outperform simple ones. We have similar conclusions based on our study on the attention weights of a state-of-the-art method [5] in Section 7.2: the learned attention weights are not always meaningful.

To better learn from sparse, historical purchase/rating sequences and generate more accurate sequential recommendations, we ask the questions whether simpler models are actually more effective and more efficient. Particularly, we wonder whether simplistic pooling instead of attention mechanisms, and more explicit and intuitive patterns instead of highly parameterized recurrence are superior on sparse, sequential recommendation data. Motivated by the above questions, we propose a set of new, hybrid associations models, denoted as HAM. HAM models explicitly use the following three intuitive factors to generate the sequential recommendations via a simplistic linear scoring function: 1) users' general/long-term preferences, 2) sequential, association patterns in the users' most recent purchases/ratings, and 3) synergies among the most recent, purchased/rated items. It has been shown that the users' general preferences persist in a relatively long period [6], and play an important role to determine in their purchases/ratings [7]. For example, some users may prefer warm colors, while others may prefer cool colors; such preference would effect their purchases during a long period. Previous study [8] has also shown the existence of sequential associations in recommendation data (e.g., sequential association rules). Thus, among all the items, the probabilities of being purchased next given previous purchases will not be equal for each user.

- Bo Peng is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210.
E-mail: peng.707@buckeyemail.osu.edu
- Srinivasan Parthasarathy and Xia Ning are with the Department of Biomedical Informatics, and the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210.
E-mail: srini@cse.ohio-state.edu, ning.104@osu.edu
- Zhiyun Ren is with the Department of Biomedical Informatics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210.
E-mail: ren.685@osu.edu
- *Corresponding author

- This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

Manuscript received April 19, 2005; revised August 26, 2015.

Moreover, the synergies among items, also called union-level effects in literature [8], could enable helpful, additional information for the recommendations that each individual items could not on their own.

In HAM models, we learn the users' general preferences by leveraging their all historical purchases/ratings and represent the preferences in user embeddings. Thus, the user embeddings will encode the user preferences that are relatively consistent across different items. The item association patterns used in HAM include both high-order associations (i.e., many items together induce the next, a few items) and low-order associations (i.e., only a few items together induce the next, a few items). We use the pooling mechanism (i.e., mean pooling and max pooling) to model the high/low-order item associations. The HAM model with item associations and max/mean pooling is denoted as HAM_x/HAM_m. In addition, we explicitly model the synergies among item pairs using Hadamard product from their embeddings and extend that to model the synergies among arbitrary numbers of items in a recursive way. We use the latent cross [9] technique to effectively combine the item synergies and item associations. The HAM model with both item associations and synergies among the associations is denoted as HAM^s. The recommendations on the next items are generated based on their recommendation scores aggregated from users' general preferences, item association patterns (and item synergies).

We conducted a comprehensive set of experiments and compare the HAM models with 3 the most recent, state-of-the-art baseline methods on 6 public benchmark datasets in 3 different experimental settings. Our experimental results demonstrate that HAM models significantly outperform the state-of-the-art methods in all the experimental settings, with the best improvement 13.3% over the state-of-the-art method HGN. In addition, we conducted an ablation study to verify the effects of low-order associations and users' general preferences. The results demonstrate the importance of explicitly modeling both of them. Moreover, we compared the run-time performance in testing of HAM models and baseline methods. The results show that HAM models are much more efficient than deep methods with a speedup as much as 139.7 folds, and an average 2.2-fold speedup compared to the state of the art.

We also conducted a thorough study on all the baseline methods with exhaustive parameter tuning. We studied the attention weights learned in benchmark datasets by one of the state-of-the-art methods, and discussed the potential issues of using attention mechanisms in sequential recommendation. We also studied various experimental settings for evaluating the performance of sequential recommendation and discussed the potential issues.

Our major contributions are summarized as follows:

- We proposed a novel sequential recommendation method HAM. HAM models three intuitive factors explicitly 1) users' long-term preference, 2) sequential, association patterns among items and 3) synergies among items. To the best of our knowledge, HAM is the first method that explicitly models both high-order and low-order sequential associations among items, and their synergies (Section 4).
- HAM uses simplistic pooling instead of learned attentions to efficiently represent a set of items (Section 4).
- HAM significantly outperforms the state-of-the-art meth-

ods. The experimental results over 6 benchmark datasets demonstrate that HAM achieves significant improvement in both recommendation performance and time efficiency compared to the state-of-the-art methods in various experimental settings (Section 6).

- We studied various experimental settings in which sequential recommendation performance is evaluated, and discussed the potential issues in the most widely used experimental setting in literature (Section 7).
- We conducted a study on the state-of-the-art methods more thoroughly than reported in their respective papers, and discussed potential issues (Section 7).
- We investigated the attention weights learned in benchmark datasets and studied the potential scenarios in which pooling could outperform attention mechanisms in sequential recommendation (Section 7).
- For reproducibility and fair comparison, we published our code and data at <https://github.com/BoPeng112/HAM> and reported all the parameters used in the study (Appendix).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous sequential recommendation methods have been developed, particularly using Markov Chains (MCs), Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), attention and gating mechanisms, etc. Specifically, MCs-based methods, such as factorized personalized Markov chains method (FPMC) [6], use MCs to capture pairwise item-item transition relations to recommend the next item for each user. Based on FPMC, He *et al.* [7] used high-order MCs to capture the impact from all historical purchases/ratings on the next item. Recently, many RNN-based methods [1], [2], [10] have been developed to model the sequential patterns in users' purchase/rating sequences. For instance, Hidasi *et al.* [1] developed a gated recurrent units (GRUs) based recommendation model (GRU4Rec), which uses GRUs to capture users' short-term preferences. Hidasi *et al.* [2] further improved GRU4Rec to GRU4Rec++ by introducing a novel ranking loss to mitigate the gradient vanish problem in GRUs. In addition, Quadana *et al.* [10] developed a hierarchical RNN-based recommendation model to capture the users' short-term preferences in the current session and the evolvement of users' preferences across different sessions.

Besides RNNs, attention mechanisms are also adapted to model the sequential patterns among sequences. Li *et al.* [11] developed a neural attentive recommendation model (NARM), which extends GRU4Rec by introducing the attention mechanism to improve the GRUs' ability on modeling long-term dependence. Liu *et al.* [12] developed an attention-based recommendation mode that solely relies on attention mechanisms to model the sequential patterns among sequences. Kang *et al.* [13] developed a self-attention-based sequential model (SASRec) to capture a few, most informative items in users' purchase/rating sequences to generate recommendations. Recent work also adapts CNNs for sequential recommendation. For example, Tang *et al.* [8] developed a convolutional sequence embedding recommendation model (Caser), which uses multiple convolutional filters on the most recent purchases/ratings




Fig. 1: HAM Model Architecture

to extract union-level features from a set of recent items. Yuan *et al.* [14] developed a CNN-based generative model NextItRec to improve Caser on learning long-term dependencies in the item sequences. Ma *et al.* [5] developed a hierarchical gating network (HGN), which captures item-item transition relations and user long-term preferences, and uses gating mechanisms to identify important items and their latent features from users' historical purchases/ratings. HGN has been demonstrated as the state of the art, and outperforms an extensive set of existing methods including GRU4Rec [1], GRU4Rec++ [2] and NextItRec [14].

3 DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS

Table 1 presents the key notations using in this manuscript. In this manuscript, the historical purchases or ratings of user i in chronological order are represented as a sequence $S_i = \{s_i(1), s_i(2), \dots\}$, where $s_i(t)$ is the t -th purchased/rated item. A length- l subsequence of S_i starting at the t -th purchase/rating is denoted as $S_i(t, l)$, that is, $S_i(t, l) = \{s_i(t), s_i(t+1), \dots, s_i(t+l-1)\}$. When no ambiguity arises, we will eliminate i in $S_i/S_i(t, l)$. We use upper-case letters to denote matrices, lower-case and bold letters to denote row vectors, and lower-case non-bold letters to represent scalars. In this manuscript, we tackle the sequential recommendation problem defined as follows:

Sequential Recommendation Problem: for a user i , given S_i , recommend a few items she/he will purchase/rate next.

4 METHODS

Fig. 1 presents the HAM architecture. HAM generates recommendations for the next items for each user using three factors: 1) the user's general/long-term preferences (Section 4.1), 2) the sequential, association patterns in the user's most recent purchases/ratings (Section 4.2), and 3) synergies among items that users purchased/rated most recently (Section 4.2.2). These three factors will be used to calculate a recommendation score for each item candidate (Section 4.3) in order to prioritize and recommend the next items.

Before we discuss HAM, we first discuss the heterogeneous item embeddings here that HAM will be using. It has been shown [6], [13], [15] that the item transitions may be asymmetric: item j might be frequently purchased/rated after item k , but not vice versa. To model such asymmetry

TABLE 1: Notations

notations	meanings
$m/n, d$	number of users /items, embedding dimension
S_i	purchase/rating sequence of user i
$S_i(t, l)$	a length- l subsequence of S_i starting from the t -th purchase/rating
U/V	user/item embedding matrix
W	candidate item embedding matrix
r_{ij}	the recommendation score of user i on item j
n_h/n_l	the number of items in high-/low-order associations
n_p	the number of items to calculate recommendation errors during training

in HAM, we follow the ideas of heterogeneous item embeddings [13] and learn two item embedding matrices, denoted as $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, respectively. Both V and W are lookup tables, in which the j -th rows, denoted as \mathbf{v}_j and \mathbf{w}_j , respectively, represent item j . In HAM, if item j is used to recommend the next items, it is represented by \mathbf{v}_j . If item j is a candidate to be recommended, it is represented by \mathbf{w}_j .

4.1 Modeling Users' General Preferences

It has been shown that the users' general preferences persist in a relatively long period [16], and play an important role in users' purchases/ratings [7]. For example, some users may prefer items of low price, while others may prefer luxurious items that could be more expensive. Therefore, in HAM, we learn users' general preferences using an embedding matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ (optimization details in Section 4.4). U serves as a lookup table, in which the i -th row, denoted as \mathbf{u}_i , represents the general preferences of user i . Importantly, \mathbf{u}_i stays the same for user i 's recommendations, and is learned from all the items purchased/rated by the user.

4.2 Modeling Sequential Hybrid Associations

Previous study [8] has shown the existence of sequential associations in data of recommendation problems. That is, the probabilities of being purchased next given previous purchases will not be equal for all the items for each user. For example, after watching the movie Avengers: Infinity War, users may be more likely to watch the movie Avengers: Endgame, which is the sequel of the previous movie, than the movie Roman Holiday, which is of a different genre and story. Therefore, using the sequential, association patterns, we can better identify the next most possible items given immediately previous purchases.

We denote the sequential association at time t from its previous n_h purchases/ratings to the next n_p subsequent purchases/ratings as $S(t-n_h, n_h) \rightarrow S(t, n_p)$, and the number of the involved n_h+n_p items as the order of the association. It has also been shown [8] that the sequential associations among items in benchmark recommendation datasets (used in experiments as in Section 5.2) have different orders. For example, about 50% significant associations have $n_h=2$ and $n_p \leq 2$ (i.e., previous 2 purchases/ratings have immediate effects on the next 1 or 2 purchases/ratings), and about 15% significant associations have $n_h=4$ and $n_p \leq 2$.

We propose to explicitly model the item associations of different orders in HAM such that the aggregated information from the previous different numbers of purchases/ratings will contribute to the recommendation scores of all the

subsequent item candidates. Particularly, we include a high-order association $S(t-n_h, n_h) \rightarrow S(t, n_p)$ and a low-order association $S(t-n_l, n_l) \rightarrow S(t, n_p)$, where $n_l < n_h$ and $S(t-n_l, n_l) \subset S(t-n_h, n_h)$, to recommend the next n_p items. During training, we split the historical purchase/rating sequence of each user into multiple subsequences (training instances) of length $n_h + n_p$ (these subsequences will overlap through a sliding window, Section 5.3), and learn the individual item embeddings, and thus the embeddings of n_h/n_l successive items, from all the length- $(n_h + n_p)$ subsequences. Note that HAM can be a general framework, in which arbitrary numbers of various-order associations can be incorporated. We use high-order associations and low-order associations in HAM because intuitively, the most recent purchased/rated items are more informative than earlier items in indicating the next items that users may purchase/rate. Thus, we emphasize the effect of the most recent purchased/rated items in $S(t-n_l, n_l)$ by explicitly modeling the low-order associations, and also use $S(t-n_h, n_h)$ to incorporate a slightly longer purchase history and its trend.

4.2.1 Modeling Item Associations: HAM_x and HAM_m

In order to represent the information from the previous n_h/n_l purchased/rated items as a whole, we use pooling mechanisms, and learn one embedding \mathbf{h}/\mathbf{o} for the n_h/n_l successive purchases/ratings using 1) max pooling and 2) mean pooling, respectively, from individual item embeddings of the n_h/n_l purchased/rated items, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } S_i(t-n_h, n_h): \quad & \mathbf{h}_i^t = \max/\text{mean}(\mathbf{v}_j), \\ & j \in S(t-n_h, n_h) \\ \text{for } S_i(t-n_l, n_l): \quad & \mathbf{o}_i^t = \max/\text{mean}(\mathbf{v}_j), \\ & j \in S(t-n_l, n_l) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where max/mean indicates either max pooling or mean pooling. HAM with high-order and low-order associations calculated from the above max and mean pooling is denoted as HAM_x and HAM_m , respectively.

Given the sparse nature of the data in recommendation problems, it might be difficult to learn and differentiate the contributions of different items. The mean pooling is a simplistic solution to average the effects from each individual item. The max pooling is based on the assumption that the purchased/rated items contribute in various dimensions to determine the next n_p purchases/ratings.

4.2.2 Modeling High-Order Item Synergies: HAM_x^s and HAM_m^s

The pooling in Section 4.2.1 learns the aggregated effects of all the items together in $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ and in $S_i(t-n_l, n_l)$ on recommending next items. Literature suggests that there could be synergies among certain items [8] that could impact the next items differently (so called union-level effects). For example, if the user purchased candles and wines together, it is likely that she/he is preparing for a candlelight dinner, and thus we may recommend steaks to her/him for the dinner. However, if we consider candles or wines independently, better recommendations could be birthday cakes or beer, based on item associations. Thus, the synergies among items in $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ may provide additional information that is not possible from individual items alone. Motivated by this observation, we further incorporate the synergies among the items in HAM.

In HAM, we model the synergies among item j and item k in $S(t-n_h, n_h)$ using Hadamard product (element-wise product) of their embeddings as follows:

$$\mathbf{c}_{jk}^{(2)} = \mathbf{v}_j \circ \mathbf{v}_k, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{c}_{jk}^{(2)}$ is the synergy vector between the items j and k ; \mathbf{v}_j and \mathbf{v}_k are the embeddings of item j and k , respectively; \circ is the Hadamard product operator (element-wise product). The intuition is that if two items both have high values on some latent embedding dimensions, they may have similar properties corresponding to those dimensions. The element-wise product will strengthen those properties, whereas mean pooling otherwise could smooth them out.

Given the pairwise synergies calculated as in Equation 2, we aggregate all the synergies between item j and all the other items in $S(t-n_h, n_h)$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{c}_j^{(2)} = \sum_{k \in S(t-n_h, n_h), k \neq j} \mathbf{c}_{jk}^{(2)}, \quad (3)$$

and aggregate all the synergies in $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{c}^{(2)} = \text{mean}_{j \in S(t-n_h, n_h)} (\mathbf{c}_j^{(2)}). \quad (4)$$

The above synergies only consider pairs of items (i.e., order-2, Equation 2). It is possible that synergies exist among multiple items (i.e., order- p , $p > 2$). In order to model synergies among arbitrary numbers of items, inspired by the idea in Min *et al.* [17], we extend the order-2 synergies to order- p synergies in a recursive way as follows:

$$\mathbf{c}^{(p)} = \text{mean}_{j \in S(t-n_h, n_h)} \left(\sum_{k \in S(t-n_h, n_h), k \neq j} \mathbf{c}_j^{(p-1)} \circ \mathbf{v}_k \right), \quad (5)$$

where $p \leq n_h$, $\mathbf{c}_j^{(1)} = \mathbf{v}_j$ and $\mathbf{c}^{(p)}$ represents all the synergies among p items. That is, the order- p synergies are constructed from order- $(p-1)$ synergies and a single item.

Using $\mathbf{c}^{(p)}$ and following the idea of latent cross [9], we combine the information of individual items and synergies among items to represent high-order associations in $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ for user i as follows:

$$\mathbf{s}_i^t = \mathbf{h}_i^t + \sum_{k=2}^p \mathbf{c}^{(k)} \circ \mathbf{h}_i^t, \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{h}_i^t is the embedding of n_h items calculated from item pooling (Equation 1); the latent cross term $\mathbf{c}^{(k)} \circ \mathbf{h}_i^t$ utilizes the information from item synergies to strengthen important latent features in \mathbf{h}_i^t ; a new item association embedding \mathbf{s}_i^t is thus calculated from the latent cross and the high-order item association embedding. HAM with high-order synergies is denoted as HAM^s . HAM with high-order synergies and item associations calculated from max and mean pooling (Equation 1) is denoted as HAM_x^s and HAM_m^s , respectively.

Please note that we don't model the synergies among items in $S_i(t-n_l, n_l)$ (i.e., among low-order associations) since we empirically found that HAM generally achieves the best performance when n_l is small (i.e., 1 or 2) (will be discussed later in Section 6.5). Thus, we assume the synergies among very a few items are not significant enough to substantially improve recommendation performance. Actually, we empirically observed that it is the case in our experiments. Please also note that multiple combinations

of pooling methods such as weighted sum or max pooling could be used in Equation 3 and Equation 4. We tried weighted sum and max pooling in our experiments but empirically found that sum in Equation 3 and mean pooling in Equation 4 work best. The possible reason could be that sum will aggregate item synergies but not smooth them out.

4.3 Recommendation Scores

The recommendation scores are calculated from the user embedding \mathbf{u} (i.e., user’s general preference, Section 4.1), the embedding of previous n_h purchases/ratings (i.e., high-order association) \mathbf{h}/\mathbf{s} (Equation 1 or 6) and the embedding of previous n_l purchases/ratings (i.e., low-order association) \mathbf{o} (Equation 1). For user i , given the subsequence $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$, the recommendation score of user i on item candidate j , denoted as r_{ij}^t , is calculated as follows:

$$\text{in HAM: } r_{ij}^t = \underbrace{\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\text{user's general preferences}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{h}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\text{high-order association}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{o}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\text{low-order association}}, \quad (7)$$

$$\text{in HAM}^s: r_{ij}^t = \underbrace{\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\text{user's general preferences}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{s}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\substack{\text{high-order association} \\ \text{with synergies}}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{o}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top}_{\text{low-order association}}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{w}_j is the embedding of candidate item j , $\mathbf{h}_i^t/\mathbf{s}_i^t$ is the embedding for $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ without/with synergies, and \mathbf{o}_i^t is the embedding for $S_i(t-n_l, n_l)$; $\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{w}_j^\top$ measures how item candidate j matches user i ’s general preferences; $\mathbf{h}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top/\mathbf{s}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top$ measures how $S_i(t-n_h, n_h)$ induces item candidate j , and $\mathbf{o}_i^t \mathbf{w}_j^\top$ measures how $S_i(t-n_l, n_l)$ induces item candidate j . For each user, we recommend the items of top- k largest recommendation scores. Note that we do not explicitly weight the three factors, as their weights can be learned as part of the user/sequence/item embeddings.

4.4 HAM Optimization

We adapt the Bayesian personalized ranking objective [18] and minimize the loss that occurs when the truly purchased/rated items are ranked below those not purchased/rated based on the recommendation scores. The objective function for HAM models is as follows:

$$\min_{\Theta} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{S_i(t, n_p) \subset S_i} \sum_{j \in S_i(t, n_p) k \notin S_i(t, n_p)} -\log \sigma(r_{ij} - r_{ik}) + \lambda(\|\Theta\|^2), \quad (9)$$

where $\Theta = \{U, V, W\}$ is the set of the parameters; σ is the sigmoid function; $S_i(t, n_p)$ is a sequence of n_p items in S_i ; j denotes an item in $S_i(t, n_p)$; and k denotes an item not in $S_i(t, n_p)$. Given the huge number of items not in $S_i(t, n_p)$, following the ideas in literature [5], [8], we randomly sample a non-purchased/rated item k for each purchased/rated item j . Please note that, in HAM, the recommendation scores of purchased/rated item are not necessarily close to their ground-truth ratings, as long as the scores of purchased/rated items are higher than scores of those not purchased/rated. Also, note that each of the items in $S_i(t, n_p)$ will be recommended and evaluated independently, following the literature [5]. We use Adam optimizer [19] to optimize the objective function.

TABLE 2: Dataset Statistics

dataset	#users	#items	#intrns	#intrns/u	#u/i
CDs	17,052	35,118	472,265	27.7	13.4
Books	52,406	41,264	1,856,747	35.4	45.0
Children	48,296	32,871	2,784,423	57.6	84.7
Comics	34,445	33,121	2,411,314	70.0	72.8
ML-20M	129,780	13,663	9,926,480	76.5	726.5
ML-1M	5,950	3,125	573,726	96.4	183.6

The columns “#users”/“#items”/“#intrns” represent the number of users/items/user-item interactions, respectively. The column of “#intrns/u” represents the average number of interactions (average length of purchase/rating sequence) of each user. The column of “#u/i” represents the average number of purchases/ratings on each item.

5 MATERIALS

5.1 Baseline Methods

We compare HAM with three state-of-the-art methods:

- Caser [8]: This method uses multiple convolutional filters on the most recent purchases/ratings of a user to extract the user’s sequential features and items’ group features. These two features and the users’ long-term preferences are used to calculate item recommendation scores.
- SASRec [13]: This method uses self-attention mechanisms to capture the most informative items in users’ purchase/rating sequences to recommend the next item.
- HGN [5]: This method uses gating mechanisms to identify important items and their latent features from users’ historical purchases/ratings to recommend next items.

Note that HGN has been compared with a comprehensive set of other methods including GRU4Rec [1], GRU4Rec++ [2], NextItRec [14] and has been demonstrated outperforming those methods. Thus, we compare HAM with HGN instead of the methods that HGN outperforms. For all the baseline methods, we use the implementation provided by the authors in github (Section B in the Appendix).

5.2 Datasets

We evaluate the methods on 6 public benchmark datasets: Amazon-Books (Books) and Amazon-CDs (CDs) [20], Goodreads-Children (Children) and Goodreads-Comics (Comics) [21], and MovieLens-1M (ML-1M) and MovieLens-20M (ML-20M) [22]. The Books and CDs datasets are from Amazon reviews [23], which contain users’ 1-5 star ratings and reviews on books and CDs, respectively. The Children and Comics datasets are from goodreads website [24]. These two datasets have users’ implicit feedback (i.e., if a user has read the book or not), explicit feedback (i.e., ratings) and reviews on children and comics books. The ML-1M and ML-20M datasets are from the MovieLens website [25] with user-movie ratings. Following the data preprocessing protocol in HGN [5], among the 6 datasets, we only kept the users with at least 10 ratings, and items with at least 5 ratings. We converted the rating values into binary values by setting rating 4 and 5 to value 1, and the lower ratings to value 0. Table 2 presents the statistics of the 6 datasets.

As in Table 2, CDs is the most sparse dataset with the lowest average number of interactions per user “#intrns/u” and the lowest average number of interactions per item “#u/i” (i.e., #intrns/u= 27.7, #u/i= 13.4). Books is the second most sparse dataset with “#intrns/u” 35.4 and “#u/i” 45.0. Children and Comics are moderately sparse with




Fig. 2: Experimental settings.

“#intrans/u” 57.6 and 70.0, respectively. ML-20M and ML-1M are relatively dense with large “#intrans/u” and “#u/i” (e.g., “#u/i” of ML-20M: 726.5). Overall, we use datasets of different sparsities in our experiments to comprehensively compare methods in various recommendation scenarios.

5.3 Experimental Settings

We use three experimental settings to evaluate the methods: 80-20-cut-off setting (80-20-CUT, Section 5.3.1), 80-3-cut-off setting (80-3-CUT, Section 5.3.2) and leave-out setting (3-LOS, Section 5.3.3). Fig. 2 presents the three settings. As shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, in the model training, we use a sliding window of training instances of size $n_h + n_p$ to slide item by item over the training set. In each window, the first n_h items are used to generate recommendations and the subsequent n_p items are used to calculate the recommendation errors. We update model parameters after calculating the recommendation errors for a batch of training instances. In Section 7.3, we will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of these experimental settings.

5.3.1 80-20-cut-off setting (80-20-CUT)

We extract the first 70% of each user’s sequence as training set, the next 10% as validation set for parameter tuning, and the remaining 20% as testing set¹. During training, we train models using the training set and evaluate the models on the validation sets every 20 epochs. We select the best parameters with respect to Recall@10 values on the validation sets and use these parameters for testing. During testing, following HGN and Caser, we use both training and validation sets and the best parameters identified as above to train new models, and evaluate them on all the items in the testing set. Specifically, for each user, we evaluate whether his/her items in the testing set are ranked as the top- k items in the recommendation list using the metrics as described in Section 5.4. Note that if the user has a long sequence of items, his/her testing set could be large. 80-20-CUT is the most widely used experimental setting in sequential recommendation literature [5], [8], [26], [27].

5.3.2 80-3-cut-off setting (80-3-CUT)

We use the same training and validation set as in 80-20-CUT, but only the next 3 items after the validation set as the testing set. The training, validation and testing processes are identical to those in 80-20-CUT, respectively. Compared to 80-20-CUT, 80-3-CUT recommends the immediate next few

items, not potentially many items that might be only purchased/rated much later (e.g., in 80-20-CUT, 20% of a long user sequence may have many and late items). In addition, 80-3-CUT evaluates the recommendation performance on a same number of next items (i.e., 3) for all the users.

5.3.3 Leave-3-out setting (3-LOS)

We use only the last 3 items in each user sequence for testing and all the previous items for training and validation. The validation set contains only the 3 items before the testing items. The training, validation and test processes are also the same as in 80-20-CUT. 3-LOS maximizes the data for training and recommends the immediate next few items.

5.4 Evaluation Metrics

Following the literature [5], we use Recall@ k and NDCG@ k to evaluate the different methods. For each user, Recall@ k measures the proportion of all the ground-truth purchased/rated items in the testing set that are correctly recommended among top- k recommended items. The overall Recall@ k value is calculated as the average over all the users. Higher Recall@ k indicates better performance.

NDCG@ k is the normalized discounted cumulative gain for among top- k ranking, in which gain $\in \{0, 1\}$, indicating whether a ground-truth purchased/rated item has been recommended (i.e., 1) or not (i.e., 0). Thus, NDCG@ k incorporates the positions of the correctly recommended items among the top- k recommendations. Higher NDCG@ k indicates better performance.

6 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

6.1 Overall Performance in the 80-20-CUT Setting

Table 3 and Table 4 present the results in terms of Recall@5 and Recall@10, NDCG@5 and NDCG@10, respectively, on all the six datasets in the 80-20-CUT setting (Section 5.3.1). Note that 80-20-CUT is the setting used in Caser and HGN. In 80-20-CUT, we tuned all the parameters exhaustively using grid search over the validation sets. Following the parameter tuning process as in HGN, we evaluate the models on the validation sets every 20 epochs and select the best parameters with respect to Recall@10 values on the validation sets. We report the results achieved by the selected best parameters on the testing sets in the tables. In particular, in HAM, we used a larger parameter space and tuned more parameters (e.g., d , n_h , n_p) than those reported [5]. As a result, the performance in Table 3 and Table 4 are in general better than those reported in the original HGN paper [5] for all the baseline methods.

Table 3 and Table 4 together show that overall, HAM_m^s is the best performing method in 80-20-CUT. In terms of both recall and NDCG, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on three datasets: Children, Comics and ML-20M, and the second best performance on the rest three datasets: CDs, Books and ML-1M. HAM_m is the second best performing method in 80-20-CUT. In terms of both recall and NDCG, HAM_m achieves the best performance on the CDs dataset, and the second best performance or (near) the second best performance on Children, Comics and ML-20M datasets. HAM-based methods (HAM_m^s and HAM_m) consistently outperform

1. We used the data splits from <https://github.com/allenjack/HGN>.

TABLE 3: Overall Performance in 80-20-CUT (Recall)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
Recall@5	CDs	0.0237	<u>0.0356</u>	0.0337	0.0384	†0.0401	0.0360	0.0397	12.6*
	Books	0.0231	†0.0433	0.0317	0.0380	0.0380	0.0373	0.0412	-4.8*
	Children	0.0757	0.0806	<u>0.0866</u>	0.0897	0.0905	0.0897	†0.0921	6.4*
	Comics	0.1169	0.1344	<u>0.1355</u>	0.1330	0.1354	0.1347	†0.1385	2.2*
	ML-20M	0.0781	<u>0.0784</u>	0.0751	0.0751	0.0816	0.0754	†0.0838	6.9*
	ML-1M	†0.0823	0.0713	0.0727	0.0739	0.0759	0.0741	0.0793	-3.6*
Recall@10	CDs	0.0381	<u>0.0567</u>	0.0536	0.0598	†0.0621	0.0564	0.0615	9.5*
	Books	0.0383	†0.0654	0.0496	0.0574	0.0587	0.0572	0.0630	-3.7*
	Children	0.1174	0.1230	<u>0.1322</u>	0.1361	0.1390	0.1361	†0.1393	5.4*
	Comics	0.1662	0.1890	<u>0.1900</u>	0.1898	0.1906	0.1881	†0.1945	2.4*
	ML-20M	<u>0.1340</u>	0.1337	0.1271	0.1259	0.1357	0.1269	†0.1389	3.7*
	ML-1M	†0.1379	0.1253	0.1252	0.1266	0.1287	0.1254	0.1330	-3.6*

The best performance in each dataset is **†bold**. The second best performance in each dataset is **bold**. The column “imp%” presents the percentage improvement of best performance of HAM-based methods over the best performance of non-HAM methods (underlined or **bold**) in each row. The * indicates that the improvement is statistically significant at 95% confidence level.

the best baseline methods on four out of the six datasets (except on Books and ML-1M, which will be discussed later in Section 6.1.4). On these four datasets, the average improvement from HAM-based methods over the best baseline methods is 7.0%, 5.3%, 6.6%, 6.1% in terms of Recall@5, Recall@10, NDCG@5, and NDCG@10, respectively.

6.1.1 Comparison between HAM and HAM^s

Table 3 and Table 4 together show that HAM_m^s outperforms HAM_m on all the datasets except the most sparse dataset CDs (Table 2) in terms of all the evaluation metrics. The difference between HAM_m^s and HAM_m is that HAM_m^s incorporates the information from item synergies, whereas HAM_m doesn’t explicitly model item synergies. The superior performance of HAM_m^s over HAM_m on most benchmark datasets indicates that the synergies among items may provide additional information compared to individual items, and thus could improve the recommendation performance. HAM_m^s achieves very similar performance with HAM_m on the CDs dataset. This might be due to the fact that the CDs dataset is extremely sparse. Thus, very limited information about item synergies can be learned from the data.

Table 3 and Table 4 together also show that HAM_x^s always achieve very similar performance with HAM_x on all the metrics over the six datasets. This indicates that when using max pooling to calculate the high-order associations, the latent cross mechanism could not effectively combine information from the high-order associations and the item synergies. We leave the investigation of this problem in our future work.

6.1.2 Comparison between mean pooling and max pooling

Table 3 and 4 also show that HAM_m and HAM_m^s consistently outperforms HAM_x and HAM_x^s, respectively, over all the six datasets. This indicates that mean pooling is more effective than max pooling on calculating the high/low-order associations on recommendation datasets. This may be because of that max pooling may focus on a few items with high values in latent features and thus fails to effectively capture the high-order associations that involve multiple items.

6.1.3 Comparison HAM Methods with HGN

Table 3 and Table 4 show that HAM methods (HAM_m and HAM_m^s) consistently outperforms HGN on all the six datasets. Note

TABLE 4: Overall Performance in 80-20-CUT (NDCG)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
NDCG@5	CDs	0.0277	0.0392	<u>0.0401</u>	0.0440	†0.0458	0.0412	0.0452	14.2*
	Books	0.0345	†0.0614	0.0467	0.0549	0.0547	0.0551	0.0606	-1.3*
	Children	0.1254	0.1330	<u>0.1425</u>	0.1476	0.1479	0.1475	†0.1523	6.9*
	Comics	0.2283	0.2631	0.2585	0.2527	0.2572	0.2587	†0.2662	1.2
	ML-20M	0.1473	<u>0.1489</u>	0.1381	0.1350	0.1496	0.1377	†0.1552	4.2*
	ML-1M	†0.1890	0.1690	0.1742	0.1666	0.1757	0.1680	0.1863	-1.4
NDCG@10	CDs	0.0327	<u>0.0470</u>	0.0469	0.0517	†0.0534	0.0485	0.0528	13.6*
	Books	0.0383	†0.0663	0.0505	0.0590	0.0593	0.0591	0.0649	-2.1*
	Children	0.1305	0.1371	<u>0.1467</u>	0.1517	0.1532	0.1514	†0.1559	6.3*
	Comics	0.2157	0.2468	0.2436	0.2408	0.2434	0.2425	†0.2507	1.6
	ML-20M	0.1573	<u>0.1587</u>	0.1473	0.1433	0.1584	0.1467	†0.1635	3.0*
	ML-1M	†0.1904	0.1727	0.1763	0.1719	0.1778	0.1714	0.1875	-1.5*

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 3.

that HGN is the state-of-the-art method in literature [5] and outperforms many other baseline methods. The difference between HAM and HGN is that HAM uses mean pooling over the last n_h items and last n_l items to recommend the next items, whereas HGN uses gating mechanisms over the last items and also over their latent features to differentiate the importance of these items and their features. However, as Table 2 shows, each user typically has only a few items (compared to all the possible items), and each item is typically only purchased/rated by a few users (compared to all the possible users). Therefore, the data sparsity issue may lead to less meaningful gating weights learned by parameterized gating mechanisms (more discussion in Section 7.2), whereas equal weights from mean pooling would suffice. In addition, HAM combines both high-order and low-order sequential patterns, conforming to the discovery in [8], which may also contribute to the superior performance. Moreover, HAM_m^s explicitly models the synergies among items, which may provide additional information for the recommendation and contributes to the superior performance as well.

6.1.4 Comparison HAM Methods with SASRec and Caser

Table 3 and Table 4 show that both HAM_m and HAM_m^s outperform SASRec on 5 out of 6 datasets and achieve similar performance as SASRec on the rest Books dataset. A key difference between HAM and SASRec is that HAM leverages item associations and item synergies in the most recent purchases/ratings, whereas SASRec only uses the long-term user preferences. As demonstrated in literature [28], user preferences may shift over time and thus preferences from the most recent purchases/ratings might provide more pertinent information for the next recommendations. In addition, similar to HGN, SASRec adapts attention mechanisms to identify most informative items. However, as discussed in Section 6.1.3, the data sparsity issue may result in less meaningful weights, whereas equal weights from mean pooling may lead to better performance. We notice that HAM_m^s achieves slightly worse performance compared to that of SASRec on the Books dataset (HAM_m^s: 0.0412 vs SASRec: 0.0433 on Recall@5, HAM_m^s: 0.0630 vs SASRec: 0.0654 on Recall@10). This might be due to the reason that users have in general strong long-term preferences on books. Thus, SASRec, which focuses on modeling the long-term user preferences, outperforms HAM_m^s, which learns users’ preferences primarily from users’ most recent purchases/ratings on the Books

TABLE 5: Overall Performance in 80-3-CUT (Recall)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
Recall@5	CDs	0.0271	0.0398	0.0395	0.0433	0.0449	0.0423	0.0442	12.8*
	Books	0.0306	0.0589	0.0438	0.0517	0.0511	0.0512	0.0555	-5.8*
	Children	0.1001	0.1360	0.1404	0.1446	0.1436	0.1432	0.1483	5.6*
	Comics	0.1510	0.2689	0.2484	0.2454	0.2528	0.2529	0.2563	-4.7*
	ML-20M	0.1119	0.1097	0.1022	0.1032	0.1133	0.1031	0.1166	4.2*
	ML-1M	0.1209	0.1293	0.1243	0.1274	0.1307	0.1248	0.1364	5.5*
Recall@10	CDs	0.0438	0.0624	0.0616	0.0659	0.0696	0.0638	0.0687	11.5*
	Books	0.0400	0.0869	0.0671	0.0774	0.0777	0.0766	0.0835	-3.9*
	Children	0.1589	0.1939	0.2013	0.2063	0.2078	0.2054	0.2111	4.9*
	Comics	0.2102	0.3372	0.3188	0.3190	0.3243	0.3220	0.3278	-2.8*
	ML-20M	0.1858	0.1839	0.1685	0.1678	0.1825	0.1687	0.1878	1.1*
	ML-1M	0.1933	0.2113	0.2065	0.2077	0.2145	0.2074	0.2221	5.1*

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 3.

dataset. We also notice that on Comics, the improvement of HAM_m^s over SASRec is statistically significant on Recall@5 and Recall@10, while not statistically significant on NDCG@5 and NDCG@10. This indicates that on Comics, HAM_m^s works significantly better than SASRec on recommending the items of users' interest (i.e., Recall), and slightly better than SASRec on ranking the items of users' interest on top (i.e., NDCG). In addition, Table 3 and Table 4 show that HAM_m and HAM_m^s outperform Caser except on the relatively dense dataset ML-1M, which may exhibit strong local patterns in the latent item features that Caser could well capture utilize. However, in terms of NDCG@5, the improvement of Caser over HAM_m on ML-1M is not statistically significant, indicating that HAM_m^s could still achieve very similar performance with Caser on ML-1M.

6.1.5 Summary

Overall, HAM outperforms the best baseline methods with very high percentage improvement when the dataset is very sparse (e.g., 9.5% on CDs on Recall@10), and significant improvement when the datasets is moderately sparse (e.g., 5.4% on Children on Recall@10). When the datasets are dense (e.g., ML-1M) or in the datasets, users' behaviors are significantly affected by users' long-term preferences, HAM could be slightly worse than the other baseline methods. However, most of the sequential recommendation problems always have very sparse and time sensitive datasets, on which HAM will be effective. More detailed analysis at the data sparsity aspect is available in Section 7.2.

6.2 Overall Performance in the 80-3-CUT Setting

Table 5 and Table 6 present the results of different methods in the 80-3-CUT setting (Section 5.3.2). In 80-3-CUT, for HAM methods and all the baseline methods, the parameters are also tuned by grid search on the validation sets. The parameters tuning protocol is the same as in 80-20-CUT. Overall, the performance in 80-3-CUT of HAM methods and the baseline methods has a similar trend as that in 80-20-CUT. Particularly, HAM_m^s is still the best performing method in this setting. In terms of Recall@5 and Recall@10, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on 3 out of 6 datasets (i.e., Children, ML-20M and ML-1M), and the second best performance on the rest CDs, Books and Comics datasets. In terms of NDCG@5 and NDCG@10, HAM_m^s also achieves the best performance on the Children, ML-20M and ML-1M datasets. On the rest

TABLE 6: Overall Performance in 80-3-CUT (NDCG)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
NDCG@5	CDs	0.0239	0.0357	0.0354	0.0389	0.0403	0.0378	0.0400	12.9*
	Books	0.0274	0.0554	0.0403	0.0489	0.0476	0.0474	0.0518	-6.5*
	Children	0.0890	0.1263	0.1281	0.1323	0.1314	0.1317	0.1355	5.8*
	Comics	0.1376	0.2615	0.2302	0.2273	0.2356	0.2351	0.2398	-8.3*
	ML-20M	0.0989	0.0963	0.0904	0.0921	0.1006	0.0915	0.1044	5.6*
	ML-1M	0.1077	0.1128	0.1083	0.1109	0.1172	0.1110	0.1221	8.2*
NDCG@10	CDs	0.0313	0.0458	0.0452	0.0489	0.0514	0.0474	0.0509	12.2*
	Books	0.0361	0.0680	0.0508	0.0604	0.0597	0.0590	0.0644	-5.3*
	Children	0.1156	0.1526	0.1556	0.1603	0.1605	0.1599	0.1640	5.4*
	Comics	0.1645	0.2927	0.2623	0.2609	0.2683	0.2666	0.2724	-6.9*
	ML-20M	0.1322	0.1297	0.1203	0.1212	0.1321	0.1211	0.1365	3.3*
	ML-1M	0.1405	0.1498	0.1454	0.1486	0.1550	0.1483	0.1608	7.3*

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 3.

CDs, Books and Comics datasets, HAM_m^s achieves very similar performance compared to the best method on these datasets. For example, on the CDs dataset, HAM_m achieves the best Recall@5 0.0449 and HAM_m^s achieves the second best Recall@5 0.0442 (i.e., 1.6% difference).

Table 5 and Table 6 also show that HAM_m^s doesn't work as well as SASRec on the Books and Comics datasets (e.g., HAM_m^s: 0.0555 and SASRec: 0.0589 on Recall@5 on Books). On Books, as discussed in Section 6.1.4, there could exist strong long-term preferences among users and thus SASRec could work well. As shown in Table 2, Comics is much denser than CDs and Books. Thus, the attention mechanism in SASRec could learn meaningful weights and improve the recommendation performance. Even though HAM_m^s does not outperform SASRec on Books and Comics, it still achieves the second best performance on these two datasets, and statistically significantly outperforms SASRec on the other datasets (e.g., CDs).

6.2.1 Comparison with the 80-20-CUT Setting

A comparison between Table 3 (in the 80-20-CUT setting) and Table 5 (in the 80-3-CUT setting) shows that in terms of Recall@5 and Recall@10, all the methods have in general better performance in 80-3-CUT (evaluating on the immediate next few items) than in 80-20-CUT (evaluating on the rest 20% items). Note that 80-3-CUT and 80-20-CUT have the same training sets but different testing sets (Fig. 2) This might be due to that as there are many testing items in 80-20-CUT, and therefore, when calculating recall values on the testing set, we will have a large denominator (i.e., the number of testing items) leading to low recall values.

However, the trend for NDCG@5 and NDCG@10 is different from that for Recall@5 and Recall@10. A comparison between Table 4 and 6 shows that in terms of NDCG@5 and NDCG@10, all the methods have in general worse performance in 80-3-CUT than in 80-20-CUT. This might be due to that when calculating NDCG values, the denominator will not change with the number of testing items. However, as there are many testing items in 80-20-CUT, the recommended items are more likely to be found in the testing set, and thus the numerator could be large and result in high NDCG values in 80-20-CUT. We will discuss this issue in detail later in Section 7.3. In addition, it is worthy noting that although HAM_m^s underperforms Caser on the ML-1M dataset in 80-20-CUT, it outperforms Caser

TABLE 7: Overall Performance in 3-LOS (Recall)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
Recall@5	CDs	0.0289	0.0385	0.0389	0.0401	0.0437	0.0364	0.0430	12.3*
	Books	0.0264	0.0653	0.0440	0.0483	0.0520	0.0495	0.0528	-19.1*
	Children	0.0860	<u>0.1055</u>	0.1021	0.1069	0.1100	0.1039	0.1110	5.2*
	Comics	0.1726	<u>0.0374</u>	0.1933	0.1933	0.1957	0.1960	0.2033	5.2*
	ML-20M	0.0963	0.0998	0.0899	0.0910	0.0982	0.0889	0.1002	0.4
	ML-1M	0.1191	0.1095	0.1119	0.1097	0.1148	0.1095	0.1198	0.6
Recall@10	CDs	0.0456	<u>0.0621</u>	0.0600	0.0629	0.0669	0.0577	0.0662	7.7*
	Books	0.0437	0.0958	0.0665	0.0725	0.0783	0.0750	0.0798	-16.7*
	Children	0.1280	<u>0.1503</u>	0.1497	0.1544	0.1575	0.1503	0.1588	5.7*
	Comics	0.2198	0.0597	<u>0.2445</u>	0.2460	0.2484	0.2470	0.2564	4.9*
	ML-20M	0.1591	0.1660	0.1487	0.1473	0.1586	0.1455	0.1612	-2.9*
	ML-1M	0.1910	0.1822	0.1790	0.1794	0.1854	0.1779	0.1898	-0.6

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 3.

in 80-3-CUT. It indicates that HAM can outperform Caser in recommending the immediate next few items on the relatively dense datasets.

6.3 Overall Performance in the 3-LOS Setting

Table 7 and Table 8 present the results of the different methods in the 3-LOS setting (Section 5.3.3). Overall, HAM methods (i.e., HAM_x, HAM_m, HAM_x^s and HAM_m^s) still outperform the other methods. Particularly, HAM_m^s is still the best performing method in 3-LOS. In terms of Recall@5, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on 4 out of 6 datasets and the second best performance on the rest CDs and Books datasets. In terms of NDCG@5, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on 5 out of 6 datasets and the second best performance on Books.

Table 7 and 8 also show that HAM_m^s doesn't perform as well as SASRec on the Books and ML-20M datasets. Especially on the Books dataset, HAM_m^s underperforms SASRec by 19.1% and 20.5% on Recall@5 and NDCG@5, respectively. The good performance of SASRec in 3-LOS might be due to that in 3-LOS (training on all the items except the 6 items used for validation and testing), the data sparsity issue is less severe than that in 80-20-CUT and 80-3-CUT (training on 70% items). Thus the attention mechanism used in SASRec may learn meaningful weights and thus, on some datasets, SASRec is able to achieve better performance than that of HAM_m^s. Even though HAM_m^s works worse than SASRec on Books and ML-20M, it still achieves the second best performance.

Please recall that we did a very comprehensive parameter study for SASRec in order to identify its best performance. During the parameter study, we observed that SASRec could be very sensitive to the parameters. For example, in our experiments on the Comics dataset, SASRec can achieve good performance (e.g., 0.3353 on Recall@10) on its validation set via a set of parameters. However, by slightly changing the parameters, the performance can decrease dramatically (e.g., from 0.3353 Recall@10 to 0.0587, that is, 6-fold decrease) on the validation set. This issue may prevent SASRec to perform well on the testing set because the optimal parameters on the validation set may lead to dramatically different performance on the testing set. Compared to SASRec, HAM is much more stable and less sensitive to parameters as will be discussed in Section 6.5. More details of the parameter sensitivity issue of SASRec are described in Section A in the Appendix. We also observed that SASRec requires a large amount of memory

TABLE 8: Overall Performance in 3-LOS (NDCG)

	Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _x	HAM _m	HAM _x ^s	HAM _m ^s	imp%
NDCG@5	CDs	0.0267	<u>0.0346</u>	0.0342	0.0367	0.0394	0.0328	0.0394	13.9*
	Books	0.0240	0.0620	0.0416	0.0456	0.0486	0.0462	0.0493	-20.5*
	Children	0.0790	0.0999	0.0940	0.0994	0.1030	0.0966	0.1030	3.1*
	Comics	0.1666	0.0344	<u>0.1862</u>	0.1854	0.1881	0.1909	0.1975	6.1*
	ML-20M	0.0850	0.0886	0.0797	0.0815	0.0882	0.0795	0.0900	1.6*
	ML-1M	0.1067	0.0974	0.0996	0.0987	0.1026	0.0977	0.1070	0.3
NDCG@10	CDs	0.0342	<u>0.0453</u>	0.0444	0.0471	0.0499	0.0425	0.0499	10.2*
	Books	0.0318	0.0758	0.0518	0.0566	0.0605	0.0577	0.0615	-18.9*
	Children	0.0980	<u>0.1201</u>	0.1155	0.1208	0.1246	0.1177	0.1246	3.7*
	Comics	0.1881	0.0445	<u>0.2094</u>	0.2094	0.2121	0.2140	0.2217	5.9*
	ML-20M	0.1136	0.1185	0.1063	0.1069	0.1156	0.1050	0.1176	-0.8*
	ML-1M	0.1391	0.1302	0.1299	0.1302	0.1346	0.1286	0.1387	-0.3

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 3.

during training and some parameters could cause the out-of-memory issue. The details of this issue are also described in Section A in the Appendix. Table 7 and 8 also show that HAM_m^s work slightly worse than Caser on ML-1M in terms of Recall@10 and NDCG@10. However, the difference is not statistically significant.

6.3.1 Comparison with the 80-3-CUT Setting

A comparison between Table 5 and Table 7, and between Table 6 and Table 8 shows that in terms of both Recall (i.e., Recall@5 and Recall@10) and NDCG (i.e., NDCG@5 and NDCG@10), all the methods have in general better performance in 80-3-CUT (i.e., the next 3 items after the validation set of each user are used for testing and the first 80% sequence are used for training and validation) than in 3-LOS (i.e., the last 3 items of each user are used for testing and all the previous items are used for training and validation). Compared to 80-3-CUT setting, the training sets in 3-LOS setting contain more early purchases/ratings (i.e., purchases/ratings that occurred long time ago before the testing items). These early purchases/ratings may not accurately represent users' preferences at the time of the testing items as such preferences may shift [28].

6.4 Performance Summary among All the Settings

Table 9 presents the average improvement of HAM_m^s compared to Caser, SASRec, HGN and HAM_m in each of the experimental settings 80-20-CUT, 80-3-CUT and 3-LOS. The average improvement is calculated as the mean of the improvement of HAM_m^s over the compared methods (i.e., Caser, SASRec, HGN and HAM_m) over all the datasets. We also present the average improvement of HAM_m^s over SASRec when the Books dataset is excluded (i.e., the “(-B)” column in Table 9) due to that the strong performance of SASRec on Books in 3-LOS (Table 7 and Table 8) may dominate the average improvement. Considering the parameter sensitivity issue of SASRec (Section 6.3) in 3-LOS, we exclude the Comics dataset when calculating the average improvement of HAM_m^s over SASRec in 3-LOS (i.e., the “(-C)” column in Table 9). Please note that HAM_m consistently outperforms HAM_x and HAM_x^s in all the three settings as shown in Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Thus, we compare HAM_m^s only with HAM_m, not with HAM_x or HAM_x^s that HAM_m outperforms.

Table 9 shows that overall HAM_m^s performs the best, and achieves significant improvement over other baseline

TABLE 9: Performance Improvement of HAM_m^s (%)

Setting	Metric	Caser	SASRec		HGN	HAM_m
			all	-B		
80-20-CUT	Recall@5	31.6*	7.0*	9.4*	12.8*	3.1*
	Recall@10	26.9*	5.2*	6.9*	10.8*	2.4*
	NDCG@5	30.1*	7.4*	9.1*	11.9*	4.3*
	NDCG@10	28.2*	6.2*	7.8*	11.3*	3.6*
80-3-CUT	Recall@5	46.6*	3.6	5.4	11.9*	3.2*
	Recall@10	45.1*	3.2	4.7	10.4*	2.5*
	NDCG@5	50.3*	3.5	5.5	13.3*	3.5*
	NDCG@10	44.4*	3.2	4.9	12.1*	2.9*
Setting	Metric	Caser	SASRec		HGN	HAM_m
			-C	(-B&C)		
3-LOS	Recall@5	33.4*	1.5	6.7*	10.5*	1.9*
	Recall@10	28.2*	-0.6	3.4	9.3*	1.5*
	NDCG@5	34.7*	1.6	7.1*	11.6*	2.1
	NDCG@10	31.3*	0.2	4.9	10.4*	1.8

In this table, the column Caser/SASRec/HGN/ HAM_m represents the percentage improvement of HAM_m^s over the corresponding method, respectively. For 80-20-CUT and 80-3-CUT, the column “all”/“-B”/“-C” represents that the improvement is calculated over all the datasets/with Books excluded/with Comics excluded, respectively. For 3-LOS, the column “-C”/“-B&C” represents that the improvement is calculated with Comics excluded/with Books and Comics excluded, respectively. The * indicates that the improvement is statistically significant at 90% confidence level.

methods in all the settings. For example, compared to HGN, HAM_m^s achieves 12.8%, 11.9% and 10.5% improvement in 80-20-CUT, 80-3-CUT and 3-LOS, respectively. This indicates that HAM_m^s could achieve the state-of-the-art performance regardless of experimental settings. We notice that in terms of Recall@10 and NDCG@10, HAM_m^s achieves very similar performance compared to that of SASRec in 3-LOS. This is because SASRec works very well on the Books dataset. However, excluding Books, HAM_m^s still achieves 3.4% and 4.9% improvement over SASRec on Recall@10 and NDCG@10, respectively.

Table 9 also shows that HAM_m^s achieves highly significant improvement over other methods on all the evaluation metrics in the widely used 80-20-CUT setting. For example, in terms of Recall@5, HAM_m^s achieves 31.6%, 7.0%, 12.8% and 3.1% improvement over Caser, SASRec, HGN and HAM_m in 80-20-CUT, respectively. In 80-3-CUT and 3-LOS, the improvement of HAM_m^s over SASRec, HGN and HAM_m is slightly lower than that in 80-20-CUT. However, the improvement is still significant. For example, in terms of Recall@5, HAM_m^s achieves 3.6%, 11.9% and 3.2% improvement over SASRec, HGN and HAM_m , respectively, in 80-3-CUT. We notice that in 80-3-CUT and 3-LOS, the average improvement of HAM_m^s over SASRec is not statistically significant on most evaluation metrics. This might be due to the superior performance of SASRec on Books and Comics in 80-3-CUT and on Books in 3-LOS. However, HAM_m^s still achieves improvement as high as 5.5% in 80-3-CUT at Recall@5 and 7.1% in 3-LOS at NDCG@5. Moreover, HAM_m^s achieves statistically significant improvement over SASRec on multiple individual datasets (e.g., CDs, Children and ML-20M) as shown in Table 3-8.

6.5 Parameter Study

We conduct a comprehensive parameter study for HAM_m^s on the most sparse dataset CDs and moderately sparse datasets Children and Comics in the widely used 80-20-CUT setting, following HGN. In the study, we first identify the parameter

TABLE 10: Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on CDs in 80-20-CUT

parameter	d	n_h	n_l	n_p	p	Recall@5	Recall@10
d	200	5	2	3	2	0.0392	0.0603
	<u>400</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0615</u>
	600	5	2	3	2	0.0403	0.0618
	800	5	2	3	2	0.0400	0.0613
n_h	400	3	2	3	2	0.0391	0.0610
	400	4	2	3	2	0.0397	0.0617
	<u>400</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0615</u>
	400	6	2	3	2	0.0378	0.0608
n_l	400	5	0	3	2	0.0378	0.0597
	400	5	1	3	2	0.0398	0.0606
	<u>400</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0615</u>
	400	5	3	3	2	0.0394	0.0607
n_p	400	5	2	2	2	0.0380	0.0604
	<u>400</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0615</u>
	400	<u>5</u>	2	4	2	0.0389	0.0603
	400	5	2	4	2	0.0389	0.0603
p	400	5	2	3	1	0.0403	0.0625
	<u>400</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.0397</u>	<u>0.0615</u>
	400	5	2	3	3	0.0378	0.0596
	400	5	2	3	3	0.0378	0.0596

In this table, d , n_h , n_l , n_p and p are the dimension of embeddings, number of items in high-order/low-order associations, number of items to calculate recommendation errors during training and the order of item synergies. The best performance overall is **bold** and the best performance in each row block is **bold**. The best results based on validation sets and the corresponding parameters tuned on the validation sets are underlined. The “parameter” column presents the parameter to be studied in each row block.

TABLE 11: Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on Children in 80-20-CUT

parameter	d	n_h	n_l	n_p	p	Recall@5	Recall@10
d	200	6	1	4	3	0.0917	0.1395
	<u>400</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	0.0921	<u>0.1393</u>
	600	6	1	4	3	0.0908	0.1372
n_h	400	5	1	4	3	0.0917	0.1390
	<u>400</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	0.0921	0.1393
	400	7	1	4	3	0.0909	0.1383
n_l	<u>400</u>	6	1	<u>4</u>	3	0.0921	0.1393
	400	6	2	4	3	0.0897	0.1370
	400	6	3	4	3	0.0875	0.1339
n_p	400	6	1	3	3	0.0906	0.1371
	<u>400</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	0.0921	0.1393
	400	<u>6</u>	1	5	3	0.0914	0.1391
p	400	6	1	4	1	0.0904	0.1383
	400	6	1	4	2	0.0914	0.1396
	<u>400</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	0.0921	<u>0.1393</u>
	400	<u>6</u>	1	4	4	0.0903	0.1374

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 10.

values that achieve the best performance on the validation sets of CDs, Children and Comics. Then, we change one of the values and fix the others so as to study how the changing parameter affects the recommendation performance. We report the corresponding results on the testing sets of CDs and Children in Table 10 and Table 11, and the results of Comics in Table 12, respectively. The best results based on validation sets (Table 3) and the corresponding parameters tuned on the validation sets are underlined in Table 10, Table 11 and Table 12. Please note that the underlined parameters are the best parameters based on the tuning on the validation set but they are not necessarily the best parameters on the testing set. Thus, other parameters may achieve even better performance on the testing set. We use different values on the testing set just for parameter study purposes, but using the parameter values tuned on the validation set is the

proper way to compare different methods as in Section 5.3.1. Overall, as shown in Table 10, 11 and 12, HAM_m^s is stable with respect to the parameters within a certain optimal range. In addition, HAM_m^s is able to achieve the state-of-the-art performance on different datasets with appropriate parameters.

6.5.1 Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on CDs in 80-20-CUT

Table 10 presents the results of parameter study on CDs. As shown in this table, HAM_m^s achieves better performance as the dimension of embeddings d increases, and achieves the best performance with $d=600$. This indicates that HAM_m^s is able to learn from even sparse datasets into large-dimension embeddings. Table 10 also shows that HAM_m^s achieves the best performance when association orders are small ($n_h=4$, $n_l=2$). This indicates that the most recent associations among a few items are effective in inducing the next items. It also demonstrates the importance of modeling low-order associations in HAM. Table 10 also shows that as more items are used to calculate recommendation errors during training (i.e., larger n_p , Fig. 2), the performance increases first and then decreases, and HAM_m^s achieves the best performance with $n_p=3$. It indicates that the association patterns are most effective in inducing the next few items than the items purchased/rated much later.

We also notice that HAM_m^s has poor performance as the order of item synergies p is large. This conforms to the results in Table 3 that HAM_m^s underperforms HAM_m (i.e., HAM_m^s without item synergies) on CDs in 80-20-CUT. This might be due to the same reason as discussed in Section 6.1.1, that is, the CDs dataset is extremely sparse and thus, very limited information about item synergies can be learned from the data. However, with $p=2$ (Recall@5=0.0397), the performance of HAM_m^s is still very comparable to that without item synergies (i.e., $p=1$, Recall@5=0.0403, difference 1.5%), indicating that HAM_m^s could still achieve the state-of-the-art performance even on extremely sparse dataset. Moreover, as will be shown later in Table 11 and Table 12, HAM_m^s could achieve highly significant improvement after incorporating item synergies on Children and Comics, indicating that explicitly model item synergies will improve the recommendation performance on most benchmark datasets. Please note that we tried p up to n_h in the study but did not present the results when unnecessary given the clear trend.

6.5.2 Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on Children in 80-20-CUT

Table 11 presents the results of parameter study on Children. Similar to that on CDs, on Children, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance with a large d (i.e., 400) and a small n_l (i.e., 1). However, different with that on CDs, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on Children with relatively large n_h and n_p ($n_h=6$, $n_p=4$). This is probably due to that there could be a lot of associations with high orders on Children. In addition, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance with large p (i.e., 3). Compared to HAM_m^s without item synergies (i.e., $p=1$), HAM_m^s with item synergies achieves reasonable improvement (e.g., $p=3$: 0.0921 vs $p=1$: 0.0904 on Recall@5, 1.9% improvement), demonstrating that item synergies could effectively improve the recommendation performance.

TABLE 12: Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on Comics in 80-20-CUT

parameter	d	n_h	n_l	n_p	p	Recall@5	Recall@10
d	200	7	2	5	3	0.1354	0.1914
	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	600	7	2	5	3	0.1378	0.1929
n_h	400	6	2	5	3	0.1372	0.1930
	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	400	8	2	5	3	0.1389	0.1945
	400	9	2	5	3	0.1387	0.1948
n_l	400	7	0	5	3	0.1223	0.1767
	400	7	1	5	3	†0.1398	†0.1953
	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	400	7	3	5	3	0.1352	0.1902
n_p	400	7	2	4	3	0.1380	0.1930
	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	400	7	2	6	3	0.1367	0.1944
p	400	7	2	5	1	0.1299	0.1874
	400	7	2	5	2	0.1331	0.1888
	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	400	7	2	5	4	0.1311	0.1859

The columns in this table have the same meanings as those in Table 10.

6.5.3 Parameter Study of HAM_m^s on Comics in 80-20-CUT

Table 12 presents the results of parameter study on the Comics dataset. As shown in this table, similar to that on CDs and Children, on Comics, HAM_m^s still achieves the best performance with a large d (i.e., 400) and a small n_l (i.e., 2). Similar to that on Children, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance with relatively large n_h , n_p ($n_h=8$, $n_p=5$) and p (i.e., 3). On Comics, compared to HAM_m^s without item synergies (i.e., $p=1$), HAM_m^s with item synergies achieves significant improvement (e.g., $p=3$: 0.1385 vs $p=1$: 0.1299 on Recall@5, 6.6% improvement), demonstrating that item synergies could improve the recommendation performance on most benchmark datasets. We also notice that as shown in Table 11 and Table 12 on Children and Comics, the best parameters based on validation sets achieve the best or near the best performance on testing as well.

6.6 Ablation Study

We also conduct an ablation study for HAM_m^s in 80-20-CUT. In particular, we want to verify the effect of the low-order associations \mathbf{o} (i.e., only one item association term) and users' general preferences \mathbf{u} in HAM methods from the ablation study. To this end, we remove \mathbf{o} or \mathbf{u} from the objective function (Equation 9) and tune parameters for the ablated HAM_m^s on the validation sets. We report the results on the testing sets in Table 13, where we denote the HAM_m^s without \mathbf{o}/\mathbf{u} as $\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-o}/\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-u}$, respectively.

Table 13 shows that overall HAM_m^s achieves the best performance compared to $\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-o}$ and $\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-u}$. In particular, HAM_m^s achieves the best performance on 4 out of 6 datasets and the second best performance on the rest CDs and Comics datasets. Table 13 also shows that HAM_m^s significantly outperforms $\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-o}$ (i.e., HAM_m^s without \mathbf{o}) on the 4 datasets. For example, in terms of Recall@5, HAM_m^s significantly outperforms $\text{HAM}_m^s\text{-o}$ by 12.3%, 7.8%, 14.9% and 3.9% on Books, Children, Comics and ML-1M, respectively. This indicates that modeling both high and low-order associations could significantly improve the recommendation performance. We

TABLE 13: Ablation Study of HAM_m^s in 80-20-CUT

Dataset	model	d	n_h	n_l	n_p	p	Recall@5	Recall@10
CDs	HAM _m ^s	400	5	2	3	2	0.0397	0.0615
	HAM _m ^s -o	400	3	0	3	2	0.0403	0.0623
	HAM _m ^s -u	400	6	2	2	2	0.0346	0.0549
Books	HAM _m ^s	400	9	2	7	2	0.0412	0.0630
	HAM _m ^s -o	400	3	0	8	2	0.0367	0.0579
	HAM _m ^s -u	400	7	1	5	2	0.0373	0.0548
Children	HAM _m ^s	400	6	1	4	3	0.0921	0.1393
	HAM _m ^s -o	600	3	0	4	3	0.0854	0.1324
	HAM _m ^s -u	200	6	1	4	2	0.0910	0.1386
Comics	HAM _m ^s	400	7	2	5	3	0.1385	0.1945
	HAM _m ^s -o	400	6	0	3	3	0.1205	0.1726
	HAM _m ^s -u	200	7	1	6	2	0.1422	0.1974
ML-20M	HAM _m ^s	400	9	3	2	3	0.0838	0.1389
	HAM _m ^s -o	600	8	0	3	3	0.0834	0.1394
	HAM _m ^s -u	600	10	3	3	2	0.0830	0.1379
ML-1M	HAM _m ^s	400	7	2	3	3	0.0793	0.1330
	HAM _m ^s -o	600	5	0	1	3	0.0763	0.1291
	HAM _m ^s -u	200	9	2	3	2	0.0792	0.1322

In this table, d , n_h/n_l , n_p and p are the dimension of embeddings, number of items in high-order/low-order associations, number of items to calculate recommendation errors during training and the order of item synergies. The best performance on each dataset is **bold**. The “model” column presents the factor ablated: the row corresponding to HAM_m^s represents the full model without any ablation; the row corresponding to HAM_m^s-o represents the results when the low-order association is ablated (i.e., $n_l=0$); the row corresponding to HAM_m^s-u represents the results when the users’ general preferences is ablated.

also notice that HAM_m^s achieves very similar performance with HAM_m^s-o on CDs and ML-20M. (e.g., HAM_m^s: 0.0397 vs HAM_m^s-o: 0.0403 on Recall@5 on CDs, difference: 1.5%). On CDs, this might be due to that HAM_m^s-o uses a small $n_h=3$ to model the item associations, and it would have a similar effect as to HAM_m^s using high-order $n_h=5$ and low-order $n_l=2$ together. On ML-20M, this might be because of ML-20M has very limited low-order associations. Thus, removing **o** doesn’t significantly affect the recommendation performance.

Table 13 shows that HAM_m^s significantly outperforms HAM_m^s-u (i.e., HAM_m^s without **u**) on 5 out of 6 datasets (i.e., CDs, Books, Children, ML-20M and ML-1M). This indicates the effectiveness of explicitly modeling users’ general preferences. We also notice that HAM_m^s is slightly worse than HAM_m^s-u on Comics (e.g., HAM_m^s: 0.1385 vs HAM_m^s-u: 0.1422 on Recall@5, difference: 2.6%). This indicates that users may have limited long-term preferences on comics. Thus, explicitly modeling the long-term preferences does not improve the recommendation performance. Overall, HAM_m^s significantly outperforms HAM_m^s-o and HAM_m^s-u on most benchmark datasets, demonstrating the effectiveness of explicitly modeling high-order and low-order associations and users’ general preferences.

6.7 Run-Time Performance in Testing

Table 14 presents the run-time performance during testing for each user on average (i.e., on the testing set) in 80-20-CUT. We compare the run-time performance in testing instead of training due to the fact that in real applications, latency in real-time recommendation affects the user experience and thus revenue very significantly, while model training can be implemented as an off-line or online, incremental/batch process and thus long run time for model training can be tolerated.

Table 14 shows that HAM_m^s achieves the best run-time performance in testing compared to all the baseline methods

TABLE 14: Testing Run-Time Performance in 80-20-CUT (sec)

Dataset	Caser	SASRec	HGN	HAM _m ^s	speedup
CDs	1.2e-1	2.3e-2	1.5e-3	6.3e-4	2.4
Books	1.4e-1	2.6e-2	<u>3.2e-3</u>	7.9e-4	4.1
Children	1.2e-1	1.9e-2	<u>1.6e-3</u>	7.4e-4	2.2
Comics	1.2e-1	2.2e-2	<u>1.5e-3</u>	7.1e-4	2.1
ML-20M	5.0e-2	1.2e-2	<u>6.0e-4</u>	4.9e-4	1.2
ML-1M	1.3e-2	6.1e-3	<u>3.7e-4</u>	3.5e-4	1.1

In this table, the best run-time performance in testing of each dataset is **bold**. The second best inference-time performance in each dataset is underlined. All the run time is in seconds (s). The column “speedup” presents the speedup of the **bold** best performance over the underlined second best performance in each dataset.

on all the datasets, followed by HGN. HAM_m^s is on average 2.2-times faster than the best baseline HGN over all the datasets. The primary difference between HGN and HAM_m^s during testing is that HGN needs to calculate weights for latent features and items using the gating mechanism, but HAM_m^s only uses mean pooling to aggregate items. Compared to deep methods SASRec and Caser, HAM_m^s achieves highly significant speedup on all the six datasets. For example, HAM_m^s achieves 190.5-times (e.g, 1.2e-1/6.3e-4 = 190.5) faster than Caser on CDs. On average, HAM_m^s achieves 139.7 and 28.0 speedup compared to Caser and SASRec, respectively. This indicates that by using the simplistic pooling mechanism, HAM_m^s could be much more efficient than deep methods such as SASRec and Caser. Recall that as shown in Table 9 (Section 6.4), in 80-20-CUT, HAM_m^s also achieves significant improvement over Caser, SASRec and HGN in terms of the recommendation performance. These results indicate that HAM_m^s is both much more effective and much more efficient than state-of-the-art methods. We also notice that although HAM_m^s is slightly worse than Caser and SASRec on the ML-1M and Books datasets, respectively, in terms of the recommendation performance (Table 3 and Table 4), HAM_m^s is much faster than Caser and SASRec: HAM_m^s achieves 37.1-fold (1.3e-2/3.5e-4=37.1) and 32.9-fold (2.6e-2/7.9e-4=32.9) speedup over Caser on ML-1M and SASRec on Books, respectively. Overall, HAM_m^s significantly outperforms state-of-the-art baseline methods in run-time performance in testing, demonstrating its efficiency.

Similar trend is also observed in the run-time performance during training. For example, in 80-20-CUT, on Books, HAM_m^s needs 1.1 hour to achieve the reported results (Table 3), while Caser and SASRec needs 3.5 hours (3-fold slower) and 7.7 hours (7-fold slower), respectively. HAM_m^s could be slower than HGN in training due to the fact that HAM_m^s generally needs more epochs to converge than HGN, while HGN has lower embedding dimensions (Table A2 in Appendix). However, we believe the difference is very tolerable in real applications. For example, in 80-20-CUT, on Books, HAM_m^s needs 1.1 hours to achieve the reported results, while HGN needs 0.7 hours (24-minute difference). On ML-20M (i.e., the largest dataset), the difference is relatively large: HAM_m^s takes 4.0 hours to achieve the reported best results, while HGN needs 1.0 hours (3-hour difference). However, we think the 3-hours difference in training is tolerable in real applications, particularly given that the training can be done off line.




Fig. 3: Item Frequency Distribution

7 DISCUSSIONS

7.1 Comparison with Reported Results

In HGN [5], the authors reported that HGN significantly outperforms SASRec on the CDs, Books, Children, Comics and ML-20M datasets in 80-20-CUT. For example, HGN achieves 19.83% and 16.67% [5] improvement over SASRec on Books and Comics, respectively, in terms of Recall@10 in 80-20-CUT. However, in our experiments, as shown in Table 3, SASRec outperforms HGN on 4 out of 6 datasets (i.e., CDs, Books, ML-20M and ML-1M), after we used a much larger parameter space and exhaustively tuned more parameters (e.g., d , n_h , n_p) than those reported in HGN. However, as we have discussed in Section 6.3, SASRec is sensitive to parameters and it becomes very expensive to find the best performance of SASRec in real applications. This could be the reason why we observed the discordance between our experimental results and those reported in HGN.

7.2 HGN Attention Weight Analysis

It has been shown that the learned attention weights may not always be meaningful [29], [30]. Therefore, we further investigate the attention weights in HGN to interpret their significance and to understand why instead the simplistic mean pooling in HAM would suffice. We use datasets CDs, Comics, ML-1M and ML-10M in the investigation, because these datasets, as Table 2 shows, represent different data sparsities (i.e., CDs is highly sparse, Comics is moderately sparse, and ML-1M and ML-10M are dense). Fig. 3 (the x-axis in the Fig. is logarithmized item frequencies and then normalized into [0,1]) shows that most of the items in CDs and Comics are very infrequent, whereas in ML-1M infrequent items are fewer; in ML-20M, the infrequent items (compared to other frequent items in ML-20M) still have many purchases/ratings (Table 2).

Fig. 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d present the distributions of attention weights from the best performing HGN models on the CDs, Comics, ML-1M and ML-20M, respectively. Note that a same item can have different weights in different user sequences; we use all the weights of a same item from all the users in the Figs. The distributions for CDs, Comics and ML-20M datasets show very similar patterns: for very infrequent items, their attention weights are highly centered around 0.5 (i.e., the initialization value); for the most frequent items, their attention weights are slightly off 0.5 and have some different values than 0.5. Given that as Fig. 3 shows, most of the items in CDs, Comics and ML-20M are infrequent, the weight distribution over infrequent items indicates that the weights might not be well learned to differentiate the importance of infrequent items. The weights on frequent items might be relatively




Fig. 4: HGN Attention Weight Distributions

better learned. However, unfortunately, frequent items are not many and their weights may not substantially affect recommendations. The distributions for the ML-1M dataset also shows similar patterns: the weights for both infrequent and frequent items are closely centered at 0.5, indicating that such weights might not well differentiate item importance. Such HGN weight distributions from both sparse and dense datasets indicate that the learned weights may not play an effective role in recommendation. Instead, a special case of weights, that is, equal weights as we have in HAM, should also achieve comparable performance as HGN. As a matter of fact, equal weights on better learned item representations as in HAM actually improve the recommendation performance.

7.3 Discussions on Experimental Settings

80-20-CUT (i.e., to evaluate the last 20% items) and NDCG@ k (e.g., $k=10$) are the most commonly used experimental setting and evaluation metric in literature. NDCG@ k in 80-20-CUT could over estimate the sequential recommendation performance as discussed in Section 6.2.1, particularly for long sequences in which the last 20% items include many. In such long sequences, NDCG@ k could be high when items purchased/rated very late are recommended on top. However, such recommendations would have limited use scenarios. Meanwhile, many testing items will increase the chances that the recommended k items will be included in those items, and thus inflate the NDCG@ k values.

80-3-CUT and 3-LOS mitigate the over-estimation issue because always a same number of items will be tested and NDCG@ k calculated over a same number of testing items will not be affected by the number of testing items. However, in 80-3-CUT, the number of validation items are larger than that of testing items for most users. As a result, the best parameters selected based on validation sets may not always work well in recommending the next few items on the testing set. 3-LOS mitigates this problem to some extent by using the same number of items (i.e., 3) in both the validation and testing sets. However, there are only three validation items for each user. The small number of validation items may result in more randomness in identifying the

best parameters and thus the best parameters on validation sets may not work well on testing either, especially for methods that are sensitive to parameters such as SASRec (Section 6.3).

Overall, considering the advantages and disadvantages of the three settings, we think 80-3-CUT is more suitable for the sequential recommendation problem compared to 80-20-CUT and 3-LOS. However, it is still an open question as to how to standardize the experimental settings and evaluation metrics for sequential recommendation tasks.

8 CONCLUSIONS

In this manuscript, we present novel, effective and efficient HAM models for sequential recommendation. The HAM models use three factors to generate recommendations: 1) users' long-term preferences, 2) sequential, high-order and low-order association patterns in the users' most recent purchases/ratings, and 3) synergies among those items. Our experimental results in comparison with three state-of-the-art sequential recommendation methods on six public benchmark datasets in three experimental settings demonstrate that HAM models achieve significant improvement over the state-of-the-art baseline methods (e.g., 46.6-fold improvement over Caser in 80-3-CUT). In addition, our experimental results in the ablation study demonstrate the importance of modeling both low-order associations and users' general preferences (e.g., 14.9% improvement with low-order associations modeled on Comics). Moreover, our results in the run-time performance comparison in testing show that HAM models are much more efficient than baseline methods especially for deep methods such as Caser (139.7 average speedup) and SASRec (28.0 average speedup). In addition, we studied the attention weights in benchmark datasets and found that the attention mechanism may learn less meaningful weights on sparse recommendation datasets. We also discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the three experimental settings used in our experiments. We think 80-3-CUT is more suitable for the sequential recommendation problem compared to 80-20-CUT and 3-LOS. However, how to standardize the experimental settings and evaluation metrics is still open to future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project was made possible, in part, by support from the National Science Foundation under Grant Number IIS-1855501 and IIS-1827472, and from National Library of Medicine under Grant Number 1R01LM012605-01A1. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agencies.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Hidasi, A. Karatzoglou, L. Baltrunas, and D. Tikk, "Session-based recommendations with recurrent neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06939*, 2015.
- [2] B. Hidasi and A. Karatzoglou, "Recurrent neural networks with top-k gains for session-based recommendations," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. ACM, 2018, pp. 843–852.
- [3] M. F. Dacrema, P. Cremonesi, and D. Jannach, "Are we really making much progress? a worrying analysis of recent neural recommendation approaches," 2019.
- [4] M. Ludewig, N. Mauro, S. Latifi, and D. Jannach, "Performance comparison of neural and non-neural approaches to session-based recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, ser. RecSys '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 462–466. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3298689.3347041>
- [5] C. Ma, P. Kang, and X. Liu, "Hierarchical gating networks for sequential recommendation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09217*, 2019.
- [6] S. Rendle, C. Freudenthaler, and L. Schmidt-Thieme, "Factorizing personalized markov chains for next-basket recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*. ACM, 2010, pp. 811–820.
- [7] R. He and J. McAuley, "Fusing similarity models with markov chains for sparse sequential recommendation," in *2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 191–200.
- [8] J. Tang and K. Wang, "Personalized top-n sequential recommendation via convolutional sequence embedding," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. ACM, 2018, pp. 565–573.
- [9] A. Beutel, P. Covington, S. Jain, C. Xu, J. Li, V. Gatto, and E. H. Chi, "Latent cross: Making use of context in recurrent recommender systems," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 2018, pp. 46–54.
- [10] M. Quadrana, A. Karatzoglou, B. Hidasi, and P. Cremonesi, "Personalizing session-based recommendations with hierarchical recurrent neural networks," in *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. ACM, 2017, pp. 130–137.
- [11] J. Li, P. Ren, Z. Chen, Z. Ren, T. Lian, and J. Ma, "Neural attentive session-based recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2017, pp. 1419–1428.
- [12] Q. Liu, Y. Zeng, R. Mokhosi, and H. Zhang, "Stamp: short-term attention/memory priority model for session-based recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2018, pp. 1831–1839.
- [13] W.-C. Kang and J. McAuley, "Self-attentive sequential recommendation," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 197–206.
- [14] F. Yuan, A. Karatzoglou, I. Arapakis, J. M. Jose, and X. He, "A simple convolutional generative network for next item recommendation," in *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 2019, pp. 582–590.
- [15] S. Kabbur, X. Ning, and G. Karypis, "Fism: factored item similarity models for top-n recommender systems," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2013, pp. 659–667.
- [16] X. He, Z. He, X. Du, and T.-S. Chua, "Adversarial personalized ranking for recommendation," in *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, 2018, pp. 355–364.
- [17] M. R. Min, X. Ning, C. Cheng, and M. Gerstein, "Interpretable sparse high-order boltzmann machines," in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2014, pp. 614–622.
- [18] S. Rendle, C. Freudenthaler, Z. Gantner, and L. Schmidt-Thieme, "Bpr: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.2618*, 2012.
- [19] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [20] R. He and J. McAuley, "Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering," in *proceedings of the 25th international conference on world wide web*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2016, pp. 507–517.
- [21] M. Wan and J. McAuley, "Item recommendation on monotonic behavior chains," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. ACM, 2018, pp. 86–94.
- [22] F. M. Harper and J. A. Konstan, "The movielens datasets: History and context," *Acm transactions on interactive intelligent systems (tiis)*, vol. 5, no. 4, p. 19, 2016.
- [23] "Amazon review dataset," <http://jmcauley.ucsd.edu/data/amazon/>.
- [24] "Goodreads dataset," <https://www.goodreads.com/>.
- [25] MovieLens, "Movielens dataset," <https://movielens.org/>, 2020.
- [26] Q. Yuan, G. Cong, and A. Sun, "Graph-based point-of-interest recommendation with geographical and temporal influences," in

Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management. ACM, 2014, pp. 659–668.

- [27] S. Zhao, T. Zhao, H. Yang, M. R. Lyu, and I. King, “Stellar: spatial-temporal latent ranking for successive point-of-interest recommendation,” in *Thirtieth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2016.
- [28] G. Zhou, N. Mou, Y. Fan, Q. Pi, W. Bian, C. Zhou, X. Zhu, and K. Gai, “Deep interest evolution network for click-through rate prediction,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, 2019, pp. 5941–5948.
- [29] S. Jain and B. C. Wallace, “Attention is not explanation,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, 2019, pp. 3543–3556.
- [30] S. Serrano and N. A. Smith, “Is attention interpretable?” in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019, pp. 2931–2951.

Bo Peng received his M.S. degree from the Department of Computer and Information Science, Indiana University–Purdue University, Indianapolis, in 2019. He is currently a Ph.D. student at the Computer Science and Engineering Department, The Ohio State University. His research interests include machine learning, data mining and their applications in recommender systems and graph mining.

Zhiyun Ren received her Ph.D. degree from the Department of Computer Science, George Mason University, Fairfax, in 2019. She is currently a Postdoctoral Scholar at the Biomedical Informatics Department, The Ohio State University. Her research interests include machine learning, data mining and their applications in learning analytics, recommender systems and biomedical informatics.

Srinivasan Parthasarathy received his Ph.D. degree from the Department of Computer Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, in 1999. He is currently a Professor at the Computer Science and Engineering Department, and the Biomedical Informatics Department, The Ohio State University. His research is on high performance data analytics, graph analytics and network science, and machine learning and database systems.

Xia Ning received her Ph.D. degree from the Department of Computer Science & Engineering, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, in 2012. She is currently an Associate Professor at the Biomedical Informatics Department, and the Computer Science and Engineering Department, The Ohio State University. Her research is on data mining, machine learning and artificial intelligence with applications in recommender systems, drug discovery and medical informatics.

APPENDIX A

PARAMETER STUDY OF SASRec 3-LOS

TABLE A1: Parameter Study of SASRec on Comics in 3-LOS

parameter	d	n	h	Recall@5	Recall@10
d	200	600	1	0.2543	0.3209
	400	600	1	0.2611	0.3250
	600	600	1	<u>0.2750</u>	<u>0.3353</u>
	800	600	1	0.0374	0.0588
n	600	200	1	0.2714	0.3333
	600	400	1	0.0459	0.0737
	600	600	1	<u>0.2750</u>	<u>0.3353</u>
	600	800	1	OOM	OOM
h	600	600	1	<u>0.2750</u>	<u>0.3353</u>
	600	600	2	0.0357	0.0587
	600	600	4	OOM	OOM

In this table, d , n and h are the dimension of embeddings, maximum sequence length and the number of head of the multi-head attention. The best results on validation sets and the corresponding parameters are underlined. The “parameter” column presents the parameters to be studied in each row block. The “OOM” represents the out-of-memory issue.

In this section, we present more details of the parameter study on SASRec as discussed in Section 6.3 of the main manuscript. Table A1 presents the results of SASRec on the validation set of Comics in 3-LOS with respect to different parameters. In Table A1, the “OOM” represents the out-of-memory issue and the best results on the validation set and the corresponding parameters are underlined. Table A1 shows that the performance of SASRec changes dramatically by slightly changing the parameters. For example, when the dimension of embeddings d is changed from 600 to 800 and all the other parameters are fixed, the performance of SASRec on Recall@10 decreases dramatically from 0.3353 to 0.0588 (6-fold decrease). The similar trend could also be found in the other parameters (i.e., maximum sequence length n and the number of head in the multi-head attention h). For example, when h is changed from 1 to 2, the performance decreases from 0.3353 to 0.0587 on Recall@10 (6-fold decrease). These results indicate that SASRec could be very sensitive to parameters. Table A1 also shows that SASRec requires a large amount of memory in training, as we got the out-of-memory issue when using large n (i.e., 800) and h (i.e., 4). This limits the real-application scenarios that SASRec could be used for. Our HAM methods do not suffer from such memory issues.

APPENDIX B

PARAMETERS FOR REPRODUCIBILITY

In this Section, we report the parameters corresponding to the best Recall@10 results of HAM^s and all the other baseline methods for the sake of reproducibility. These parameters are identified through tuning on the validation sets. Recall that we use the same training and validation sets in 80-20-CUT and 80-3-CUT (Fig. 2). As a result, the best parameters based on the tuning on the validation sets are identical in 80-20-CUT and 80-3-CUT.

We implement HAM in python with pytorch 1.2.0 (<https://pytorch.org>). We used Adam optimizer with learning rate 1e-3 and regularization factor 1e-3 on all the datasets. The dimension of embeddings d , the number

of items in high-order/low-order associations n_h/n_l , the number of items to calculate recommendation errors during training n_p , and the order of item synergies that are specific for each dataset are reported in the $\text{HAM}_{\text{m}}^{\text{s}}$ column of Table A2. Our HAM implementation is publicly available at <https://github.com/BoPeng112/HAM>.

For HGN, we used the implementation provided by the authors in [github](https://github.com/allenjack/HGN)². We used the default Adam optimizer with learning rate 1e-3 and regularization factor 1e-3 on all the datasets. The dimension of embeddings, denoted as d , the length of the subsequences, denoted as L and the number of items used as targets in training, denoted as T , of each dataset are reported in the HGN column of Table A2.

For SASRec, we used the implementation provided by the authors in [github](https://github.com/kang205/SASRec)³ as well. We used the default Adam optimizer with learning rate 1e-3 and the exponential decay rate for the second-moment estimates beta2 0.98. The dimension of embeddings, denoted as d , the maximum sequence length, denoted as n and the number of heads of the multi-head attention, denoted as h , of each dataset are reported in the SASRec column of Table A2.

For Caser, we also used the pytorch implementation suggested by the authors in [github](https://github.com/graytowne/caser_pytorch)⁴. We used the default Adam optimizer with learning rate 1e-3 and regularization factor 1e-6. The dimension of embeddings, denoted as d , the length of the subsequences, denoted as L , the number of items used as targets in training, denoted as T , the number of vertical filters in CNNs, denoted as nv , and the number of horizontal filters in CNNs, denoted as nh , of each dataset are reported in the Caser column of Table A2.

2. <https://github.com/allenjack/HGN>

3. <https://github.com/kang205/SASRec>

4. https://github.com/graytowne/caser_pytorch

TABLE A2: Best Parameters for HAM_m^s and Baseline Methods

	Dataset	HAM_m^s					HGN			SASRec			Caser				
		d	n_h	n_l	n_p	p	d	L	T	d	n	h	d	L	T	nv	nh
80-20-CUT 80-3-CUT	CDs	400	5	2	3	2	200	5	2	400	600	1	200	5	4	2	16
	Books	400	9	2	7	2	400	4	4	400	600	1	200	6	4	2	8
	Children	400	6	1	4	3	200	2	4	400	200	1	100	4	4	2	16
	Comics	400	7	2	5	3	200	2	6	400	400	1	100	4	4	2	16
	ML-20M	400	9	3	2	3	100	5	3	400	400	4	100	6	2	4	8
	ML-1M	400	7	2	3	3	100	4	4	200	600	1	200	6	2	2	8
3-LOS	CDs	400	4	2	7	2	200	4	3	400	400	4	200	4	4	2	16
	Books	400	9	2	9	2	400	2	6	400	400	1	200	5	3	2	8
	Children	400	6	1	4	3	100	2	5	400	200	1	200	4	4	2	8
	Comics	400	7	1	5	3	200	2	5	600	600	1	200	4	4	2	8
	ML-20M	400	8	3	3	3	100	6	3	400	400	4	200	4	4	2	8
	ML-1M	400	8	2	2	3	100	3	4	200	600	2	200	5	2	2	16

In this table, in HAM_m^s , d , n_h/n_l , n_p and p are the embedding dimension, number of items in high-order/low-order associations, number of items to calculate recommendation errors during training and the order of item synergies, respectively. In HGN, d , L and T are the embedding dimension, length of the subsequences and the number of items used as targets in training. In SASRec, d , n and h are the embedding dimension, maximum sequence length and the number of head of the multi-head attention. In Caser, d , L , T , nv and nh are the embedding dimension, the length of the subsequences, the number of items used as targets in training the number of vertical filters and the number of horizontal filters, respectively. The HAM_m^s , HGN, SASRec, Caser columns present the best parameters on validation sets and thus are used in testing for HAM_m^s , HGN, SASRec and Caser, respectively.