

Meta-Shop: Improving Item Advertisement For Small Businesses

Yang Shi
Rakuten, Inc.
San Mateo, USA
yang.shi@rakuten.com

Guannan Liang
Rakuten, Inc.
San Mateo, USA
guannan.liang@rakuten.com

Young-joo Chung
Rakuten, Inc.
San Mateo, USA
youngjoo.chung@rakuten.com

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we study item advertisements for small businesses. This application recommends prospective customers to specific items requested by businesses. From analysis, we found that the existing Recommender Systems (RS) were ineffective for small/new businesses with a few sales history. Training samples in RS can be highly biased toward popular businesses with sufficient sales and can decrease advertising performance for small businesses. We propose a meta-learning-based RS to improve advertising performance for small/new businesses and shops: *Meta-Shop*. Meta-Shop leverages an advanced meta-learning optimization framework and builds a model for a shop-level recommendation. It also integrates and transfers knowledge between large and small shops, consequently learning better features in small shops. We conducted experiments on a real-world E-commerce dataset and a public benchmark dataset. Meta-Shop outperformed a production baseline and the state-of-the-art RS models. Specifically, it achieved up to 16.6% relative improvement of Recall@1M and 40.4% relative improvement of nDCG@3 for user recommendations to new shops compared to the other RS models.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems; Similarity measures.

KEYWORDS

cold-start recommendation, recommender system, meta-learning

1 INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems (RS) are the core component of the E-commerce business. E-commerce companies such as Amazon and eBay need to provide personalized recommendations to customers and provide prospective user targeting services to sellers, i.e., recommend potential customers to sellers so that sellers can increase their sales on the platform. When E-commerce companies provide such services to sellers or business owners, one obstacle is the recommendation bias to large businesses. While large and established businesses with a sufficient number of popular items can get accurate potential customers, the performance of RS for small businesses is usually unsatisfactory due to items with a limited number of sales. In addition, the bias toward items in large businesses could hurt users' experience since the system may fail to find new and niche items in small businesses, which may be of interest to the users.

We show the different distribution of sales, revenue, and unique items of large and small businesses from Rakuten Ichiba in Figure 6.




Figure 1: Sales data of Genre A from Ichiba platform. After sorting the shops by the number of sales, the top 25% of shops are categorized as large businesses, and the rest are small businesses. (a) the histogram of shop's sales. (b) the breakdown of one-year revenue. (c) the breakdown of unique items in large and small businesses.

Rakuten Ichiba¹ is the largest E-commerce platform in Japan, where 50K shops sell more than 300M items. Each shop sells various products, from unique hand-made shoes to home appliances. Shops also promote their products via targeted advertisement and various customer experiences such as gift wrapping services or rewards. While items from the small businesses account for 20% of all items, their revenue contribution is only 6%. With a similar average price per item in the big and small businesses (\$29 and \$35 respectively), we conclude that small businesses are not finding the right customers. By improving recommendation performance for small businesses, we aim to increase the revenue contribution from small businesses and the satisfaction from both sellers and customers.

On the one hand, the small business problem is closely related to the popularity bias problem. Many researchers have explored the popularity bias in recommender systems. Abdollahpouri *et al.* proposed a regularization-based factorization method to improve long tail recommendations [1]. Brynjolfsson *et al.* and Park *et al.* tried to improve the long-tail recommender system performance via reducing popularity bias and balancing the popularity distributions [9, 30]. We tried two widely-used solutions, oversampling (Section 5.7.3), and

¹<https://www.rakuten.co.jp>

regularization (Section 5.7.4). However, they did not improve the recommendation performance for small businesses shop-wise. Thus, item-level bias approaches cannot solve shop-level bias. Our work focuses on shop-level popularity bias instead of item-level bias.

On the other hand, less popular items from small businesses can be treated as cold-start items. One possible solution for cold-start items is the content-based models [20, 26]. Instead of using transaction history, these models used content features (i.e., side information) such as user profile and item information. Hybrid models that combine content-based models and collaborative filtering have also been popular [11, 23]. The main idea is to map the side information and the feedback to separated low-dimensional representations and then use them together to predict the final interaction. However, hybrid methods still suffer from sample selection bias [45] problem since it is inevitable during training [29]. Our experimental results in Section 3 also showed that the state-of-the-art cold-start RS [32] did not solve the shop-level imbalanced performance.

In many recent works, meta-learning has been used to improve recommendation performance. Notably, model-agnostic meta-learning (MAML) [17] is widely used to solve cold-start problems in RS due to its success in few-shot learning [6, 22, 49]. In this scenario, the recommendation for a user is a task. Each user has their local model that is updated by their past transaction. After all local models are updated, the global model is updated by minimizing the loss over all training tasks. Then, the learned global model initializes local models for the next update. With this, the knowledge from local models with sufficient training samples can be transferred to models with less sufficient models and help cold-start users.

To improve the advertising performance for small businesses, we propose *Meta-Shop*. *Meta-Shop* leverages the MAML and builds a model for the shop-level recommendation. By applying the MAML framework to shop-level tasks, *Meta-Shop* could solve the popularity bias problem by integrating and transferring knowledge between large and small shops, consequently providing better recommendation performance for small shops. In addition, the learning-to-learn property of MAML enables our model to adapt to cold-start or new shops quickly. While the recent work MeLU [22] focused on cold-start user preference estimation, *Meta-Shop* learns user and item representations for different shops. Another advantage of *Meta-Shop* is its training stability. MAML is known to have issues such as training instability and slow convergence [3]. Previous work added additional task-specific parameters or gradient-skip connections to reduce model instability [14, 31]. By training per shop-level, *Meta-Shop* reduces the number of tasks without any hyper-parameter setting and thus provides stable training with better generalization.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that considers popularity bias in businesses, learns meta user/item features at the shop-level, and builds a quick-adaptive shop-level recommender system. Our contributions are as follows:

- We study a novel problem on real-world E-commerce platforms, namely improving advertising performance for small businesses (i.e., shops with a few sales history).
- We propose *Meta-Shop* to solve the above problem. *Meta-Shop* is a meta-learning-based recommender system. It trains a user-item interaction prediction model that quickly adapts to different shops. Instead of emphasizing learning on the large

businesses/shops, it transfers knowledge learned from large shops to small shops and improves small shops' prospective user targeting. Also, it can quickly adapt to unseen shops without the past transaction.

- Experimental results on a real-world E-commerce dataset and the MovieLens IM dataset demonstrate that our method outperforms the existing production baseline and the state-of-the-art models. Notably, for the recommendation for unseen shops, we achieved 16.6% relative improvement of Recall@1Million on Ichiba E-commerce dataset and 40.4% relative improvement of nDCG@3 on the MovieLens dataset.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Popularity Bias Problem in RS

The popularity bias problem in RS, also known as the long-tail item popularity problem, has been explored. The researches are mainly fallen into two categories: 1) to improve the performance of RS in the presence of long-tail items; 2) to increase the chance of long-tail items to be recommended. First of all, researchers worked on improving the overall recommendation performance [9]. For example, Park and Tuzhilin proposed splitting tail items from the whole item sets and building a RS based on head items and tail items separately. Furthermore, other researches focused on controlling popularity bias to recommend more long-tail items [2]. More specifically, Abdollahpouri et al. introduced a regularization-based framework and showed that the regularization could trade-off between recommendation accuracy and coverage of long-tail items. Zhang *et al.* [47] combined curriculum learning and meta-learning to improve the performance of long-tail item recommendations. However, this model requires information about all items popularities in training which can be hard to obtain in real-world cases.

2.2 Hybrid RS for Cold-start Problems

Various hybrid methods have been proposed to tackle the cold-start problem, such as collaborative topic regression [42] and its variants [19, 43]. Based on the availability of feedback information, collaborative topic regression interpolated between content-based representations generated from side information by Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [8] and feedback-based ones generated from interaction matrices by weighted matrix factorization (WMF).

Recent hybrid methods utilized neural networks to learn representations from side information. To solve the cold-start problem in the music recommendation system, DeepMusic [38] created multiple embeddings based on contents (e.g., artist biographies and audio spectrogram) using neural networks. Other researchers utilized various autoencoders to learn the representation of side information [15, 24, 46].

Some works, such as Dropoutnet [41], focused on integrating side information and the preference/feedback information. The values of preference representations are set to zero for cold-start items when past interactions are missing. Bianchi *et al.* utilized feedbacks from multi-brand retailers and aligned item embeddings across shops using translation models [7]. CB2CF [5] learned a mapping function from side information to representation. Attention mechanisms were also introduced to improve the recommendation performance.

ACCM [34] paid more attention to the cold-start item’s side information than other interaction information to make predictions. Raziperchikolaei *et al.* proposed a hybrid method that creates user representation using side information of items purchased [32]. With this, this method recommended cold-start items only with side information.

2.3 Meta-learning

Meta-learning, also called learning-to-learn, is thriving as it trains a meta-model that can quickly adapt to new tasks [18, 40]. It has been applied to different areas such as computer vision [3, 10] and natural language processing [4, 44]. Previous researchers learned novel metric functions [36, 37] or designed architectures that rapidly generalize to new tasks [27, 33]. Recently, optimization-based methods have achieved massive success in the meta-learning field [17]. It can quickly adapt to new tasks with a few samples.

The success of optimization-based meta-learning in few-shot settings has shed light on the cold-start recommendation systems. Lee *et al.* and Vartak *et al.* applied meta-learning to RS and treated each user’s recommendation as separated tasks [22, 39]. Each task predicts whether a user likes an item or not. Scenario-specific sequential meta learner [16] learned user’s behaviors from different scenarios such as “what to take when traveling” and “how to dress up yourself on a party”. Here, tasks are based on scenarios. Pan *et al.* proposed a two-step model to improve click-through rate predictions for cold-start advertisements (ads) by first training a traditional classification model using warm-start ads and then adding a meta-learning module to fine-tune cold-start item feature embeddings [29]. Besides using meta-learning to learn user and item features, several works also focused on using meta-learning to optimize model structures [25, 48]. Dong *et al.* [14] introduced memory-augmented meta-optimization (MAMO) for recommender systems. Introducing two memory tensors that store user preference and prediction weight helped the model with better generalization. However, MAMO requires a hyper-parameter to decide the number of user preference groups.

3 POPULARITY BIAS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

This section presents the analysis result showing that existing cold-start item recommender systems suffer from popularity bias issues.

We analyzed the shop-level recommendation performance using Ichiba’s production RS baseline. The architecture of the production baseline is shown in Figure 2. It creates item representations from side information such as price and title, then creates user representation by aggregating representations of items the user purchased in the training period. Euclidean distance between the user and item representation is the final interaction score. It utilizes contrastive loss [13] with positive and negative samples to make user and item representations similar when there is interaction and dissimilar when not².




Figure 2: Production baseline model for cold-start item recommendation. \otimes operation is a summation of all item representations of which the user purchased.




Figure 3: Distribution of the number of sales per test shop in training data. Shops with lower recall have few sales.

The objective function is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta} & \sum_{(i,u) \in \mathcal{D}^+} \|f_u(N_u) - f_i(x_i)\| \\ & + \lambda \sum_{(i,u) \in \mathcal{D}^-} \max(0, m_d - \|f_u(N_u) - f_i(x_i)\|) \\ \text{subject to} & f_u(N_u) = \frac{1}{|N_u|} \sum_{i \in N_u} f_i(x_i) \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{D}^+ are positive samples, \mathcal{D}^- are negative samples, N_u is a collection of items purchased by user u , x_i is item i ’s side information, m_d is the margin.

We trained the baseline model using a randomly selected $\sim 30M$ purchase history with $\sim 3M$ users and $\sim 1.3M$ items from purchase data in Ichiba Genre A. We evaluated the Recall@1M per test shop. The shop recall was computed by averaging Recall@1M of each test item sold by the shop. Based on shop recall, we divided test shops into two groups: shops with Recall@1M ≥ 0.8 and shops with Recall@1M < 0.8 .

After computing statistics such as “number of sales per shop”, “average item price per shop”, and “average length of item description per shop”, we found that the “number of sales per shop” is most likely a cause for the performance differences. Specifically, bad-performed shops have fewer sales. For example, 59.9% shops with Recall@1M ≥ 0.8 have more than 10k sales in training, while more than 52% shops with Recall@1M < 0.8 have less than 5k sales.

²The performance of the baseline model with Mean-squared-error loss was worse than with contrastive loss.




Figure 4: Meta-Shop model: User and item have separated mapping models. The two hidden features are combined by a dot product at the last layer. Parameters in $f()$ are meta-parameters shared among all shops.

The details are shown in Figure 3. This analysis concluded that *the existing cold-start recommendation models are ineffective for small shops/businesses because of the popularity bias.*

4 PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we propose a novel meta-learning framework to solve cold-start item recommendations for small businesses: **Meta-Shop**. In the Meta-Shop model, we define per shop recommendations as separated tasks.

4.1 The Meta-Shop Model

Model inputs are user feature e_u and item feature e_i . They can be trainable one-hot embeddings or pre-trained representations. The model parameter is θ . For shop $p \in \mathcal{T}_{shop}$, we define its loss as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^p; \theta) = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{(i,u,y_{i,u}) \in \mathcal{D}^p} \mathcal{L}(y_{i,u}, \tilde{y}_{i,u}),$$

where \mathcal{D}^p are shop p 's transaction data, i.e., $\{(i, u, y_{i,u})\}$ (with size $n_p = |\mathcal{D}^p|$). $y_{i,u} \in \{0, 1\}$ describes a user-item purchase interaction, i.e., $y_{i,u}$ is 1 if user u purchased item i (in shop p) and 0 otherwise, $\hat{y} = f(e_u, e_i; \theta)$ is the predicted score, $f(\cdot)$ is the prediction function and θ are model parameters. $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is loss function, which can be either squared loss: $\mathcal{L}(y_{i,u}, \tilde{y}_{i,u}) = (y_{i,u} - \tilde{y}_{i,u})^2$, or cross-entropy loss $\mathcal{L}(y_{i,u}, \tilde{y}_{i,u}) = y_{i,u} \log(\tilde{y}_{i,u}) + (1 - y_{i,u}) \log(1 - \tilde{y}_{i,u})$. In this paper, we use squared loss for all experiments. For prediction function $f(\cdot)$, we design the network architecture: **Meta-Shop (MeSh)**, as shown in Figure 4.

In MeSh, user and item inputs are separately fed into two different multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs): $h_u = f_u(e_u; \theta_u)$, $h_i = f_i(e_i; \theta_i)$, and at the last layer, the two hidden features are combined by a dot product: $\hat{y} = \langle h_u, h_i \rangle$, where user preference representation $f_u(e_u; \theta_u)$ and item preference representation $f_i(e_i; \theta_i)$ are:

$$f_u(e_u; \theta_u) = \sigma(\dots \sigma(\sigma(e_u; W_1^u, b_1^u); W_2^u, b_2^u) \dots; W_L^u, b_L^u)$$

$$f_i(e_i; \theta_i) = \sigma(\dots \sigma(\sigma(e_i; W_1^i, b_1^i); W_2^i, b_2^i) \dots; W_L^i, b_L^i)$$

and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is an activation function, W_l^u, b_l^u and W_l^i, b_l^i are the weight matrix and bias vector of l -th layer of MLP $f_u(\cdot; \theta_u)$ and $f_i(\cdot; \theta_i)$ respectively.

4.2 Optimization

We adopt the MAML algorithm [18] and show training steps in Algorithm 1 and inference steps in Algorithm 2. In Algorithm 1, \mathcal{T}_{shop} is a collection of all shops, which can be either large shops or small shops. For each shop p , support dataset \mathcal{D}_S^p and query dataset \mathcal{D}_Q^p are i.i.d drawn from \mathcal{D}^p , where $\mathcal{D}_S^p \cap \mathcal{D}_Q^p = \emptyset$. The gradient update for shop p in the inner loop is as follows:

$$\theta^p \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_S^p; \theta),$$

which update one or more gradient steps for meta model parameter θ for shop p . It is important to take a note that the meta model parameter θ is expected to be general enough for all shops, so that the one step of local gradient update for shop p can achieve a good performance. To attain such a goal, we adopt the standard gradient-based meta-learning framework, for which the meta-objective is formalized as:

$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{T}_{shop}} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_Q^p; \theta^p)$$

In above meta-objective, it is optimized over meta parameter θ , while the value of the objective function is calculated using the parameter θ^p of each shop p . We solve the meta-objective by MAML method but any other gradient-descent based optimization methods, such as

Algorithm 1: Meta-Shop Training

Result: θ
Initialization of θ , stepsize α, β , number of local updates K ;
while not converge **do**
 Sample batch of shops \mathcal{P} from \mathcal{T}_{shop} ;
 for shop p in \mathcal{P} **do**
 Set $\theta^p = \theta$;
 Sample \mathcal{D}_S^p and \mathcal{D}_Q^p from \mathcal{D}^p ;
 for k in $1, \dots, K$ **do**
 $\theta^p \leftarrow \theta^p - \alpha \nabla_{\theta^p} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_S^p; \theta^p)$;
 end
 end
 global update $\theta: \theta \leftarrow \theta - \beta \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_Q^p; \theta^p)$;
end

Algorithm 2: Meta-Shop Inference

Result: $\{\theta^p; p \in \mathcal{P}_{inf}\}$
Targeted small shops \mathcal{P}_{inf} and their observed transaction data $\{\mathcal{D}^p; p \in \mathcal{P}_{inf}\}$, number of local updates K ;
Trained meta model parameter θ , stepsize α ;
for shop p in \mathcal{P}_{inf} **do**
 Set $\theta^p = \theta$;
 Sample \mathcal{D}_S^p from \mathcal{D}^p ;
 for k in $1, \dots, K$ **do**
 $\theta^p \leftarrow \theta^p - \alpha \nabla_{\theta^p} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_S^p; \theta^p)$;
 end
end

Reptile[28], can also be used here. The global update step for meta parameter θ can be described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta &\leftarrow \theta - \beta \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_Q^p; \theta^p) \\ &= \theta - \beta \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_Q^p; \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_S^p; \theta)) \\ &= \theta - \beta \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \nabla_{\theta'} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_Q^p; \theta')|_{\theta'=\theta} (I - \alpha \nabla_{\theta''}^2 \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_S^p; \theta''))|_{\theta''=\theta} \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ is the first derivative of \mathcal{L} , $\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}$ is the second derivative of \mathcal{L} and I is identity matrix. For simplicity, we ignore the second derivative part in application.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we detail experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method. We verify its effectiveness with the following questions: (Q1) how good is the performance for all item-level recommendations? (Q2) how good is the shop-level recommendation performance, especially the small businesses? The first question considers item-level performance, and the second one considers shop-level performance. In the end, we perform additional experiments to show other solutions for promoting small businesses, such as changing training data and adding a bias regularizer.

5.1 Dataset

We use two datasets in our experiments: Ichiba and Movielens1M [21]. For the Ichiba dataset, we extracted sales history from genre A in Ichiba platform. We used the sales data from January 2020 to September 2020 for training and used October 2020 as test data. We kept shops with at least 13 sales in both training and test time, as the model requires support and query sets for each shop. 10 sales were randomly selected as the support set in each shop, and the rest went into the query set. Also, we classified test shops into *new shops* and *existing shops*. New shops are shops never shown in the training period while existing shops exist in the training period. We further separated existing shops into small and large based on the number of sales in training. Specifically, the top 25% of shops with the most sales are large shops; the rest are small shops.

For Movielens, we followed MeLU [22]: movies released before 1998 and after 1998 are training and test sets, respectively. We regard each genre (e.g. "action", "drama", and "crime.") as a shop for the experiment, based on the observation that the number of ratings was also biased on genres. Among 18 genres, we manually removed 3 genres from the training. They were used as *new shops* in the test. Like the Ichiba dataset, we kept at least 13 movie ratings in both training and test for each genre. We will use shops instead of genres for unified notation purposes in the following section.

Note that all test items did not appear in both datasets in the training period, i.e., all test items are completely cold-start. The statistics of the datasets are listed in Table 1.

5.2 Models

For the Ichiba dataset, we compared the proposed method with the following models:

Ichiba	User	Item	New shop	Existing shop	Purchases
Train	9,095,846	1,409,483	0	7,035	40,118,920
Test	9,387,803	894	9	354	23,325
Movielens	User	Item	New genre	Existing genre	Ratings
Train	5943	2526	0	15	146,023
Test	5847	621	3	15	126,064

Table 1: Dataset statistics.

- **LV2**: For each query item, we return the most frequent buyers who purchased items from the same level 2 genre as the query item. Note that genre taxonomy has several levels, from broad genres (lv1, e.g., shoes) to specific genres (lv5, e.g., running shoes).
- **Baseline**: The production baseline is introduced in Section 3. Item inputs are learnable one-hot embeddings from side information such as price and title. User inputs are summations of all item representations of which they purchased in the training period.
- **Meta-Shop-interaction (MeSh-i)**: Instead of training user and item embeddings separately, in MeSh-i, user and item inputs are concatenated ($x_0 = [e_u; e_i]$) before feeding into a MLP network. Output is $\hat{y} = f(x_0; \theta)$, where $f(x_0; \theta) = \sigma(\dots \sigma(\sigma(x_0; W_1, b_1); W_2, b_2) \dots; W_L, b_L)$ and $\sigma()$ is an activation function, W_l, b_l are the weight matrix and bias vector of l -th layer of MLP $f(\cdot; \theta)$
- **MeLU** [22]: MeLU is the state-of-the-art meta-learning framework for cold-start recommendation. It applied model-agnostic meta-learning (MAML) for individual users to learn a user preference estimator. Since in our setting, our goal is prospective user targeting–recommend users to sellers, which is the opposite of user preference estimation, we trained MeLU for individual items. The model structure is the same as MeSh-i.

For the Movielens dataset, we followed MeLU [22] and compared our model with **Wide & Deep** [12] and **MeLU**. Wide & Deep shared the same model structure as MeLU. The difference is that Wide & Deep used a standard SGD optimizer without MAML-style optimization.

5.3 Evaluation Metrics

For the Ichiba dataset, we computed recall (R). For Movielens, we computed mean absolute error (MAE) and normalized discounted cumulative gain (nDCG). The detailed metrics are:

$$\begin{aligned} R@k &= \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{T}_{shop}} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i, u \in \mathcal{D}^p} \frac{R_k^p}{k} \\ MAE &= \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{T}_{shop}} \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i, u \in \mathcal{D}^p} |y_{i,u} - \hat{y}_{i,u}| \\ nDCG_k &= \frac{1}{n_t} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{T}_{shop}} \frac{DCG_k^p}{IDCG_k^p}; DCG_k^p = \sum_{r=1}^k \frac{2^{y_{pr}} - 1}{\log_2(1+r)} \end{aligned}$$

where n_t, n_p, R_k^p are the number of shops in all shops \mathcal{T} , number of transactions in shop p and the number of true purchases in shop p from the top- k ranked predicted purchases. y_{pr}/\hat{y}_{pr} and $IDCG_k^p$ are




Figure 5: Distribution of test shops with different Recall@1M. The distribution for MeSh-i and MeSh are more right-skewed than the ones for Baseline and MeLU, which means our proposed methods tend to give overall better performance in the shop-level recall.

the real/predicted rating of user i for the r -th ranked item and the best possible DCG_k^p for shop p , respectively. We used different evaluations for the two datasets because the Ichiba dataset has implicit feedback (purchase data) while Movielens has explicit feedback (1-5 ratings).

For all evaluation metrics, we have *item-level* and *shop-level* results. Take the Ichiba dataset evaluation as an example: Assume total N items, M shops, r_i is the i -th item recall value, s_p is the p -th shop recall value, \mathcal{D}^p is a set of items in shop p , and $n_p = |\mathcal{D}^p|$ is the number of items in shop p , then item-level and shop-level recall are computed as: $R_{item} = (\sum_{i=1}^N r_i)/N$, $R_{shop} = (\sum_{p=1}^M s_p)/M$, where $s_p = (\sum_{i \in \{\mathcal{D}^p\}} r_i)/n_p$.

5.4 Implementation Details

For the Ichiba dataset, the user and item input features are pretrained 4096-dim embeddings from the baseline we described in Section 3. For the Movielens dataset, we followed MeLU’s implementation³ and performed an embedding process for the inputs. Specifically, we used categorical information: user’s gender, age, occupation, area, and item’s rate, genre, director, and actor. Each category embedding’s dimension is 32. User and items are represented using the concatenated embeddings of their information.

In all neural network-based models, the MLP network is a two-layer MLP with first and second dimensions 128 and 100. We performed hyper-parameter tuning and selected the best stepsizes $\alpha: 5e^{-6}$ and $\beta: 5e^{-5}$. The number of local updates K per shop is set to 2. All experiments were performed on an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080 Ti. All codes were written with Tensorflow 2.1.0.

5.5 Item-level Performance

We summarize item-level performance results in Tables 2 and 3. For the Ichiba dataset, MeSh performs the best for the *new shops*. It has a 60.1% relative improvement compared to LV2 and 17.8% to MeLU for R@1M. For the *existing shops*, MeLU becomes competitive for the large shops. It is reasonable since MeLU may see more items transactions from large shops in each user’s support/query set. With more training samples from large shops, MeLU will have more advantages. For the Movielens dataset, we see similar results, except that MeLU outperforms MeSh in the *existing shop* section. The reason may be that the explicit feedback from Movielens further helps MeLU learn better item representations during item-level optimization. At the same time, the Ichiba dataset experiment only

³<https://github.com/hoyeoplee/MeLU>

Type	Method	Item-level		Shop-level	
		R@500K	R@1M	R@500K	R@1M
New Shop	LV2	0.223	0.331	0.067	0.112
	Baseline	0.329	0.521	0.306	0.482
	MeLU	0.349	0.450	0.302	0.394
	MeSh-i	0.361	0.523	0.324	0.451
	MeSh	0.326	0.530	0.331	0.562
Existing Shop (Small)	LV2	0.239	0.322	0.239	0.327
	Baseline	0.384	0.538	0.370	0.529
	MeLU	0.388	0.520	0.391	0.520
	MeSh-i	0.396	0.551	0.394	0.546
	MeSh	0.385	0.541	0.377	0.559
Existing Shop (Large)	LV2	0.391	0.494	0.337	0.448
	Baseline	0.506	0.662	0.467	0.626
	MeLU	0.538	0.651	0.492	0.607
	MeSh-i	0.517	0.667	0.475	0.625
	MeSh	0.475	0.652	0.444	0.627

Table 2: Item-level and shop-level recall on Ichiba dataset.

Type	Method	Item-level			Shop-level	
		MAE	nDCG1	nDCG3	nDCG1	nDCG3
New Shop	Wide & Deep	1.017	0.250	0.319	0.221	0.292
	MeLU	0.954	0.237	0.433	0.307	0.391
	MeSh-i	0.981	0.309	0.453	0.345	0.410
	MeSh	0.985	0.288	0.437	0.238	0.367
	Wide & Deep	1.001	0.268	0.368	0.288	0.380
Existing Shop	MeLU	0.924	0.324	0.433	0.321	0.413
	MeSh-i	0.968	0.302	0.414	0.321	0.416
	MeSh	0.974	0.296	0.409	0.313	0.410

Table 3: Item-level and shop-level evaluations on Movielens dataset.

utilizes 0 or 1 feedback. Also, we notice that MeLU was not the best model for new shops on Movielens, which implies possible overfitting.

5.6 Shop-level Performance

In Table 4, we compute the portion of shops with shop-level R@1M above a specific value and mean and variance of shop-level R@1M of each shop. Our model outperforms the rest methods. Specifically, in MeSh, more than 77% of shops have R@1M more than 0.5. It is twice more than LV2 and 6.9% more than MeLU. It also achieves a 2.2% relative improvement of shop-level R@1M compared to baseline while keeping a smaller variance, which indicates that our model is more robust across all different-sized shops. We plot the

Table 4: Left: The portion of shops with R@1M above a specific value on the Ichiba dataset. Right: Shop-level R@1M mean and variance. \uparrow means the metric the higher, the better, \downarrow means the metric the lower, the better.

Model	≥ 0.5	≥ 0.6	≥ 0.7	≥ 0.8	Mean \uparrow	Variance \downarrow
LV2	0.361	0.215	0.140	0.066	0.424	0.226
Baseline	0.741	0.545	0.325	0.187	0.602	0.197
MeLU	0.705	0.507	0.331	0.168	0.589	0.208
MeSh-i	0.744	0.540	0.347	0.185	0.609	0.202
MeSh	0.774	0.529	0.298	0.165	0.615	0.177

Table 5: Left: The portion of shops with nDCG@3 above a specific value on the Movielens dataset. Right: Shop-level nDCG@3 mean and variance.

Model	≥ 0.35	≥ 0.40	≥ 0.45	≥ 0.50	Mean \uparrow	Variance \downarrow
Wide & Deep	0.388	0.333	0.167	0.167	0.366	0.311
MeLU	0.500	0.389	0.333	0.278	0.409	0.112
MeSh-i	0.722	0.444	0.389	0.167	0.415	0.104
MeSh	0.556	0.389	0.333	0.222	0.403	0.110

distribution of test shops with different R@1M in Figure 5. *The smooth tail of the distribution matches the fact that MeSh has a smaller shop-level recall variance.* Even though MeLU performs the best in item-level evaluation on the Movielens dataset, it loses its advantage when considering shop-level performance, as shown in Table 5. In MeSh-i, more than 72% of shops have a nDCG@3 score of more than 0.35. It also achieves a 1.5% relative improvement of shop-level nDCG@3 with a smaller variance than MeLU. In summary, the above results indicate that MeSh and Mesh-i provide less-biased recommendations for all shops and movie genres.

To further understand the impact of Meta-Shop on small business advertisements, we focus on the *new shop*’s shop-level results. New shops belong to the small business scenario as they do not exist in the training set and only require 10 transactions for the local update before the test. From the right side of Tables 2 and 3, we see Meta-Shop models outperform others in new shop sections on both datasets. On the Ichiba dataset, the relative improvement of MeSh over Baseline for the new shops and large existing shops are 16.6% and 1.6% for R@1M. On Movielens, the relative improvement of MeSh-i over Wide & deep for the new shops and large existing shops are 40.4% and 9.5% for nDCG@3. *More significant improvements for new shops indicate that our model truly helps small business advertisement.*

Table 6 lists the Gross Merchandise Value (GMV) improvement over the LV2 model on the Ichiba dataset. The GMV improvement is more than 200% in the new shop section when using MeSh which further proves the effectiveness of our model in helping small businesses.

Note: Between MeSh-i and MeSh, MeSh-i performed better in Movielens experiments, while MeSh performed better in Ichiba experiments. However, we must mention that MeSh-i cannot store user/item final representations separately and has to feed in raw input data to compute the score. It is less convenient at inference than MeSh, which can pre-store all representations of users and

Table 6: GMV improvement over LV2 on Ichiba dataset.

Method	New Shop	Existing Shop (Small)	Existing Shop (Large)
LV2	-	-	-
Baseline	+104.8%	+80.4%	+70.9%
MeLU	+62.7%	+65.8%	+50.1%
Mesh-i	+101.6%	+81.4%	+64.7%
MeSh	+235.2%	+70.1%	+67.3%

Table 7: Performance of one-shop training on the Ichiba dataset.

Type	Method	R@500K	R@1M
Small	One-shop	0.096 \pm 0.172	0.157 \pm 0.195
	Mesh	0.408 \pm 0.153	0.641 \pm 0.146
Large	One-shop	0.061 \pm 0.052	0.129 \pm 0.132
	Mesh	0.471 \pm 0.137	0.651 \pm 0.137

Table 8: Performance of one-shop training on Movielens dataset.

Type	Method	MAE	nDCG1	nDCG3
Small	One-shop	1.303 \pm 0.164	0.093 \pm 0.002	0.126 \pm 0.010
	Mesh	0.890 \pm 0.002	0.100 \pm 0.016	0.143 \pm 0.020
Large	One-shop	1.316 \pm 0.104	0.092 \pm 0.009	0.119 \pm 0.009
	Mesh	0.917 \pm 0.004	0.082 \pm 0.001	0.114 \pm 0.004




Figure 6: Training loss with MSE and BCE losses.

items and compute the score using the dot product. We see similar concerns in previous work [16].

5.7 Additional Experiments

5.7.1 Stability of Meta-Shop training. To ensure the stability of MAML training, we found the best settings through ablation study—using 2-step local updates, adam optimizer and MSE loss. We show MeSh training loss on the Ichiba dataset in Figure 6. It demonstrates the training stability and the reason for selecting MSE instead of other losses.

The number of tasks also plays an important role for training stability and performance. Given the Ichiba dataset, we define tasks based on unique items, users and shops; Item-based and shop-based are MeLU and MeSh models defined in Section 5.2. User-based model treats each user’s preferences as each tasks as the original MeLU paper proposed. Item-based and user-based models have a total 459K and 1.3M tasks respectively while shop-based only has 7K tasks. We believe smaller number of tasks improves performance more as we show in Table 9. Too many tasks will affect model’s generalization and convergence speed as shown in [3].

Table 9: Item-level R@1M of models with different definitions of tasks on the Ichiba dataset.

Method	# of Tasks	New Shop	Existing Shop (S)	Existing Shop (L)
Item-based	459,178	0.450	0.520	0.651
User-based	1,312,017	0.519	0.528	0.652
Shop-based	7,035	0.530	0.541	0.652

5.7.2 Meta-Shop versus One-shop training. One practical solution for sample bias in the real world is to train separate models for each shop. Here, we randomly select 6 shops from small and large existing shops respectively, train and test each shop separately using the Wide & Deep model, namely the one-shop model. The difference between one-shop and Wide & Deep is that the former is trained only using one shop’s user-item (all available) interaction data instead of all shops’. We report the mean and variance of the shop-level test results in Table 7. Results on Movielens dataset with 2 shops in each section are in Table 8. One-shop model results are more than 4 times worse than MeSh’s on the Ichiba dataset for R@1M and more than 1.4 times worse on the Movielens for MAE. In summary, one-shop training is not a good solution for sample bias, especially when the dataset is highly sparse and long-tailed like the Ichiba dataset.

5.7.3 Negative oversampling. We try to remove sample bias using different negative sampling strategies with the Baseline we described in Section 3. For each positive item-user purchase pair, we draw one item-user negative pair. Here, we need shop size information during the training. We define small shops be shops with less than N sales in training. N is set to be the median of the number of sales for all shops in training. The rest are large shops. We tested three negative sampling methods:


- N0: The original NS; the negative user comes from all users who purchased items from different Level 3 genres.
- N1: The negative user is selected either from all users who purchased from small shops or users who purchased from different level 3 genres with 0.5 probability each.
- N2: For items in large shops, we use N0, for items in small shops, we use N1.

Compared to N0 and N2, N1 has more training users who purchased from small shops. N2 is a combination of N0 and N1. In Table 10, N0 has the highest Recall@1M in both item-level and shop-level evaluation. N0 and N2 keep a similar recall at the shop-level, while N2 achieves a much smaller variance. In Figure 7, we show the recall distribution of test shops. The slope gets smaller from N0 to N1, which indicates the recall distributes more evenly among shops. In summary, even though N2 achieves lower shop-wise performance variance, the overall performance was similar to N0. Nevertheless, the selecting negative samples requires more computation costs.

5.7.4 Debiasing regularization. We applied a regularizer to the loss function to see if it helps reduce shop-size bias. Followed by the idea in [35], the regularizer improves the likelihood of items in small shops being recommended. The definition of small/large shops is similar to Section 5.7.3: $\mathcal{L}_{new}(DP; \theta) = \mathcal{L}(DP; \theta) + \gamma \mathcal{R}(D_{small}^P; \theta)$,

Table 10: R@1M using different negative sampling on Ichiba dataset.

NS	Item-level	Shop-level	
	Mean	Mean	Variance
N0	0.838	0.807	0.166
N1	0.807	0.769	0.174
N2	0.835	0.804	0.159

**Figure 7: Distribution of test shops with different R@1M. x-axis is the recall value, y-axis is the number of shops, bottom integers are counts of each bar.****Table 11: Item-level R@1M of models with different regularization weights on Ichiba dataset.**

γ	New Shop	Existing Shop (Small)	Existing Shop (Large)
0.8	0.519	0.551	0.651
0.01	0.525	0.549	0.648
0	0.530	0.541	0.652

where the regularizer

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(D_{small}; \theta) &= 1 - \text{Prob}(\text{shop is recommended} | D_{small}) \\ &\approx 1 - \frac{1}{|D_{small}|} \sum_{(i,u) \in D_{small}} \text{score}(i, u) \end{aligned}$$

Table 11 shows experimental results on the Ichiba dataset with different γ , which is the weight to balance between original loss and the regularizer. Bigger γ gives bigger weights on the regularizer. With $\gamma = 0.8$, we see improvement over small existing shop’s recommendation. Nevertheless, the new shop’s recommendation accuracy was dropped. We also tried bigger γ ; however, it did not return better results. In conclusion, the regularizer only helps small shops that existed in training, but not new shops that did not exist.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed Meta-Shop to improve advertising performance for small shops with limited sales. It utilized a meta-learning strategy to learn parameters that can be adapted quickly to unseen shops. The knowledge learned from large shops helped small shops to learn better user and item features. The experimental results showed that Meta-Shop significantly improved recommendation performance for small businesses.

REFERENCES

- [1] Himan Abdollahpouri, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2017. Controlling popularity bias in learning-to-rank recommendation. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM conference on recommender systems*. 42–46.

- [2] Himan Abdollahpouri, Robin Burke, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2019. Managing popularity bias in recommender systems with personalized re-ranking. In *The thirty-second international flairs conference*.
- [3] Antreas Antoniou, Harrison Edwards, and Amos Storkey. 2019. How to train your MAML. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [4] Trapit Bansal, Rishikesh Jha, and Andrew McCallum. 2020. Learning to few-shot learn across diverse natural language classification tasks. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 5108–5123.
- [5] Oren Barkan, Noam Koenigstein, Eylon Yogev, and Ori Katz. 2019. CB2CF: a neural multiview content-to-collaborative filtering model for completely cold item recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM RecSys*.
- [6] Homanga Bharadhwaj. 2019. Meta-Learning for User Cold-Start Recommendation. In *IJCNN*.
- [7] Federico Bianchi, Jacopo Tagliabue, Bingqing Yu, Luca Bigon, and Ciro Greco. 2020. Fantastic Embeddings and How to Align Them: Zero-Shot Inference in a Multi-Shop Scenario. SIGIR Workshop On eCommerce.
- [8] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. 2003. Latent Dirichlet Allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)* (2003).
- [9] Erik Brynjolfsson, Yu Jeffrey Hu, and Michael D Smith. 2006. From niches to riches: Anatomy of the long tail. *Sloan management review* 47, 4 (2006), 67–71.
- [10] Qi Cai, Yingwei Pan, Ting Yao, Chenggang Yan, and Tao Mei. 2018. Memory Matching Networks for One-Shot Image Recognition. CVPR, 4080–4088.
- [11] Minmin Chen, Zhixiang Xu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Fei Sha. 2012. Marginalized denoising autoencoders for domain adaptation. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- [12] Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishii Aradhya, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, Wei Chai, Mustafa Ipsir, Rohan Anil, Zakaria Haque, Lichan Hong, Vihan Jain, Xiaobing Liu, and Hemal Shah. 2016. Wide & Deep Learning for Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems (Boston, MA, USA) (DLRS 2016)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 7–10.
- [13] S. Chopra, R. Hadsell, and Y. LeCun. 2005. Learning a similarity metric discriminatively, with application to face verification. In *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 539–546.
- [14] Manqing Dong, Feng Yuan, Lina Yao, Xiwei Xu, and Liming Zhu. 2020. MAMO: Memory-Augmented Meta-Optimization for Cold-Start Recommendation. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 688–697.
- [15] Xin Dong, Lei Yu, Zhonghuo Wu, Yuxia Sun, Lingfeng Yuan, and Fangxi Zhang. 2017. A hybrid collaborative filtering model with deep structure for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 31st AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [16] Zhengxiao Du, Xiaowei Wang, Hongxia Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Jie Tang. 2019. Sequential Scenario-Specific Meta Learner for Online Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. New York, NY, USA, 2895–2904.
- [17] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1126–1135.
- [18] Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. 2017. Model-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Fast Adaptation of Deep Networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70 (Sydney, NSW, Australia) (ICML '17)*. JMLR.org, 1126–1135.
- [19] Prem Gopalan, Jake M. Hofman, and David M. Blei. 2015. Scalable recommendation with hierarchical Poisson factorization. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI)*.
- [20] Casper Hansen, Christian Hansen, Jakob Grue Simonsen, Stephen Alstrup, and Christina Lioma. 2020. Content-Aware Neural Hashing for Cold-Start Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Virtual Event, China) (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 971–980.
- [21] F. Maxwell Harper and Joseph A. Konstan. 2015. The MovieLens Datasets: History and Context. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 5, 4, Article 19 (2015).
- [22] Hoyeop Lee, Jinbae Im, Seongwon Jang, Hyunsouk Cho, and Sehee Chung. 2019. MeLU: Meta-Learned User Preference Estimator for Cold-Start Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. ACM, 1073–1082.
- [23] Sheng Li, Jaya Kawale, and Yun Fu. 2015. Deep Collaborative Filtering via Marginalized Denoising Auto-encoder. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*.
- [24] Tianyu Li, Yukun Ma, Jiu Xu, Bjorn Stenger, Chen Liu, and Yu Hirate. 2018. Deep Heterogeneous Autoencoders for Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of the 18th IEEE International Conference Data Mining (ICDM)*.
- [25] Mi Luo, Fei Chen, Pengxiang Cheng, Zhenhua Dong, Xiuqiang He, Jiashi Feng, and Zhenguo Li. 2020. MetaSelector: Meta-Learning for Recommendation with User-Level Adaptive Model Selection. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020 (Taipei, Taiwan)*. New York, NY, USA, 2507–2513.
- [26] Raymond J. Mooney and Lorie Roy. 2000. Content-Based Book Recommending Using Learning for Text Categorization. In *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM Conference on Digital Libraries (DL '00)*, 195–204.
- [27] Tsendsuren Munkhdalai and Hong Yu. 2017. Meta networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2554–2563.
- [28] Alex Nichol, Joshua Achiam, and John Schulman. 2018. On first-order meta-learning algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999* (2018).
- [29] Feiyang Pan, Shuokai Li, Xiang Ao, Pingzhong Tang, and Qing He. 2019. Warm Up Cold-Start Advertisements: Improving CTR Predictions via Learning to Learn ID Embeddings (SIGIR '19). New York, NY, USA, 695–704.
- [30] Yoon-Joo Park and Alexander Tuzhilin. 2008. The long tail of recommender systems and how to leverage it. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Recommender systems*, 11–18.
- [31] Jathushan Rajasegaran, Salman H. Khan, Munawar Hayat, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. 2021. Meta-learning the Learning Trends Shared Across Tasks. *Bmvc* (2021).
- [32] Ramin Raziperchikolaei, Guannan Liang, and Young-joo Chung. 2021. Shared Neural Item Representations for Completely Cold Start Problem. In *15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. New York, NY, USA, 422–431.
- [33] Adam Santoro, Sergey Bartunov, Matthew Botvinick, Daan Wierstra, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2016. Meta-learning with memory-augmented neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1842–1850.
- [34] Shaoyun Shi, Min Zhang, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2018. Attention-based Adaptive Model to Unify Warm and Cold Starts Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM CIKM*.
- [35] Dylan Slack, Sorelle Friedler, and Emile Givental. 2019. Fair Meta-Learning: Learning How to Learn Fairly. In *Workshop on Human-Centric Machine Learning at the 33rd Conference on NeurIPS*.
- [36] Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard S Zemel. 2017. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.05175* (2017).
- [37] Flood Sung, Yongxin Yang, Li Zhang, Tao Xiang, Philip HS Torr, and Timothy M Hospedales. 2018. Learning to compare: Relation network for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on CVPR*, 1199–1208.
- [38] Aäron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, and Benjamin Schrauwen. 2013. Deep content-based music recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- [39] Manasi Vartak, Arvind Thiagarajan, Conrado Miranda, Jeshua Bratman, and Hugo Larochelle. 2017. A Meta-Learning Perspective on Cold-Start Recommendations for Items. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 30.
- [40] Ricardo Vilalta and Youssef Drissi. 2002. A Perspective View and Survey of Meta-Learning. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 77–95.
- [41] Maksims Volkovs, Guangwei Yu, and Tomi Poutanen. 2017. DropoutNet: Addressing Cold Start in Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.
- [42] Chong Wang and David M. Blei. 2011. Collaborative topic modeling for recommending scientific articles. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*.
- [43] Hao Wang, Naiyan Wang, and Dit-Yan Yeung. 2015. Collaborative Deep Learning for Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGKDD*.
- [44] Wenpeng Yin. 2020. Meta-learning for Few-shot Natural Language Processing: A Survey. Arxiv.
- [45] Bowen Yuan, Jui-Yang Hsia, Meng-Yuan Yang, Hong Zhu, Chih-Yao Chang, Zhen hua Dong, and Chih-Jen Lin. 2019. Improving Ad Click Prediction by Considering Non-displayed Events. In *CIKM*, 329–338.
- [46] Shuai Zhang, Lina Yao, and Xiwei Xu. 2017. AutoSVD++: An Efficient Hybrid Collaborative Filtering Model via Contractive Auto-encoders. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*.
- [47] Yin Zhang, Derek Zhiyuan Cheng, Tiansheng Yao, Xinyang Yi, Lichan Hong, and Ed H. Chi. 2021. A Model of Two Tales: Dual Transfer Learning Framework for Improved Long-Tail Item Recommendation. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2220–2231.
- [48] Yang Zhang, Fuli Feng, Chenxu Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Yan Li, and Yongdong Zhang. 2020. How to Retrain Recommender System? A Sequential Meta-Learning Method. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR (Virtual Event, China) (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1479–1488.
- [49] Yongchun Zhu, Ruobing Xie, Fuzhen Zhuang, Kaikai Ge, Ying Sun, Xu Zhang, Leyu Lin, and Juan Cao. 2021. Learning to Warm Up Cold Item Embeddings for Cold-start Recommendation with Meta Scaling and Shifting Networks. In *SIGIR 2021*.