

Pre-trained Sequential Recommendation Framework via Popularity Dynamics

Junting Wang*
junting3@illinois.edu
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois

Praneet Rathi*
prathi3@illinois.edu
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois

Hari Sundaram
hs1@illinois.edu
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois

ABSTRACT

Sequential recommenders model sequential users' behavior and are the fundamental building blocks of many online applications, e.g., e-commerce, video streaming, and social media. While effective, they learn item embeddings one-on-one mapped to explicit item IDs, which are unique in different domains, making them hard to generalize to new recommendation domains, whereas pre-trained models have shown great success in generalizing to new application domains in peer AI fields. Pioneer works on pre-trained sequential recommenders rely on application-dependent auxiliary information and can only generalize to the related domains within the same application, e.g., online retail. In this work, we aim to set a baseline for pre-trained sequential recommenders by tackling the most challenging task: zero-shot cross-domain and cross-application sequential recommendation without auxiliary information. We present a novel pre-trained sequential recommendation framework: **PREP**REC. We learn universal item and sequence representations by modeling item dynamics and propose a popularity dynamics-aware transformer architecture. Through extensive experiments on five real-world datasets, we show that PREP

*RE*C, developing pre-trained sequential recommenders for cross-domain inference seems impossible. While we see pre-trained language [4, 5, 30, 35, 37] and vision models [8, 12, 36] show excellent generalizability across datasets and applications, being able to achieve state-of-the-art performance by just a few fine-tuning steps [5, 30] or even without any training [4, 35] (*i.e.*, zero-shot transfer), there are essential differences. The representations learned by the pre-trained language model seem universal since the training domain and the application domain (*e.g.*, text prediction and generation) share the same language and vocabulary, supporting the effective reuse of the word representations. However, in the cross-domain recommendation problem, the items are distinct across domains in sequential recommendation datasets (*e.g.*, grocery items vs movies). Therefore, forming such generalizable correspondence is nearly impossible if we learn specific representations for each item *within* each domain. Recent work explores pre-trained models for sequential recommendation [6, 11, 18] within the same application (*e.g.*, online retail). However, they assume access to metadata of items (*e.g.*, item description), which is application-dependent and is often not generalizable to other applications. These models cannot learn universal representations of items; instead, they bypass the representation learning problem by using additional item-side information. This paper tackles the more challenging task of zero-shot, cross-domain and cross-application sequential recommendations without any auxiliary information.

Present Work: Our crucial insight is to learn the universal item representations based on the item popularity dynamics and use these representations for cross-domain and cross-application zero-shot prediction. We know that the marginal distribution of user and item activities is universal and heavy tailed across datasets, supported by prior work in network science [2, 3] and by experiments in recommender systems [40]. In addition, recent work in recommender systems suggests that the popularity dynamics of items are also crucial for predicting users' behaviors [20]. Therefore, in this paper, we explicitly model the popularity dynamics of items and propose a novel pre-trained sequential recommendation framework: PREP

REREC. We learn universal item representations based on their popularity dynamics, instead of their explicit item IDs or auxiliary information. We encode the relative time interval between two consecutive interactions via relative-time encoding and the position of each interaction in the sequence by positional encoding. Using physical time ensures that the predictions are not

KEYWORDS

Recommender System, Neural Collaborative Filtering, Sequential Recommendation, Zero-shot Sequential Recommendation

1 INTRODUCTION

Modeling sequential user behavior is critical to the success of online applications such as e-commerce, video streaming, and social media. Despite essential innovations for tackling the sequential recommendation task [15, 21, 27, 39, 44, 46], these models have to be trained from scratch for each application domain because they learn representations for each item [21, 44] in the domain. Further, to maintain high performance, we need to retrain the models when there is a large influx of new users and items. Since the models learn representations for each item, they cannot generalize to new domains. Thus, in this paper, we ask: *can we build a pre-trained*

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

anti-causal, *i.e.*, using the future interactions to predict the present. We propose a popularity dynamics-aware transformer architecture for learning universal sequence representations. We show that it is possible to build a pre-trained sequential recommender system capable of cross-domain and cross-application transfer without any auxiliary information. Our key contributions are as follows:

Universal item and sequence representations: We are the first to learn universal item and sequence representations for sequential recommendation without any auxiliary information by exploiting item popularity dynamics. In contrast, prior research learns item representations for each item ID or through item auxiliary information. We learn universal item representations by modeling item popularity dynamics of two temporal resolutions: coarse and fine-grained. We learn universal sequence representations using a carefully designed popularity dynamics-aware transformer architecture. These universal item and sequence representations make possible pre-trained sequential recommender systems capable of cross-domain and cross-application transfer without any auxiliary information.

Zero-shot transfer without auxiliary information: We propose a new challenging setting for pre-trained sequential recommender systems: zero-shot cross-domain and cross-application transfer without any auxiliary information. In contrast, previous pre-trained sequential recommenders requires overlapping users [60], application-dependent auxiliary information [6, 11, 17, 18, 54], and are few-shot adapted to related domains within the same application [17, 18, 54]. Assuming no user or item metadata posts a more challenging but crucial problem as we want to set a baseline for the performance of pre-trained sequential recommenders. Using metadata can only make the problem easier and improve the performance.

With extensive experiments, we empirically show that PREPPEC has excellent generalizability across domains and applications. Remarkably, had we trained a state-of-the-art model from scratch for the target domain, *instead of zero-shot transfer using PREPPEC*, the maximum performance gain would have been only 4%. In addition, we show that with a post-hoc interpolation, PREPPEC can outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommender system on average by 12.4% in Recall@10 and 22% in NDCG@10. We attribute the improvements to the performance gains over long-tail items, which we show in the qualitative analysis. With this work, we set a baseline for pre-trained sequential recommenders and show that it is possible to build a pre-trained sequential recommender system under the most challenging setting: cross-domain and cross-application transfer without any auxiliary information.

2 RELATED WORK

Sequential Recommendation: Sequential recommenders model user behavior as a sequence of interactions, and aim to predict the next item that a user will interact with. Early sequential recommenders adopt Markov chains and model item-item transition probability [39, 42]. Later, with the advance of neural networks, some basic neural architectures have been explored for sequential recommenders, such as convolutional neural networks [49, 50]. Recurrent neural networks [16] and its variants, such as GRU4Rec [15] and

GRU4Rec+ [46], have also been widely used for sequential recommendation due to the sequential nature of RNN-based architectures.

With the success of Transformer [51] in modeling sequential data, *e.g.*, text sequences, some works adopt the transformer architecture for sequential recommendation [21, 27, 44]. Additionally, [27] considers the timestamps of each interaction and looks at the time interval between two consecutive interactions and proposes a time-aware attention mechanism. Some works [32, 45, 58] separate interaction sequences and categorize them to show the long-term and short-term interests of users. Temporal sequential recommenders [25, 57, 61] models the change in users' preferences. These works, while achieving state-of-the-art performance, only focus on the regular sequential recommendation and cannot transfer to other domains.

Cross-domain Recommendation: Cross-domain recommendation literature leverages the information-rich domain to improve the recommendation performance on the data-sparse domain [19, 28, 33]. However, most of these works assume user or item overlap [19, 28, 33, 62, 63] for effective knowledge transfer. Other cross-domain literature focuses on the cold-start problem [7, 9, 10, 26, 29, 31, 52, 56, 63]. Note that we are not trying to address the cold-start problem. Instead, we focus on building a pre-trained sequential recommendation framework that can zero-shot transfer to a new domain without any auxiliary information.

Pre-trained Sequential Recommenders: Recently, with the success of pre-trained language models [4, 5, 35], pre-trained recommenders have caught the attention of the community. ZESRec [6] is capable of zero-shot sequential recommendations. However, it only works for closely related domains and relies on application-dependent auxiliary information (*i.e.*, description text of items). PeterRec [60] requires overlapping users in both domains. On the other hand, finetuning-based models, *e.g.*, MISSRec [54], UnisRec [18], and VQ-Rec [17], are not designed for zero-shot sequential recommendation and works within the same application (e-commerce) since they rely on application-dependent auxiliary information. [53] investigates the joint and marginal activity distribution of users and items, but are not suitable for the sequential recommendation task.

To summarize, prior works on sequential recommendation focus on learning high-quality representations for *each* item in the training set and are not generalizable across domains. Pre-trained sequential recommenders are evaluated on closely related domains and platforms and rely heavily on application-dependent auxiliary information of items.

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this section, we formally define the research problems this paper addresses (*i.e.*, regular sequential recommendation and zero-shot sequential recommendation) and introduce our notations.

In sequential recommendation, denote \mathbf{M} as the implicit feedback matrix, $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|\mathcal{U}|}\}$ as the set of users, $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|\mathcal{V}|}\}$ as the set of items. The goal of sequential recommendation is to learn a scoring function, that predicts the next item $v_{u,t}$ given a user u 's interaction history $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,t-1}\}$. Note that in this paper, since we model time explicitly, we assume access to the timestamp of each interaction, including the next item interaction. We argue that this is a reasonable assumption since the timestamp




Figure 1: Model Architecture of PREPRec

of the next interaction is always available in practice. For example, if Alice logs in to Netflix, Netflix will always know when Alice logs in and can predict the next movie for Alice. Formally, we define the scoring function as $\mathcal{F}(v^t | S_u, M)$, where t is the time of the prediction.

Zero-shot Sequential Recommendation: Given two domains M and M' over \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} and $\mathcal{U}', \mathcal{V}'$ respectively, we study the zero-shot recommendation problem in the scenario where the domains are different ($M \cap M' = \emptyset$), users are disjoint ($\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}' = \emptyset$), and item sets are unique ($\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}' = \emptyset$). The goal is to produce a scoring function \mathcal{F}' without training on M' directly. In other words, the scoring function \mathcal{F}' has to be trained on a different interaction matrix M . Furthermore, we assume there is no metadata associated with users or items, which makes the problem particularly challenging but crucial to study. We want to set a baseline for pre-trained sequential recommenders, using metadata can only improve and simply the problem.

4 PREPRec FRAMEWORK

We first introduce the model architecture of PREPRec (§ 4.1) then the training procedure (§ 4.2). Finally, we formally define the zero-shot inference process (§ 4.3).

4.1 Model Architecture

The first step of building a pre-trained sequential recommender is to learn universal item representations. Prior works in sequential and pre-trained sequential recommender systems learn to represent items either through learnable embeddings specific to their item IDs or through their textual metadata, largely limiting the generalizability of the model under various scenarios, *e.g.*, different domains, platforms, and applications. Our solution is to exploit the item popularity statistics available in every domain to learn universal item representations. Instead of explicit item IDs or auxiliary information, we learn to represent items at a given timestamp through the changes in their popularity histories over different periods (popularity dynamics). We propose a popularity dynamics-aware Transformer architecture that obtains the representation of users' behavior sequences through item popularity dynamics.

4.1.1 Item Popularity Encoder. We learn to represent items based on their popularity dynamics, *i.e.*, changes in their popularity histories. Intuitively, we should model items' popularity by two horizons: long-term and short-term. Long-term horizons reflect the overall popularity of items, whereas short-term horizons should capture the recent trends in the domain. For example, the long-term popularity of a winter coat measures how popular is the coat in general, while its short-term popularity reflects more temporal changes, *e.g.*, season, weather conditions, and fashion trends. Therefore, consider an item v_j that has interaction at time t , denoted as v_j^t , we define two popularity representations for v_j^t : popularity $\mathbf{p}_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ over a coarse period (*e.g.*, month) and popularity $\mathbf{h}_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ over a fine period (*e.g.*, week).

To calculate \mathbf{p}_j^t and \mathbf{h}_j^t , we first calculate the popularities of v_j^t over the two horizons, denoted as $a_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (coarse period number of interactions) and $b_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (fine period number of interactions). Specifically, we calculate them as:

$$a_j^t = \sum_{m=1}^t \gamma^{t-m} c_a(v_j^m), \quad b_j^t = c_b(v_j^t) \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a pre-defined discount factor and $c_a(v_j^m)$ is the number of interactions of v_j over a coarse time period m . Similarly, $c_b(v_j^t)$ denotes the number of interactions of v_j over a fine period t . We do not impose the discounting factor when computing b_j^t since we want it to capture the current popularity information, whereas a_j^t captures the cumulative popularity of an item over a longer horizon.

The popularity of an item is a real value, which is not comparable across items from different domains. Therefore, we calculate the percentiles of a_j^t and b_j^t relative to their corresponding coarser and finer popularity distributions over all items at time t , denoted as $P(a_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $P(b_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}^+$, respectively.

We now encode the popularity percentiles $P(a_j^t)$ and $P(b_j^t)$ into k dimensional vector representations \mathbf{p}_j^t and \mathbf{h}_j^t respectively. Denote

the popularity encoder as $E_p : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, which takes in a percentile value. Suppose given the popularity percentile $P(a_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ over a coarse time period t , the coarse level popularity vector representation $\mathbf{p}_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is computed as follows:

$$\mathbf{p}_j^t = E_p(P(a_j^t))$$

$$(\mathbf{p}_j^t)_i = \begin{cases} 1 - \{\frac{P}{k-1}\}, & \text{if } i = \lfloor \frac{P}{k-1} \rfloor \\ \{\frac{P}{k-1}\}, & \text{if } i = \lfloor \frac{P}{k-1} \rfloor + 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor, $\{\cdot\}$ denotes the fractional part of a number, and $(\mathbf{p}_j^t)_i$ denotes the i -th index of \mathbf{p}_j^t . For example, if $k = 11$, $E_p(40.1) = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0.99, 0.01, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. The interpretation of this would be considering the 10 deciles for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 9, 10\}$ as basis vectors, and this popularity encoding as a linear combination of the nearest (in percentile space) two basis vectors. The fine level popularity vector is calculated identically, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{h}_j^t = E_p(P(b_j^t))$. In this example, we've fixed the vector representation size to be 11, but this approach is fully generalizable to other sizes and would just require changing the multipliers in the encoding function. We also experimented with sinuoidal encodings of the same size, but found that the linear encoding empirically performed better.

4.1.2 Universal Item Representation. We now define the popularity dynamics of v_j at time t over the coarse period (long-term horizon) to be $\mathcal{P}_j^t = \{\mathbf{p}_j^1, \mathbf{p}_j^2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}\}$, and over the fine period (short-term horizon) as $\mathcal{H}_j^t = \{\mathbf{h}_j^1, \mathbf{h}_j^2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}\}$. We use $t-1$ to constrain access to future interactions and prevent information leakage, *i.e.*, we do not have access to the popularity statistics of v_j at time t if we are at time t . For example, say an interaction happens on the second Wednesday in February, we consider the coarser and finer time period up until the end of January and the end of the first week in February respectively. To limit computation, we constrain window sizes m, n for \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{H} respectively. Formally, the coarse popularity dynamics of v_j at time t is $\mathcal{P}_j^t = \{\mathbf{p}_j^{t-m}, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}\}$, and the fine popularity dynamics of v_j at time t is $\mathcal{H}_j^t = \{\mathbf{h}_j^{t-n}, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}\}$.

Finally, we compute the embedding of item v_j at time t via the universal item representation encoder, defined as a function $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}_j^t, \mathcal{H}_j^t)$ that learns to encode the popularity dynamics \mathcal{P}_j^t and \mathcal{H}_j^t into a d dimension vector representation \mathbf{e}_j^t . Specifically, we have:

$$\mathbf{e}_j^t = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}_j^t, \mathcal{H}_j^t) = \mathbf{W}_p \left[\left(\prod_{i=t-m}^{t-1} \mathbf{p}_j^i \right) \parallel \left(\prod_{i=t-n}^{t-1} \mathbf{h}_j^i \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

where \parallel denotes the concatenation operation, and $\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k(m+n)}$ is a learnable weight matrix.

In addition, we define $\|\prod_{i=t-m}^{t-1} \mathbf{p}_j^i\| := \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m} \parallel \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m+1} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}$ and $\|\prod_{i=t-n}^{t-1} \mathbf{h}_j^i\| := \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n} \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n+1} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}$. The item popularity dynamics encoder can effectively capture the popularity change of items over different time periods. Most importantly, it does not take explicit item IDs or auxiliary information as input to compute the item embeddings. Instead, it learns to represent items through their popularity dynamics, which is universal across domains and applications.

4.1.3 Relative Time Interval. We also consider the time interval between two consecutive interactions when modeling sequences. Differences in time intervals might indicate differences in the users' behaviors. While previous works explore absolute time intervals [27], different domains exhibit diverse time scales, thus making modeling absolute time intervals ungeneralizable. Therefore, we propose to encode relative time intervals into modeling sequences. Given an interaction sequence $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$ of user u , we define the time interval between $v_{u,j}$ and $v_{u,j+1}$ as $t_{u,j} = t(v_{u,j+1}) - t(v_{u,j})$, where $t(v_{u,j})$ is the time that user u interacts with item $v_{u,j}$. We then rank the time intervals of user u . Define the rank of relative time interval of $t_{u,j}$ as $r_{u,j} = \text{rank}(t_{u,j})$. The relative time interval encoding of interval $t_{u,j}$ is then defined as $T_{r_{u,j}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, following the same setup in [51], is a fixed sinusoidal encoding matrix defined as:

$$T_{i,2j} = \sin\left(\frac{i}{L^{2j/d}}\right), \quad T_{i,2j+1} = \cos\left(\frac{i}{L^{2j/d}}\right) \quad (3)$$

We also tried a learnable time interval encoding, but it yielded worse performance. We hypothesize that the sinusoidal encoding is more generalizable across domains and the learnable encoding is more prone to overfitting.

4.1.4 Positional Encoding. As we will see in § 4.1.5, the self-attention mechanism does not take the positions of the items into account. Therefore, following [51], we also inject a fixed positional encoding for each position in a user's sequence. Denote the positional embedding of a position l as $P_l \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. We compute P using the same formula in Equation (3). Again, we also tried a learnable positional encoding as presented in [21, 44], but it yielded worse results.

4.1.5 Popularity Dynamics-Aware Transformer. We follow previous works in sequential recommendation [21, 27, 44] and propose an extension to the self-attention mechanism by incorporating universal item representations (§ 4.1.2), relative time intervals (§ 4.1.3), and positional encoding (§ 4.1.4).

Firstly, we transform the user sequence $\{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$ for each user u into a fixed-length sequence $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$ via truncating the oldest interactions or padding, where L is a pre-defined hyper-parameter controlling the maximum length of the sequence. Given a user sequence $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$, we compute its input matrix E_u as:

$$E_u = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_{u,1}^t + T_{r_{u,1}} + P_1 \\ \mathbf{e}_{u,2}^t + T_{r_{u,2}} + P_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}_{u,L}^t + T_{r_{u,L}} + P_L \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

$\mathbf{e}_{u,1}^t, \mathbf{e}_{u,2}^t, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{u,L}^t$ is computed from Equation (2), $T_{r_{u,1}}, T_{r_{u,2}}, \dots, T_{r_{u,L}}$ and P_1, P_2, \dots, P_L are computed following the procedure in § 4.1.3 and § 4.1.4 respectively.

Multi-Head Self-Attention. We adopt a widely used multi-head self-attention mechanism [51], *i.e.*, Transformers. Specifically, it consists of multiple multi-head self-attention layers (denoted as MHAttn(\cdot)), and point-wise feed-forward networks (FFN(\cdot)). The

multi-head self-attention mechanism is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_u &= \text{MHAttn}(E_u) \\ \text{MHAttn}(E_u) &= \text{Concat}(\text{head}_1, \dots, \text{head}_h) \mathbf{W}^O \\ \text{head}_i &= \text{Attn}(E_u \mathbf{W}_i^Q, E_u \mathbf{W}_i^K, E_u \mathbf{W}_i^V) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where E_u is the input matrix computed from Equation (4), h is a tunable hyper-parameter indicating the number of attention heads, $\mathbf{W}_i^Q, \mathbf{W}_i^K, \mathbf{W}_i^V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d/h}$ are the learnable weight matrices, and $\mathbf{W}^O \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is also a learnable weight matrix. Attn is the attention function and is formally defined as:

$$\text{Attn}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{V}) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{d/h}}\right)\mathbf{V} \quad (6)$$

The scale factor $\sqrt{d/h}$ is used to avoid large values of the inner product, which can lead to numerical instability.

Causality: In sequential recommendation, the prediction of the $L + 1$ item should only depend on the first L items that the user has interacted with in the past. However, the L -th output of the multi-head self-attention layer contains all the input information. Therefore, as in [21, 27], we do not let the model attend to the future items by forbidding links between Q_i and K_j ($j > i$) in the attention function.

Point-Wise Feed-Forward Network: To add nonlinearity and interactions between different embedding dimensions, we follow previous works in sequential recommendation [21, 27, 44] and apply the same point-wise feed-forward network to the output of each multi-head self-attention layer. Formally, suppose the output of the multi-head self-attention layer is \mathbf{z}_u , the point-wise feed-forward network is defined as:

$$\text{FFN}(\mathbf{z}_u) = \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{z}_u \mathbf{W}_1 + \mathbf{b}_1) \mathbf{W}_2 + \mathbf{b}_2 \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are learnable weight matrices, and $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are learnable bias vectors.

Stacking Layers: As shown in previous works [21], stacking multiple multi-head self-attention layers and point-wise feed-forward networks can potentially lead to overfitting and instability during the training. Therefore, we follow previous works [21, 27, 44] and apply layer normalization [1] and residual connections to each multi-head self-attention layer and point-wise feed-forward network. Formally, we have:

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \text{Dropout}(g(\text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{x}))) \quad (8)$$

$g(\mathbf{x})$ is either the multi-head self-attention layer or the point-wise feed-forward network. Therefore, for every multi-head self-attention layer and point-wise feed-forward network, we first apply layer normalization to the input, then apply the multi-head self-attention layer or point-wise feed-forward network, and finally apply dropout and add the input \mathbf{x} to the layer output. The LayerNorm function is defined as:

$$\text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha \odot \frac{\mathbf{x} - \mu}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} + \beta \quad (9)$$

where \odot denotes the element-wise product, μ and σ are the mean and standard deviation of \mathbf{x} , α and β are learnable parameters, and ϵ is a small constant to avoid numerical instability.

4.1.6 Prediction. Given a sequence \mathcal{S}_u of user u as input, we denote \mathbf{q}_u as the output of the popularity dynamics-aware transformer. Suppose at time t^+ , we want to predict the likelihood of v_j being the

next item in the sequence, we first compute the item representation $\mathbf{e}_j^{t^+}$ from § 4.1.2. Then, we predict the score as the inner product of \mathbf{q}_u and $\mathbf{e}_j^{t^+}$, formally:

$$\hat{y}(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}_u) = \langle \mathbf{q}_u, \mathbf{e}_j^{t^+} \rangle \quad (10)$$

Note that there is no information leakage in the prediction process, *i.e.*, we do not assume access to the popularity statistics of v_j at time t^+ if we are at time t^+ (§ 4.1.2).

4.2 Training Procedure

Now we present how to train the PREPPEC model. Similar to [21], we adopt the binary cross entropy loss as the objective function, formally:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = - \sum_{\mathcal{S}_u \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{z \in [1, 2, \dots, L-1]} & [\log \sigma(\hat{y}(v_{z+1}^t | \mathcal{S}_{u,:z})) \\ & + \sum_{j' \notin \mathcal{S}_u} \log \sigma(1 - \hat{y}(v_{j'}^t | \mathcal{S}_{u,:z}))] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{u,:z} := \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,z}\}$. v_{z+1}^t represents the $z + 1$ -th item in the sequence that happened at time t . We use Adam [22] as the optimizer and train the model end-to-end. Note that compared to previous sequential recommenders, we do not have any parameters modeling item IDs. Essentially, we are only optimizing \mathbf{W}_p and parameters related to the multi-head self-attention mechanism.

4.3 Zero-shot Inference

Suppose we are given a pre-trained model \mathcal{F} trained on \mathbf{M} , where \mathcal{F} is the scoring function learned from source domain \mathbf{M} . Denote the interaction matrix of the target domain as \mathbf{M}' . We first compute the popularity dynamics of each item in \mathbf{M}' over a coarser period and a finer period. Then, we apply the pre-trained model \mathcal{F} to \mathbf{M}' and compute the prediction score as:

$$\hat{y}(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}'_u) = \mathcal{F}(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}'_u, \mathbf{M}') \quad (12)$$

Note that in this procedure, we use the pre-trained model \mathcal{F} trained on domain \mathbf{M}' to predict the next item v_j^t , that user u' will interact with in domain \mathbf{M}' . We do not use any auxiliary information in either domain. In addition, none of the parameters in \mathcal{F} are updated during the zero-shot inference process.

To summarize, in this section, we showed how to develop a pre-trained sequential recommender system based on the popularity dynamics of items. We enforce the structure of each interaction in the sequence by the positional encoding and introduce a relative time encoding for modeling time intervals between two consecutive interactions. In addition, we showed the training process and formally defined the zero-shot inference procedure. In the next section, we present experiments to evaluate PREPPEC.

5 EXPERIMENTS

We present extensive experiments on five real-world datasets to evaluate the performance of PREPPEC, following the problem settings in § 3. We introduce the following research questions (RQ) to guide our experiments: (RQ1) How well can PREPPEC perform under the regular, in-domain sequential recommendation setting? (RQ2) Can PREPPEC (popularity dynamics) generalize to zero-shot cross-domain and cross-application transfer? (RQ3) How different

DATASET	#USERS	#ITEMS	#ACTIONS	AVG LENGTH	DENSITY
Office	101,133	27,500	0.74m	7.3	0.03%
Tool	240,464	73,153	1.96m	8.1	0.01%
Movie	70,404	40,210	11.55m	164.2	0.41%
Music	20,539	10,121	0.66m	32.2	0.32%
Epinions	30,989	20,382	0.54m	17.5	0.09%

Table 1: Dataset statistics

DATASET	OFFICE	TOOL	MOVIE	MUSIC	EPINIONS
SasRec	1.331m	3.581m	2.044m	0.542m	1.054m
BERT4Rec	2.687m	7.233m	4.126m	1.094m	2.127m
TiSasRec	1.367m	3.617m	2.127m	0.578m	1.09m
PREPPEC	0.045m	0.045m	0.045m	0.045m	0.045m

Table 2: Comparison of model sizes (i.e., number of learnable parameters in millions) over different datasets. PREPPEC uses significantly fewer number of parameters than baselines, ranging from 12 to 90x smaller.

model components affect the performance of PREPPEC? (RQ4) What is the difference between the predictions of PREPPEC and those of the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders?

5.1 Datasets and Preprocessing

We evaluate our proposed method on five real-world datasets across different applications, with varying sizes, and density levels.

- **Amazon** [34] is a series of product ratings datasets obtained from Amazon.com, split by product domain. We consider the **Office** and **Tool** product domains in our study.
- **Douban** [43] consists of three datasets across different domains, collected from Douban.com, a Chinese review website. We work with the **Movie** and **Music** datasets.
- **Epinions** [47, 48] is a dataset crawled from product review site Epinions. We utilize the ratings dataset for our study.

We present dataset statistics in Table 1. We compute the density as the ratio of the number of interactions to the number of users times the number of items. Both datasets from Douban (i.e., movie and music) are the densest and have no auxiliary information available, while the Amazon review datasets (i.e., office and tool) are the sparsest.

For fair evaluation, we follow the same preprocessing procedure as previous works [21, 39, 44, 49], i.e., we binarize the explicit ratings to implicit feedback. In addition, for each user, we sort interactions by their timestamp and take these chronological sequences as input, using the second most recent action for validation, and the most recent action for testing.

5.2 Baselines

To assess the effectiveness of our proposed method, we compare against the following set of baselines. These baselines include classic general recommendation models and state-of-the-art sequential recommendation models.

- **MostPop** is a non-personalized baseline that recommends the most popular items in the training set.
- **BPR** [38] learns latent representations for users and items through matrix factorization.

- **NCF** [14] learns user and item embeddings through a multi-layer perceptron instead of matrix factorization.
- **NGCF** [55] uses a bipartite graph to model user-item interactions through a graph convolutional network [23].
- **LightGCN** [13] is a simplified version of NGCF that removes the feature transformation and nonlinear activation.
- **Caser** [49] learns convolutional filters on user interaction sequences over the sequence order and latent dimensions.
- **MARANK** [59] captures individual and union-level item dependency through multi-order attention.
- **SasRec** [21] uses self-attention to model user embeddings through its sequence of latent item representations.
- **BERT4Rec** [44] improves on SasRec by using a bi-directional transformer to capture interactions from both sides.
- **TiSasRec** [27] additionally embeds the raw time interval between consecutive item interactions in the sequence.

To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to tackle the zero-shot sequential recommendation without any auxiliary information. [17, 18, 54] are designed for few-shot adaptation and uses auxiliary information. [6] is capable of zero-shot recommendation but requires textual descriptions of items, which we do not consider in the experiments. Therefore, we do not include the existing pre-trained sequential recommenders as baselines.

5.3 Experimental Setup

Following previous works [14, 21, 24, 44], we adopt the *leave-one-out* evaluation method: for each user, we pair its test item with 100 unobserved items according to the user’s interaction history. Then we rank the test item for the user among the 101 total items. We use two standard evaluation metrics for top- k recommendation: Recall@ k (R@ k) and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain@ N (N@ k). R@ k measures the proportion of test items that appear in the top- k recommendations, and N@ k accounts for the ranking position of the test interaction. Our model explicitly utilize popularity information. Therefore, in addition to randomly sampled unobserved items (negatives), we also present results where we sample the negatives based on their popularities, i.e., popular items have higher probabilities of being sampled as negatives, to show that PREPPEC can learn discriminative item representations. We report the average of R@ k and N@ k over all the test interactions.

We use publicly available Pytorch implementations for the baselines. For fair evaluation, we set dimension size d to 50, max sequence length L to 200, and batch size to 128 in all models. We use three layers (one base and two additional) in NCF and NGCF, and two attention layers for the sequential models (SasRec, BERT4Rec, TiSasRec, and ours). We use an Adam optimizer and tune the learning rate in the range $\{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}\}$ and set the weight decay to 10^{-5} . We use the dropout regularization rate of 0.3 for all models. We set $\gamma = 0.5$ in Equation (1), whose reason we will discuss the reason in § 5.8.1. We define the coarse and fine period to be 10 and 2 days respectively, and we fix the window size to be $m = 12$ and $n = 4$ for all datasets (§ 4.1.2). We train PREPPEC for a maximum of 80 epochs. All experiments are conducted on a Tesla V100 using PyTorch. We repeat each experiment 5 times with different random seeds and report the average performance.

DATASET Metric	OFFICE		TOOL		MOVIE		MUSIC		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10								
GENERAL RECOMMENDER SYSTEMS										
MostPop	0.450	0.272	0.459	0.274	0.586	0.361	0.519	0.327	0.438	0.296
BPR [38]	0.457	0.289	0.363	0.216	0.747	0.477	0.646	0.434	0.568	0.397
NCF [14]	0.446	0.266	0.388	0.239	0.784	0.505	0.652	0.437	0.570	0.396
NGCF [55]	0.460	0.291	0.421	0.256	0.788	0.510	0.659	0.441	0.571	0.393
LightGCN [13]	0.465	0.293	0.463	0.275	0.793	0.512	0.665	0.447	0.575	0.396
SEQUENTIAL RECOMMENDER SYSTEMS										
Caser [49]	0.512	0.334	0.496	0.297	0.891	0.701	0.796	0.576	0.674	0.475
MARank [59]	0.488	0.312	0.468	0.282	0.888	0.683	0.739	0.501	0.628	0.436
SasRec [21]	0.539	0.354	0.536	0.337	0.918	0.749	0.816	0.599	0.705*	0.501
BERT4Rec [44]	0.541*	0.358*	0.544*	0.350*	0.900	0.728	0.816*	0.602*	0.702	0.512*
TiSasRec [27]	0.531	0.349	0.539	0.341	0.918*	0.752*	0.809	0.523	0.701	0.499
PREPRec	0.536	0.344	0.551	0.339	0.908	0.738	0.782	0.573	0.795	0.580
PREPRec Δ	-0.9%	-3.9%	+1.2%	-3.1%	-1.1%	-1.8%	-1.9%	-4.8%	+12.7%	+13.3%
INTERP	0.648	0.483	0.659	0.482	0.929	0.769	0.851	0.653	0.816	0.640
INTERP Δ	+19.8%	+34.9%	+21.1%	+35.0%	+1.1%	+2.3%	+4.3%	+8.5%	+15.7%	+25.0%

Table 3: Regular sequential recommendation results. We embolden the best results and mark the best baseline results with ‘*’. INTERP represents the interpolation results between PREPRec and BERT4Rec. PREPRec Δ denotes the performance difference between PREPRec and the best results among the selected baselines, similar for INTERP Δ . Despite not focusing on the performance of regular sequential recommendation, PREPRec achieves comparable performance to the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders, with only on average 0.2% worse than the best performing sequential recommenders in R@10 while having only a fraction of the model size (Table 2). After a simple post-hoc interpolation, we outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders by 13.8% in R@10 on average.

DATASET Metric	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
MostPop	0.197	0.139	0.099	0.046	0.163	0.110
SasRec [21]	0.749	0.519	0.453	0.291	0.658	0.442
BERT4Rec [44]	0.747	0.519	0.461	0.299	0.655	0.456
PREPRec	0.739	0.523	0.443	0.280	0.762	0.551
PREPRec Δ	-1.3%	+0.7%	-2.2%	-6.3%	+15.8%	+17.2%

Table 4: Regular sequential recommendation results with popularity-based negative sampling. We present additional in-domain recommendation results with unobserved (negative) items sampled based on their popularity [44] to show that PREPRec can learn discriminative universal item and sequence representations despite depending only on popularity statistics.

5.4 Regular Sequential Recommendation (RQ1)

We show the performance of PREPRec against the selected baselines. We want to emphasize that the purpose of this paper is *not to outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders* but to *set a baseline for further pre-trained sequential recommenders*. We include the results here to investigate how well the popularity dynamics can items and sequences in the sequential recommendation. PREPRec achieves competitive performance- within 2% in R@10 and 5% in N@10, - with the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders. On Epinions, PREPRec even outperforms all the sequential recommenders by 7.3%. This is particularly impressive given that PREPRec has significantly fewer model parameters (Table 2).

Since PREPRec explicitly models popularity information and the MostPop demonstrates competitive performance compared to the remaining baselines, we conduct an additional experiment (Table 4) where we sample the unobserved (negative) items based on

their popularity [44]. As shown in Table 4, MostPop’s performance dropped significantly, while PREPRec shows even more competitive performance on some datasets (e.g., Music and Epinions). This suggests even though PREPRec utilizes non-personalized popularity information, it can still learn discriminative item and sequence representations.

PREPRec learns item representations through popularity dynamics, which is conceptually different from learning representations specific to each item ID. Therefore, we propose a simple post-hoc interpolation to investigate if modeling popularity dynamics can boost the performance of state-of-the-art sequential recommenders. We interpolate the scores from PREPRec with the scores from BERT4Rec as follows: $\hat{y}_{interp}(v_j^t | S_u) = \alpha * \hat{y}_O(v_j^t | S_u) + (1 - \alpha) * \hat{y}_S(v_j | S_u)$, where $\hat{y}_O(v_j^t | S_u)$ and $\hat{y}_S(v_j | S_u)$ are the scores from PREPRec (Equation (10)) and BERT4Rec, respectively. We set $\alpha = 0.5$ for all datasets. After interpolation, there is a significant performance boost by up to 34.9% in N@10. This suggests that our model effectively captures dynamic item properties that are missing with the static item embeddings of SOTA sequential models. Gains are largest in the medium and low-density datasets (Epinions, Amazon), indicating that our model is particularly complimentary to existing methods in sparse datasets where item embeddings are less informative.

5.5 Zero-shot Transfer(RQ2)

We follow the zero-shot inference setting introduced in § 4.3 and report the results in Table 5. We also include the results of the regular sequential recommendation for reference. In the zero-shot setting, after training on source datasets, PREPRec shows minimal performance reduction in the target datasets (i.e., 6% maximum and 2% average reduction in R@10). The best zero-shot transfer

S→T	OFFICE		TOOL		MOVIE		MUSIC		EPINIONS	
Metric	R@10	N@10								
REFERENCE: REGULAR SEQUENTIAL RECOMMENDATION										
MostPop	0.450	0.272	0.459	0.274	0.586	0.361	0.519	0.327	0.438	0.296
PREPREG	0.536	0.344	0.551	0.339	0.908	0.738	0.782	0.573	0.795	0.580
ZERO-SHOT SEQUENTIAL RECOMMENDATION, SOURCE→TARGET										
Office →	—	—	0.540	0.326	0.838	0.624	0.755	0.542	0.724	0.512
Tool →	0.543	0.332	—	—	0.881	0.659	0.749	0.536	0.717	0.510
Movie→	0.520	0.320	0.508	0.302	—	—	0.811	0.600	0.751	0.537
Music→	0.503	0.310	0.496	0.312	0.836	0.636	—	—	0.739	0.518
Epinions→	0.517	0.317	0.470	0.302	0.872	0.656	0.774	0.517	—	—

Table 5: Zero-shot recommendation results. Recommendation results for cross-domain, cross-application zero-shot transfer. S→T means we pre-train PREPREG using S’s data (columns) and evaluate on T’s data (rows). In this experiment, we follow the zero-shot inference setting introduced in § 4.3. We embolden the best-performing cross-domain zero-shot transfer results of each dataset. We empirically show PREPREG achieves remarkable zero-shot generalization performance across datasets and applications without any retraining, fine-tuning, and auxiliary information.

results from PREPREG only fall short against the selected sequential recommendation baselines (Table 3) by up to 4% and even outperform (by up to 6.5%) them on the target datasets (e.g., Epinions and Office). We found that our models trained on Movie and tools show the highest generalizability, even outperforming the target-trained models on Music (0.811 vs. 0.782 on R@10). We conjecture that this is because Movie is the largest dataset in terms of the number of interactions. Overall, these results show PREPREG’s effectiveness in zero-shot transfer without any training on interaction data or side information. In addition, this experiment also demonstrates that the popularity dynamics-based item and sequence representations are generalizable across domains and applications.

5.6 Ablation Study (RQ3)

DATASET	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
Metric	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
PREPREG	0.782	0.573	0.536	0.344	0.795	0.580
w/o Relative Time T (§ 4.1.3)	0.734	0.514	0.541	0.334	0.782	0.562
w/o Positional P (§ 4.1.4)	0.765	0.544	0.530	0.332	0.772	0.554
Sinusoidal Popularity Encoding	0.779	0.570	0.529	0.340	0.772	0.561

Table 6: Ablation study of PREPREG’s different variants.

Here, we assess the importance of different components crucial to PREPREG, i.e., relative time encoding (§ 4.1.3), positional encoding (§ 4.1.4), and popularity encoder E_p (§ 4.1.1). We find that removing relative time encoding T results in the largest performance drop on both the Music and Office datasets. This suggests that the relative time encoding is crucial for effectively capturing the popularity dynamics. Removing positional encoding P results in a maximum of 2.2% drop in R@10 on the Office dataset, indicating positional encoding is important for capturing sequential information. Finally, changing E_p to the non-linear sinusoidal encoding shows worse performance on all datasets, meaning that the linear encoding is more suitable for capturing the popularity dynamics.

5.7 Qualitative Analysis(RQ4)

Here we present a detailed analysis regarding the performance of PREPREG. We separate test items into equally sized groups based on their popularity in the training set. We then compute the average R@10 and N@10 for each group. We present the results in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Recommendation results for different item popularity groups. Item Popularity Group 1 represents the least popular items, and Group 5 represents the most popular items. PREPREG achieves better performance on long-tail items, while the sequential recommenders show stronger performance on popular items.

We find that PREPREG achieves better performance on item group with the least interactions, i.e., long-tail items, while the SasRec and BERT4Rec show stronger performance on popular items. Long-tail item recommendation is a particularly challenging task explored by many previous works [41] and requires recommenders able to learn high-quality representations with just a few interactions. This corresponds to our observation that PREPREG is more robust to data sparsity and can learn discriminative item and sequence representations (§ 5.4), showing that long-tail item recommendation can benefit from PREPREG’s popularity dynamics-based item representations.

5.8 Further Analysis

DATASET	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
Metric	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
$\gamma = 0.5^*$ (WEIGHTED -POP)	0.782	0.573	0.536	0.344	0.795	0.580
$\gamma = 0$ (CURR-POP)	0.749	0.542	0.512	0.328	0.689	0.496
$\gamma = 1$ (CUMUL-POP)	0.695	0.452	0.530	0.330	0.733	0.505

Table 7: Recommendation results for varying the discounting factor γ in § 4.1.2. $\gamma = 0.5$ is the default setting, denoted by * . We find that $\gamma = 0.5$ generally outperforms the other two settings

5.8.1 Effect of discounting factor γ . We examine the effect of different preprocessing weights γ used in popularity calculation (§ 4.1.1). In particular, $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the cumulative popularity, or in other words, at a given time period t , the overall number of

DATASET Metric	MOVIE→MUSIC		TOOL→OFFICE		TOOL→EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
PREPPEC	0.803	0.591	0.472	0.300	0.489	0.264
SasRec	0.815	0.599	0.437	0.290	0.433	0.245
BERT4Rec	0.816	0.602	0.407	0.249	0.433	0.255

Table 8: Recommendation results for fine-tuning PREPPEC. We fine-tune PREPPEC and retrain the baselines from scratch on the target dataset.

interactions up to period t . On the other hand, $\gamma = 0$ corresponds to the current popularity, or percentiles are calculated over interactions just in t , same as b_j^t in Equation (1). When $\gamma = 0.5$, it can be interpreted as interactions being exponentially weighted by time, with a half-life of 1 time period. We find that $\gamma = 0.5$ outperforms the other two settings, with the largest gains of around 12% R@10 and 27% N@10 over CUMUL-POP in the dense Music dataset, and the largest gains over CURR-POP in the sparser Office (5% N@10 and 4% N@10) and Epinions (15% R@10 and 17%N@10) datasets. We suspect this is due to cumulative measures in denser datasets failing to capture recent trends due to the large historical presence, while current-only measures in sparser datasets convey too little or noisy information and lose the information of long-term trends. CURR-POP shows decent performance on the Music dataset, suggesting that Music trends might be more cyclical and thus the current popularity is more informative.

5.8.2 Fine-tune Capability. While we focus on zero-shot cross-domain and cross-application transfers, we also investigate PREPPEC’s fine-tune capability. To ensure target datasets are smaller than the source, we further process the target datasets such that they are no more than 10% of the source datasets’ total interactions. After further processing, we follow the same experimental setup in § 5.3. We fine-tune PREPPEC and retrain the baselines from scratch on the target dataset and report the results in Table 8. We find that PREPPEC, after fine-tuning, outperforms the selected baselines on Office and Epinions by up to 12.9%. This indicates that PREPPEC is capable of learning from the limited data and can be further fine-tuned to achieve better performance, which further expands the use case of PREPPEC.

DATASET Metric	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
Fine:2 days; Coarse:10 days *	0.782	0.573	0.536	0.344	0.795	0.580
Fine:4 days; Coarse:15 days	0.778	0.553	0.537	0.341	0.790	0.574
Fine:7 days; Coarse:30 days	0.760	0.509	0.526	0.334	0.757	0.543

Table 9: Recommendation results for varying time horizons. Fine and coarse time horizons are used for short-term and long-term popularity dynamics respectively (§ 4.1.1).

5.8.3 Effect of Different Time Horizons. We study the effect of different time horizons to PREPPEC. We found that in general, long-term horizons of 30 days and short-term horizons of 7 days perform worse than the other settings. This is likely because the long-term horizon might lead to the lack of resolutions in popularity statistics. We also find that depending on the dataset, the effect of different time horizons also varies. For example, both Music and Epinions show larger performance decrease from short to long-term horizons

than Office. This could be because Music and Epinions are more sensitive to recent trends than Office, or their data are denser in terms of time granularity.

DATASET Metric	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
t-1*	0.782	0.573	0.536	0.344	0.795	0.580
t-2	0.775	0.553	0.530	0.338	0.728	0.516
t-6	0.730	0.497	0.523	0.326	0.682	0.473
t-12	0.705	0.462	0.507	0.313	0.645	0.445

Table 10: Recommendation results for varying prediction time. Where $t - n$ denotes n finer time periods ago. $t - 1$ is the default setting, denoted by ‘*’. The performance drops as n goes larger, indicating the importance of recent trends in sequential recommendation.

5.8.4 Effect of Prediction Time. In PREPPEC, we use the popularity trends up to some time as the context to construct universal item representations. To prevent information leakage, we can only use the popularity dynamics computed prior to the time of the interaction, as illustrated in § 4.1.2 and § 4.1.6. Intuitively, we should compute popularity dynamics as close to the actual interaction time as possible. However, experimenting with this can reveal the importance of recent trends in model performance (Table 10). Thus, denoting $t - n$ to be n fine time periods ago. We round the long-term horizon according to the change in t . Per expectation, we find that $t - 6$ and $t - 12$ drop performance significantly across all datasets while $t - 2$ performs relatively close to $t - 1$, revealing that for the experimented datasets, capturing the latest popularity changes is crucial.

5.9 Discussion

PREPPEC shows excellent potential as a pre-trained sequential recommendation model, with competitive performance to the best baseline with a fraction of the model size, and is capable of zero-shot transfer across domains and applications. We argue that PREPPEC is particularly useful in the following scenarios: 1) initial sequential model when the data in the domain is sparse; 2) backbone for developing more complex sequential recommenders (*i.e.*, prediction interpolation) 3) online recommendation settings. PREPPEC does not explicitly model Item IDs, it can also easily generalize to new items/users with no retraining by just updating the popularity dynamics. We leave this as future work.

6 CONCLUSION

Inspired by the impact of pre-trained models, we propose PREPPEC, a pre-trained sequential recommendation model that is capable of cross-domain and cross-application zero-shot transfer. We assume no access to auxiliary information (*e.g.*, textual data), and we set a baseline for pre-trained sequential recommenders under the most challenging setting. PREPPEC learns to represent items based on their popularity dynamics and computes sequence representations via a popularity dynamics-aware transformer. Through extensive experiments, we empirically show that PREPPEC can achieve comparable performance to or even outperform state-of-the-art sequential recommenders on regular sequential recommendation tasks.

PREPPEC also shows excellent generalizability and can zero-shot transfer to a new domain with minimal performance reduction, indicating that popularity dynamics play an important role in sequential recommendation and are crucial for developing generalizable sequential recommenders.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2016. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450* (2016).
- [2] Albert-László Barabási. 2005. The origin of bursts and heavy tails in human dynamics. *Nature* 435, 7039 (2005), 207–211.
- [3] Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. 1999. Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* 286, 5439 (1999), 509. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=2405932&site=ehost-live>
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina N. Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- [6] Hao Ding, Yifei Ma, Anoop Deoras, Yuyang Wang, and Hao Wang. 2021. Zero-shot recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08318* (2021).
- [7] Manqing Dong, Feng Yuan, Lina Yao, Xiwei Xu, and Liming Zhu. 2020. Mamo: Memory-augmented meta-optimization for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 688–697.
- [8] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiuhua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [9] Xiaoyu Du, Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Zechao Li, Jinhui Tang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2020. How to learn item representation for cold-start multimedia recommendation?. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 3469–3477.
- [10] Philip J Feng, Pingjun Pan, Tingting Zhou, Hongxiang Chen, and Chuanjiang Luo. 2021. Zero shot on the cold-start problem: Model-agnostic interest learning for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 474–483.
- [11] Bowen Hao, Jing Zhang, Hongzhi Yin, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2021. Pre-training graph neural networks for cold-start users and items representation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 265–273.
- [12] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [13] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. LightGCN: Simplifying and Powering Graph Convolution Network for Recommendation. *CoRR* abs/2002.02126 (2020). [arXiv:2002.02126](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.02126) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.02126>
- [14] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *WWW*. 173–182.
- [15] Balázs Hidasi, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Linas Baltrunas, and Domonkos Tikk. 2015. Session-based recommendations with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06939* (2015).
- [16] Balázs Hidasi, Massimo Quadrana, Alexandros Karatzoglou, and Domonkos Tikk. 2016. Parallel recurrent neural network architectures for feature-rich session-based recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 241–248.
- [17] Yupeng Hou, Zhankui He, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2023. Learning vector-quantized item representation for transferable sequential recommenders. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 1162–1171.
- [18] Yupeng Hou, Shanlei Mu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Towards universal sequence representation learning for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 585–593.
- [19] Guangneng Hu, Yu Zhang, and Qiang Yang. 2018. Conet: Collaborative cross networks for cross-domain recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 667–676.
- [20] Yitong Ji, Aixin Sun, Jie Zhang, and Chenliang Li. 2020. A re-visit of the popularity baseline in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1749–1752.
- [21] Wang-Cheng Kang and Julian McAuley. 2018. Self-attentive sequential recommendation. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 197–206.
- [22] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [23] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [24] Yehuda Koren. 2008. Factorization meets the neighborhood: a multifaceted collaborative filtering model. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 426–434.
- [25] Yehuda Koren. 2009. Collaborative filtering with temporal dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 447–456.
- [26] Hoyeop Lee, Jinbae Im, Seongwon Jang, Hyunsouk Cho, and Sehee Chung. 2019. MeLU: Meta-Learned User Preference Estimator for Cold-Start Recommendation. In *KDD*. 1073–1082.
- [27] Jiacheng Li, Yujie Wang, and Julian McAuley. 2020. Time interval aware self-attention for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*. 322–330.
- [28] Pan Li and Alexander Tuzhilin. 2020. Dtdcdr: Deep dual transfer cross domain recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 331–339.
- [29] Weiming Liu, Jiajie Su, Chaochao Chen, and Xiaolin Zheng. 2021. Leveraging distribution alignment via stein path for cross-domain cold-start recommendation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 19223–19234.
- [30] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [31] Yuanfu Lu, Yuan Fang, and Chuan Shi. 2020. Meta-learning on heterogeneous information networks for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 1563–1573.
- [32] Fuyu Lv, Taiwei Jin, Changlong Yu, Fei Sun, Quan Lin, Keping Yang, and Wilfred Ng. 2019. SDM: Sequential deep matching model for online large-scale recommender system. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2635–2643.
- [33] Tong Man, Huawei Shen, Xiaolong Jin, and Xueqi Cheng. 2017. Cross-domain recommendation: An embedding and mapping approach. In *IJCAI*, Vol. 17. 2464–2470.
- [34] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. 2019. Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 188–197.
- [35] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. [arXiv:cs.CL/2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774)
- [36] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [37] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 21, 1 (2020), 5485–5551.
- [38] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *UAI AUAI Press*. 452–461.
- [39] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2010. Factorizing personalized markov chains for next-basket recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*. 811–820.
- [40] Matthew J. Salganik, Peter Sheridan Dodds, and Duncan J. Watts. 2006. Experimental Study of Inequality and Unpredictability in an Artificial Cultural Market. *Science* 311, 5762 (2006), 854–856. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3843620>
- [41] Aravind Sankar, Junting Wang, Adit Krishnan, and Hari Sundaram. 2021. ProtoCF: Prototypical Collaborative Filtering for Few-Shot Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460231.3474268>
- [42] Guy Shani, David Heckerman, Ronen I Brafman, and Craig Boutilier. 2005. An MDP-based recommender system. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 6, 9 (2005).
- [43] Weiping Song, Zhiping Xiao, Yifan Wang, Laurent Charlin, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. 2019. Session-based social recommendation via dynamic graph attention networks. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 555–563.
- [44] Fei Sun, Jun Liu, Jian Wu, Changhua Pei, Xiao Lin, Wenwu Ou, and Peng Jiang. 2019. BERT4Rec: Sequential recommendation with bidirectional encoder representations from transformer. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 1441–1450.

- [45] Qiaoyu Tan, Jianwei Zhang, Ninghao Liu, Xiao Huang, Hongxia Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Xia Hu. 2021. Dynamic memory based attention network for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4384–4392.
- [46] Yong Kiam Tan, Xinxing Xu, and Yong Liu. 2016. Improved recurrent neural networks for session-based recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 1st workshop on deep learning for recommender systems*. 17–22.
- [47] H. Tang, J. and Gao, H. Liu, and A. Das Sarma. 2012. eTrust: Understanding trust evolution in an online world. , 253–261 pages.
- [48] J. Tang, H. Gao, and H. Liu. 2012. mTrust: Discerning multi-faceted trust in a connected world. In *Proceedings of the fifth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*. ACM, 93–102.
- [49] Jiayi Tang and Ke Wang. 2018. Personalized top-n sequential recommendation via convolutional sequence embedding. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 565–573.
- [50] Trinh Xuan Tuan and Tu Minh Phuong. 2017. 3D convolutional networks for session-based recommendation with content features. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM conference on recommender systems*. 138–146.
- [51] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [52] Maksims Volkovs, Guangwei Yu, and Tomi Poutanen. 2017. Dropoutnet: Addressing cold start in recommender systems. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 4957–4966.
- [53] Junting Wang, Adit Krishnan, Hari Sundaram, and Yunzhe Li. 2023. Pre-trained Neural Recommenders: A Transferable Zero-Shot Framework for Recommendation Systems. arXiv:cs.IR/2309.01188
- [54] Jinpeng Wang, Ziyun Zeng, Yunxiao Wang, Yuting Wang, Xingyu Lu, Tianxiang Li, Jun Yuan, Rui Zhang, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Shu-Tao Xia. 2023. MISSRec: Pre-training and Transferring Multi-modal Interest-aware Sequence Representation for Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 6548–6557. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581783.3611967>
- [55] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *SIGIR*. 165–174.
- [56] Yinwei Wei, Xiang Wang, Qi Li, Liqiang Nie, Yan Li, Xuanping Li, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Contrastive learning for cold-start recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 5382–5390.
- [57] Chao-Yuan Wu, Amr Ahmed, Alex Beutel, Alexander J Smola, and How Jing. 2017. Recurrent recommender networks. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 495–503.
- [58] Haochao Ying, Fuzhen Zhuang, Fuzheng Zhang, Yanchi Liu, Guandong Xu, Xing Xie, Hui Xiong, and Jian Wu. 2018. Sequential recommender system based on hierarchical attention network. In *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [59] Lu Yu, Chuxu Zhang, Shangsong Liang, and Xiangliang Zhang. 2019. Multi-order attentive ranking model for sequential recommendation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 33. 5709–5716.
- [60] Fajie Yuan, Xiangnan He, Alexandros Karatzoglou, and Liguang Zhang. 2020. Parameter-Efficient Transfer from Sequential Behaviors for User Modeling and Recommendation. *Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval* (2020).
- [61] Chenyi Zhang, Ke Wang, Hongkun Yu, Jianling Sun, and Ee-Peng Lim. 2014. Latent factor transition for dynamic collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 2014 SIAM international conference on data mining*. SIAM, 452–460.
- [62] Cheng Zhao, Chenliang Li, Rong Xiao, Hongbo Deng, and Aixin Sun. 2020. CATN: Cross-domain recommendation for cold-start users via aspect transfer network. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 229–238.
- [63] Yongchun Zhu, Kaikai Ge, Fuzhen Zhuang, Ruobing Xie, Dongbo Xi, Xu Zhang, Leyu Lin, and Qing He. 2021. Transfer-meta framework for cross-domain recommendation to cold-start users. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1813–1817.