

A Pre-trained Sequential Recommendation Framework: Popularity Dynamics for Zero-shot Transfer

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 are crucial to the success of online applications, e.g., e-commerce, video streaming, and social media. While model architectures continue to improve, for every new application domain, we still have to train a new model from scratch for high quality recommendations. On the other hand, pre-trained language and vision models have shown great success in zero-shot or few-shot adaptation to new application domains. Inspired by the success of pre-trained models in peer AI fields, we propose a novel pre-trained sequential recommendation framework: **PREP**REC. We learn universal item representations by modeling item popularity dynamics. Through extensive experiments on five real-world datasets, we show that PREP

REC, without any auxiliary information, can not only zero-shot transfer to a new domain, but achieve competitive performance compared to state-of-the-art sequential recommender models with only a fraction of the model size. In addition, with a simple post-hoc interpolation, PREP

REC can improve the performance of existing sequential recommenders on average by 13.8% in Recall@10 and 29.5% in NDCG@10. We provide an anonymized implementation of PREP

REC at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/PrepRec--2F60/>.

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 [16, 21, 28, 41, 45, 47], these models have to be trained from scratch for each application domain. because they learn representations for each item [21, 45] 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 sequential recommender system capable of cross-domain and cross-application zero-shot transfer without any auxiliary information? (e.g., using the model trained for online shopping in the US to predict the next movie that a user in India will watch).*

At first glance, developing pre-trained sequential recommenders for zero-shot cross-domain inference seems impossible. While we see pre-trained language [4, 6, 32, 37, 39] and vision models [9, 13,

38] show excellent generalizability across datasets and applications, being able to achieve state-of-the-art performance by just a few fine-tuning steps [6, 32] or even without any training [4, 37] (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 [7, 12, 18] within the same application (e.g., online retail). However, they assume access to auxiliary information of items (e.g., item description), which is application-dependent and is not always available in practice. Therefore, these models cannot learn universal representations of items; instead, they bypass the representation learning problem by using additional item side information. Thus, while achieving success within a domain, these recent models cannot generalize to new domains without auxiliary information. This paper tackles the challenge of zero-shot, cross-domain 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, zero-shot prediction. We know that the marginal distribution of user and item activities is universal across datasets, supported by prior work in network science [2, 3] and by experiments in recommender systems [42]. 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

REC. We learn to represent items based on their popularity dynamics, instead of their explicit item IDs. We encode the time interval between two consecutive interactions via relative-time encoding and the position of each interaction in the sequence by positional encoding. In contrast, prior work in sequential recommendation uses logical indices. Using physical time ensures that the predictions are not anti-causal, i.e., using the future interactions to predict the present. We learn the representations within a transformer architecture coupled with optimizations. The learned item popularity representations, time-interval and positional encoding are all universal, making it possible to build a pre-trained sequential recommender system capable of

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

cross-domain and cross-application transfer without any auxiliary information. Our key contributions are as follows:

Universal item representations: We are the first to learn universal item representations for sequential recommendation. In contrast, prior research learns item representations for each item ID or through item auxiliary information. We learn universal item representations by exploiting item popularity dynamics. We learn two temporal representations using a transformer architecture with optimizations at any time t for each item’s popularity: at a coarse and fine-grained level. We represent items’ popularity dynamics (*i.e.*, representing popularity changes) by concatenating representations over a fixed time interval. Item dynamics are in-ferrable from the user-item interaction data, and thus, the learned item representations are *transferable* across domains and applications. These item 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 transfer without any auxiliary information. In contrast, previous works in sequential recommender systems capable of cross-domain zero-shot rely heavily on application-dependent auxiliary information [7, 12, 18]. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to tackle this challenging setting in sequential recommendation.

With extensive experiments, we empirically show that PREPPEC has excellent generalizability across domains and applications. Remarkably, had we trained a state of the model from scratch for the target domain, *instead of zero-shot transfer using PREPPEC*, the performance gain would have been only (on average) 0.2%. In addition, we show that with a post-hoc interpolation, PREPPEC can outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommender system on average by 13.8% in Recall@10 and 29.5% in NDCG@10. With this work, it becomes clear that item popularity dynamics explain much of the prediction ability of the modern neural recommender systems, shedding light on what neural models are learning from data and opening a new direction for improvement in the future.

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. Early sequential recommenders adopt Markov chains and model item-item transition probability [41, 43]. Later, with the advance of neural networks, some basic neural architectures have been explored for sequential recommendation, such as convolutional neural networks [50, 51]. Recurrent neural networks [17] and its variants, such as GRU4Rec [16] and GRU4Rec+ [47], have also been widely used for sequential recommendation due to the sequential nature of RNN-based architectures.

Recently, with the success of attention mechanisms in modeling sequential data, *e.g.*, text sequences, some works have explored using attention mechanisms for sequential recommendation [27, 30]. Attention-based models, *e.g.*, Transformers [52] and BERT [5] show state-of-the-art performance in many NLP tasks. Inspired by the success of Transformers and BERT, some works have explored using attention-based models for sequential recommendation [21, 28, 45].

Symbol	Description
$P(a_j^t)$	popularity percentile of item v_j at time t over coarser time period
$P(b_j^t)$	popularity percentile of item v_j at time t over finer time period
\mathcal{P}_j^t	popularity dynamics of item v_j over a coarser time period up to time t
\mathcal{H}_j^t	popularity dynamics of item v_j over a finer time period up to time t
e_j^t	popularity dynamics embedding of item v_j at time t
T	relative time interval encoding matrix
P	positional encoding matrix
q_u	user embedding, computed from § 4.1.4
h	number of attention heads
d	embedding dimension

Table 1: Notation Table

However, these works only focus on the regular sequential recommendation and do not consider the zero-shot sequential recommendation. Some works take the timestamps of each interaction into consideration. [28] looks at the time interval between two consecutive interactions and proposes a time-aware attention mechanism for sequential recommendation. Others [34, 46, 58] separate interaction sequences and categorize them to show the long-term and short-term interests of users. Some work on temporal recommendation model the change in users’ preferences and item popularities [25, 57, 61]. However, these works do not consider the dynamics of item popularity statistics and are also not capable of zero-shot sequential recommendation.

Transfer Learning in Recommendation: Cross-domain transfer learning has been explored in recommender systems. Some works in the cross-domain recommendation literature focus on leveraging the relatively information-rich domain to improve the recommendation performance on the data-sparse domain [19, 29, 35]. However, most of these works assume user or item overlap [19, 29, 35, 62, 63] for effective knowledge transfer. Other cross-domain literature focuses on the cold-start problem. There have been works proposed to tackle the cold-start user case [11, 33, 60, 63] or the cold-start item case [10, 31, 53, 56]. However, these works assume auxiliary information is available and can only handle one-sided cold-start problems (*i.e.*, either cold-start users or cold-start items). Some other past works explore meta-learning on the cold-start problem and can handle both cold-start users and cold-start items [8, 26] with application-dependent side information and fine-tuning on the target domain. Note that in this work, we are not trying to address the cold-start problem. Instead, we focus on the zero-shot transfer problem, where no auxiliary information is available in both domains.

Recently, pre-trained recommenders capable of zero-shot transfer have caught some attention in the community. [7, 18] propose pre-trained models for sequential recommendations. However, they rely heavily on dataset-dependent auxiliary information (*i.e.*, description text of items). [54] 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 capable of zero-shot recommendation to a new domain but rely heavily on auxiliary information of items, which is not always available in practice. In this paper, we propose a novel pre-trained sequential recommendation framework based on




Figure 1: Model Architecture of PREPPEC

item popularity dynamics that are universal across datasets, and it is capable of zero-shot transfer without any auxiliary information.

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 the notations used in this paper.

In this paper, we consider building the zero-shot sequential recommender system with only implicit feedback, *i.e.*, no auxiliary information. 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 $v_{u,t+1}$ given a user u 's interaction history $\{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,t}\}$. 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 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 $\mathcal{F}(v^t | \mathcal{S}_u, \mathbf{M})$, where t is the time of the prediction.

Zero-shot Sequential Recommendation: In zero-shot sequential recommendation, given an interaction matrix \mathbf{M}' over \mathcal{U}' and \mathcal{V}' , the goal is to produce a scoring function \mathcal{F}' without training on \mathbf{M}' . In other words, the scoring function \mathcal{F}' has to be trained on a different interaction matrix \mathbf{M} and then applied to \mathbf{M}' directly to predict the next item that user u will interact with. In this paper, we study the zero-shot sequential recommendation that not only \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{M}' are from different domains, but also both $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{U}' = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{V}' = \emptyset$. In addition, we assume no auxiliary information is available in both domains.

Compared to previous works on zero-shot sequential recommendation, which assume access to side information, we pose a more challenging problem setting. We argue that this experimental setting is more universal and practical, and requires the model to learn the truly universal properties of the data.

4 PREPPEC FRAMEWORK

Here, we first introduce the model architecture of PREPPEC (§ 4.1) and the training procedure (§ 4.2). Then, we formally define the zero-shot inference process (§ 4.3).

4.1 Model Architecture

First, we transform the user sequence $\{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L} | \mathcal{S}_u\}$ for each user u into a fixed-length sequence $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$ via truncating or padding, where L is a pre-defined hyper-parameter controlling the maximum length of the sequence. Note that the truncating is done by removing the oldest items in the sequence.

4.1.1 Universal Item Representation encoder. Previous works in sequential and pre-trained sequential recommender systems learn to represent items either through learnable embeddings specific to the item IDs, or through the item's textual information. However, item IDs are not generalizable across domains and textual information is not always available and is application-dependent. In this work, we propose a novel item representation encoder that learns to represent items through the changes in their popularity histories over different time periods (popularity dynamics).

Formally, given an item v_j that has interaction in time period 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 time period (*e.g.*, month) and popularity $\mathbf{h}_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ over a fine time period (*e.g.*, week). To calculate \mathbf{p}_j^t and \mathbf{h}_j^t , we first count the number of interactions of v_j^t over the two time period, 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 the 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 time period t . Note that we do not have a 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. We then calculate a_j^t and b_j^t 's percentiles relative to their corresponding coarser and finer popularity distributions over all items at time t and denote this by $P(a_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $P(b_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively. Finally, we encode $P(a_j^t)$ and $P(b_j^t)$ into k dimension vector representations \mathbf{p}_j^t and \mathbf{h}_j^t respectively. The encoding details can be found in Appendix A.

We now define the popularity dynamics of v_j at time t over the coarse time period (long-term horizon) to be $\{\mathbf{p}_j^1, \mathbf{p}_j^2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}\}$, and over the fine time period (short-term horizon) as $\{\mathbf{h}_j^1, \mathbf{h}_j^2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}\}$. The reason we use $t-1$ is 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 consider window sizes m, n for \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{H} respectively. Formally, we now define the coarse popularity dynamics of v_j at time t as $\mathcal{P}_j^t = \{\mathbf{p}_j^{t-m}, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}\}$, and the fine popularity dynamics of v_j at time t as $\mathcal{H}_j^t = \{\mathbf{h}_j^{t-n}, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}\}$.

We then 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:

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

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 $\parallel_{i=t-m}^{t-1} \mathbf{p}_j^i := \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m} \parallel \mathbf{p}_j^{t-m+1} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{p}_j^{t-1}$ and $\parallel_{i=t-n}^{t-1} \mathbf{h}_j^i := \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n} \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{t-n+1} \parallel \dots \parallel \mathbf{h}_j^{t-1}$. 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.

4.1.2 Relative Time Interval Encoding. Since we explicitly consider time when modeling sequences, we propose a relative time interval encoding to encode the time intervals between consecutive interactions of a user. Formally, 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 [52], 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 this didn't perform as well as the sinusoidal encoding. We hypothesize that the sinusoidal encoding is more generalizable across domains and the learnable encoding is more prone to overfitting.

4.1.3 Positional Encoding. As we will see in § 4.1.4, the self-attention mechanism does not take the positions of the items into account. Therefore, following [52], 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, 45], but it yielded worse results.

4.1.4 Popularity Dynamics-Aware Transformer Layer. We follow previous works in sequential recommendation [21, 28, 45] and propose an extension to the self-attention mechanism for modeling the popularity dynamics of items in a sequence by incorporating model components introduced in § 4.1.1, § 4.1.2, and § 4.1.3.

Given a user sequence $\mathcal{S}_u = \{v_{u,1}, v_{u,2}, \dots, v_{u,L}\}$, we first compute in 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 § 4.1.2 and § 4.1.3 respectively.

Multi-Head Self-Attention. We adopt a widely used multi-head self-attention mechanism [52], *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:

$$\mathbf{z}_u = \text{MHAttn}(E_u)$$

$$\text{MHAttn}(E_u) = \text{Concat}(\text{head}_1, \dots, \text{head}_h) \mathbf{W}^O \quad (5)$$

$$\text{head}_i = \text{Attn}(E_u \mathbf{W}_i^Q, E_u \mathbf{W}_i^K, E_u \mathbf{W}_i^V)$$

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 $s+1$ item that a user will interact with should only depend on the first s items that the user has interacted with in the past. However, the s -th output of the multi-head self-attention layer contains all the input information. Therefore, as in [21, 28], 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: While the multi-head self-attention mechanism can capture the dependencies between items in a sequence and incorporate all previous items' information, it is still inherently a linear model. Therefore, to add nonlinearity and interactions between different embedding dimensions, we follow previous works in sequential recommendation [21, 28, 45] 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, 28, 45] 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.

4.1.5 Prediction. Given a sequence \mathcal{S}_u of user u , we denote the embedding of user u after going through § 4.1.1 § 4.1.2 § 4.1.3 § 4.1.4 as \mathbf{q}_u (Figure 1). Suppose at time t^+ , we want to compute user u 's preference of item v_j , we first compute the item representation $\mathbf{e}_j^{t^+}$ from § 4.1.1. Then, we predict the score as the inner product of \mathbf{q}_u and $\mathbf{e}_j^{t^+}$, formally:

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

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^+ .

4.2 Training Procedure

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

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

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 specific to the item IDs. Essentially, we are only optimizing \mathbf{W}_p and parameters related to the multi-head self-attention mechanism.

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 2: Dataset statistics

4.3 Zero-shot Inference

Our inference setup is defined in § 3. For zero-shot transfer, we first compute two levels of popularity dynamics on the target dataset. Then, we directly apply the model pre-trained on the source dataset to get the prediction.

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

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

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

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? This helps us understand the importance of modeling popularity dynamics in sequential recommendation. (RQ2) Can PREPPEC (popularity dynamics) generalize to zero-shot cross-domain and cross-application transfer? (RQ3) What are the factors that affect the performance of PREPPEC? In other words, how sensitive is PREPPEC to different choices in constructing popularity dynamics? (RQ4) What is the effect of the amount of training data available for PREPPEC? This can be crucial if the pre-trained model is applied to a new domain with limited data.

5.1 Datasets and Preprocessing

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

DATASET	OFFICE		TOOL		MOVIE		MUSIC		EPINIONS	
Metric	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 [40]	0.457	0.289	0.363	0.216	0.747	0.477	0.646	0.434	0.568	0.397
NCF [15]	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 [14]	0.465	0.293	0.463	0.275	0.793	0.512	0.665	0.447	0.575	0.396
SEQUENTIAL RECOMMENDER SYSTEMS										
Caser [50]	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 [45]	0.541*	0.358*	0.544*	0.350*	0.900	0.728	0.816*	0.602*	0.702	0.512*
TiSasRec [28]	0.531	0.349	0.539	0.341	0.918*	0.752*	0.809	0.523	0.701	0.499
PREPRec	0.533	0.334	0.545	0.335	0.896	0.715	0.778	0.553	0.757	0.543
PREPRec Δ	-1.5%	-7.1%	+0.2%	-4.4%	-2.5%	-4.9%	-4.6%	-8.1%	+7.3%	+6.1%
INTERP	0.648	0.483	0.652	0.489	0.940	0.810	0.901	0.783	0.821	0.691
INTERP Δ	+19.8%	+34.9%	+19.9%	+39.7%	+2.4%	+7.7%	+10.4%	+30.1%	+16.5%	+35.0%

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 . We want to emphasize that the regular sequential recommendation is not the main focus of this paper, rather, we include the results here to show the importance of modeling popularity dynamics in the sequential recommendation and establish a baseline of PREPRec’s performance. 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 9). After a simple post-hoc interpolation, we outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders by 13.8% in R@10 on average.

- **Amazon** [36] 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** [44] consists of three datasets across different domains, collected from Douban.com, a Chinese review website. We work with the **Movie** and **Music** datasets.
- **Epinions** [48, 49] is a dataset crawled from product review site Epinions. We utilize the ratings dataset for our study.

The dataset statistics are presented in Table 2. We compute the density as the ratio of the number of interactions to the number of users times the number of items. The Tool dataset is the largest in terms of the number of users and items, with Office and Movie following, and Epinions and Music smallest. Both datasets from Douban (*i.e.*, movie and music) are the densest, 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, 41, 45, 50], *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. As described in § 4.1, our method directly utilizes interaction timestamps to discover long-term and short-term popularity trends. Note that existing sequential methods [21, 45] use timestamps for sequence construction, so our method isn’t any more restrictive in application.

5.2 Baselines and Experimental Setup

To assess the effectiveness of our proposed method, we compare against the following set of baselines. These baselines include classic general recommendation models (*e.g.*, MostPop, BPR [40], NCF [15],

NGCF [55], LightGCN [14]) and state-of-the-art sequential recommendation models (*e.g.*, Caser [50], MARank [59], SasRec [21], BERT4Rec [45], TiSasRec [28]). We provide more detailed descriptions of the baselines in Appendix B. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to tackle the zero-shot sequential recommendation without any auxiliary information. Therefore, we do not include the existing pre-trained sequential recommenders [7, 18] as they require textual descriptions of items, which we do not consider in the experiments.

Following previous works [15, 21, 24, 45], 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. 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 § 5.5.1. We define the coarse and fine time period to be a month and a week respectively, and we fix the window size to be

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	0.533	0.334	0.545	0.335	0.896	0.715	0.778	0.553	0.757	0.543
ZERO-SHOT SEQUENTIAL RECOMMENDATION, SOURCE→TARGET										
Office →	—	—	0.560	0.346	0.875	0.665	0.731	0.531	0.711	0.523
Tool →	0.548	0.336	—	—	0.866	0.648	0.752	0.542	0.713	0.511
Movie→	0.497	0.296	0.508	0.302	—	—	0.773	0.551	0.757	0.545
Music→	0.485	0.304	0.496	0.312	0.739	0.469	—	—	0.723	0.513
Epinions→	0.446	0.296	0.470	0.302	0.783	0.588	0.719	0.540	—	—

Table 4: 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. The purpose of this is to empirically show if the popularity dynamics are generalizable across domains and applications. We embolden the best-performing cross-domain zero-shot transfer results of each dataset. We argue that PREPREG achieves remarkable generalization performance across datasets and applications without any retraining, fine-tuning, and auxiliary information, with a maximum performance reduction of 2.3% on R@10. On the two Amazon datasets, the zero-shot transfer results are even slightly better than the regular sequential recommendation results, suggesting the generalizability of popularity dynamics.

$m = 12$ and $n = 4$ for all datasets (§ 4.1.1). We train PREPREG 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.

5.3 Regular Sequential Recommendation (RQ1)

We investigate the performance of PREPREG against the selected baselines. Note that the purpose of this paper is *not to outperform the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders*. Instead, we include the results here to investigate how well the popularity dynamics can capture users’ preferences in the sequential recommendation and can explain the state-of-the-art models. To no surprise, the selected sequential recommendation baselines are the best performer. However, PREPREG still achieves competitive performance- within 5% in R@10, - with the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders. On Epinions, PREPREG even outperforms all the sequential recommenders by 7.3%. We argue that this is particularly impressive given that PREPREG has significantly fewer model parameters (Table 9) and is capable of zero-shot transfer, with no side information.

PREPREG 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 PREPREG with the scores from BERT4Rec as follows: $\hat{y}_{interp}(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}_u) = \alpha * \hat{y}_O(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}_u) + (1 - \alpha) * \hat{y}_S(v_j | \mathcal{S}_u)$ where $\hat{y}_O(v_j^t | \mathcal{S}_u)$ and $\hat{y}_S(v_j | \mathcal{S}_u)$ are the scores from PREPREG (Equation (10)) and BERT4Rec, respectively. We then proceed to rank with the final interpolated scores. We set $\alpha = 0.5$ for all datasets. After interpolation, there is a significant performance boost by up to 39.7% 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.

5.4 Cross-domain Zero-shot Transfer(RQ2)

For the zero-shot transfer experiments, we train PREPREG on the source dataset. We follow the zero-shot inference setting introduced in § 4.3. We make predictions using Equation (12) and report the results in Table 4. We also include the results of the regular sequential recommendation for reference. In the zero-shot setting, after training on source datasets, in the target dataset, PREPREG shows minimal performance reduction in most cases (*i.e.*, 2.3% maximum reduction) and even outperforms PREPREG and selected sequential recommendation baselines that are trained on the target datasets. In particular, we test all combinations of source and target pairs. We find the zero-shot transfer result from Tool to Office (*i.e.*, Tool is the source dataset while office is the target dataset) outperforms all the state-of-the-art sequential recommenders trained on office, *i.e.*, 0.548 vs 0.541 (BERT4Rec) in R@10. Similarly, when the target is Music and Epinions, using Movie as the source dataset attains nearly identical performance with the reference models. We conjecture that source datasets with similar density levels to the target dataset generally achieve excellent generalization performance, indicating that our model captures relevant characteristics across the space of datasets. Overall, these results show our model’s effectiveness in transferring across domains and applications, performing at or above par with SOTA models trained on the target dataset, without any training on interaction data or side information. We provide a more detailed analysis (case study) in Appendix F.

5.5 Ablation Study (RQ3)

DATASET Metric	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
$\gamma = 0.5^*$ (WEIGHTED -POP)	0.778	0.553	0.533	0.334	0.757	0.543
$\gamma = 0$ (CURR-POP)	0.749	0.542	0.512	0.328	0.689	0.496
$\gamma = 1$ (CUMUL-POP)	0.695	0.452	0.539	0.330	0.733	0.505

Table 5: Recommendation results for varying the discounting factor γ in § 4.1.1. $\gamma = 0.5$ is the default setting, denoted by ‘*’. We find that $\gamma = 0.5$ generally outperforms the other two settings

DATASET	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	Metric	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10
t-1*	0.778	0.553	0.533	0.334	0.757	0.543
t-2	0.775	0.553	0.540	0.338	0.728	0.516
t-3	0.780	0.543	0.539	0.337	0.723	0.514
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 6: 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.

5.5.1 Effect of discounting factor γ_a . We examine the effect of different preprocessing weights γ used in popularity percentile calculation. In particular, $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the cumulative popularity, or in other words, at a given time period t , the overall number of 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 $\gamma = 0.5$ generally outperforms the other two settings, with the largest gains of around 12% R@10 and 22% N@10 over CUMUL-POP in the dense Music dataset, and the largest gains over CURR-POP in the sparser Office (4% N@10) and Epinions (9% R@10 and 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.

5.5.2 Effect of Prediction Time. In PREPREG, 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 § 4.1.1 and § 4.1.5. A natural choice would be to 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 6. 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, revealing that for the experimented datasets, capturing trends of the 6 recent weeks is crucial. Interestingly, we find that $t - 2$ and $t - 3$ perform worse in Epinions, but similarly to $t - 1$ in Office and Music. We posit this could be due to dataset-specific cyclic patterns where Music and Office may have more short-term recurring trends than Epinions, so not as much information is lost in the previous 2 weeks. This opens up possibilities for other axes which can be used to characterized recommender datasets, independent of size, sparsity, or overall duration.

5.6 Effect of Training Data Available(RQ4)

We investigate the influence of data sparsity on the performance of PREPREG and state-of-the-art sequential recommenders. While varying the training data size, we keep the test data fixed. We




Figure 2: Recommendation results for varying the number of training interactions. 100% Training percentage corresponds to the result in Table 3. We decrease the training percentage by removing the oldest interactions. PREPREG is robust to data sparsity and outperforms all baseline sequential recommenders when fewer interactions are available.

remove the oldest interactions from the training set and keep at least 2 training interactions per user to ensure the model is successfully trained.

We can see that the baseline sequential recommenders are sensitive to data sparsity, with significant performance drops when there is less training data. This is expected as the sequential recommenders learn item representations specific to item IDs, and the representation quality is highly dependent on the number of interactions. On the other hand, PREPREG learns item representation through popularity dynamics, showing that popularity dynamics are more robust to data sparsity. We argue that this is crucial for real-world applications where we want to transfer the model to a new domain with limited data. PREPREG is capable of learning from the limited data and outperforms the baseline sequential recommenders.

5.7 Discussion

PREPREG 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 with minimal performance loss. We argue that PREPREG 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. PREPREG 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.

We also notice that the training process of state-of-the-art sequential recommenders assumes access to future interactions. For example, Alice has interacted with items A, B, C in the past. The sequential recommenders will use A, B, C to predict the next item D . If there's another person, Bob, whose interaction history is A, B, C, D and all of them happen after Alice's test interactions D , the current sequential recommenders will use Bob's interaction history A, B, C, D to help Alice predict D . This is not realistic in the online recommendation setting. We found out that on average 31% of the training interactions are after the test interactions of the same dataset. More detailed statistics can be found in Appendix E. We argue that this is a major limitation of the current sequential recommenders and should be addressed in the future.

6 CONCLUSION

Inspired by the impact of pre-trained models, we propose PREPREG, a pre-trained sequential recommendation model that is capable of cross-domain zero-shot transfer without application-dependent

side information. PREPPEC learns to represent items based on their popularity dynamics and computes user representations via a popularity dynamics-aware transformer layer. 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 Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [6] 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>
- [7] Hao Ding, Yifei Ma, Anoop Deoras, Yuyang Wang, and Hao Wang. 2021. Zero-shot recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08318* (2021).
- [8] 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.
- [9] 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).
- [10] 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.
- [11] 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.
- [12] 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.
- [13] 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.
- [14] 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>
- [15] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2017. Neural collaborative filtering. In *WWW*. 173–182.
- [16] Balázs Hidasi, Alexandros Karatzoglou, Linas Baltrunas, and Domonkos Tikk. 2015. Session-based recommendations with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06939* (2015).
- [17] 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.
- [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, Aixun 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] Jing Li, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Zhaochun Ren, Tao Lian, and Jun Ma. 2017. Neural attentive session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1419–1428.
- [28] 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.
- [29] 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.
- [30] Qiao Liu, Yifu Zeng, Refue Mokhosi, and Haibin Zhang. 2018. STAMP: short-term attention/memory priority model for session-based recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1831–1839.
- [31] 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.
- [32] 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).
- [33] 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.
- [34] 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.
- [35] Tong Man, Huawei Shen, Xiaolong Jin, and Xueqi Cheng. 2017. Cross-domain recommendation: An embedding and mapping approach. In *IJCAI*, Vol. 17. 2464–2470.
- [36] 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.
- [37] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. [arXiv:cs.CL/2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774)
- [38] 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.
- [39] 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.
- [40] Steffen Rendle, Christoph Freudenthaler, Zeno Gantner, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2009. BPR: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. In *UAI AUAI Press*. 452–461.
- [41] 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.
- [42] 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>

- [43] Guy Shani, David Heckerman, Ronen I Brafman, and Craig Boutilier. 2005. An MDP-based recommender system. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 6, 9 (2005).
- [44] 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.
- [45] 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.
- [46] 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.
- [47] 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.
- [48] H. Tang, J. and Gao, H. Liu, and A. Das Sarma. 2012. eTrust: Understanding trust evolution in an online world. , 253–261 pages.
- [49] 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.
- [50] 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.
- [51] 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.
- [52] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [53] Maksims Volkovs, Guangwei Yu, and Tomi Poutanen. 2017. Dropoutnet: Addressing cold start in recommender systems. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 4957–4966.
- [54] 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
- [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 Aixun 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.

A POPULARITY ENCODING

We provide details for the item popularity encoding technique introduced in Section 4.1.1. Denote the popularity encoder as E_p , which takes in a percentile $P(x) \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Suppose given the popularity percentile $P(a_j^t) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ over a coarse time period t , the coarse

level popularity vector representation $\mathbf{p}_j^t \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and is computed as follows:

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

$$(\mathbf{p}_j^t)_i = \begin{cases} 1 - \{\frac{P}{10}\}, & \text{if } i = \lfloor \frac{P}{10} \rfloor \\ \{\frac{P}{10}\}, & \text{if } i = \lfloor \frac{P}{10} \rfloor + 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

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, $E_p(40.1) = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0.99, 0.01, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. One interpretation of this would be considering the 10 i percentiles 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., $\mathbf{h}_j^t = E_p(P(b_j^t))$. Note that 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 sinusoidal encodings of the same size, but found that the linear encoding empirically performed better.

B BASELINES DESCRIPTION

In this section, we provide a brief description of the baselines used in our experiments. We tune the hyper-parameters for each baseline on the validation set and report the best results on the test set.

- **MostPop** is a non-personalized baseline that recommends the most popular items in the training set.
- **BPR** [40] is a learning-to-rank method that learns latent representations for users and items through matrix factorization.
- **NCF** [15] 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** [14] is a simplified version of NGCF that removes the feature transformation and nonlinear activation.
- **Caser** [50] 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 and a residual network.
- **SasRec** [21] uses self-attention to model user embeddings through its sequence of latent item representations.
- **BERT4Rec** [45] improves on SasRec by using a bi-directional transformer to capture interactions from both sides.
- **TiSasRec** [28] additionally embeds the raw time interval between consecutive item interactions in the sequence.

C ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

C.1 Performance by User Group

In this experiment, we study the performance of our model on different user activity levels (Figure 3). We divide users into 5 evenly separated groups based on their number of interactions and present the NDCG@10 for each group. We can see from the figure that the gap between baselines and PREPPEC decreases as user activity




Figure 3: Recommendation results for varying user activity levels. Subsequent groups along the x -axis have higher activity levels, i.e., user group 1 corresponds to the least active group of users while group 5 corresponds to the most active ones. We find that PREPPEC performs relatively better for users with more interactions

DATASET	MUSIC		OFFICE		EPINIONS	
	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10	R@10	N@10
36m	0.788	0.529	0.515	0.332	0.751	0.556
24m	0.790	0.553	0.530	0.333	0.748	0.542
12m*	0.778	0.553	0.533	0.334	0.757	0.543
6m	0.762	0.546	0.540	0.340	0.761	0.542
3m	0.766	0.545	0.520	0.331	0.764	0.530
2m	0.768	0.528	0.511	0.325	0.745	0.526
1m	0.784	0.543	0.510	0.325	0.747	0.527

Table 7: Recommendation results for varying coarse level popularity dynamics window size m (§ 4.1.1).

increases for Office and Movie, while PREPPEC outperforms baselines for all user groups on Epinions with significant margins. This suggests that in the presence of many interactions, popularity dynamics can capture much of the user’s preferences without using item IDs.

C.2 Parameter Sensitivity

C.2.1 Effect of Window Size. We assess the effect of different numbers of window size m used in constructing the coarse level popularity dynamics introduced in § 4.1.1 (Table 7). For all our datasets, we fix $n = 4$ for the finer horizon, but experiment with different m for the coarser horizon. The construction method for popularity dynamics and the model’s item embedding sizes remain constant, so we’re effectively trading off incorporating more historical information at the risk of losing nuances in recent trends. Results are presented in Table 7. We find that 6 and 12-month windows are generally best for Office and Epinions, although NDCG@10 improves close to monotonically with window size for Epinions. There isn’t a clear trend for Music, with the 24-month windows performing best, but the 1-month window is competitive as well. This suggests that denser datasets may have more cyclical popularity trends that are captured equally well with shorter and longer windows, while sparser datasets are more sensitive and require more fine-tuning for optimal window size.

C.2.2 Effect of Discounting Factor. In § 5.5.1 we compared performance $\gamma = 0, 0.5, 1$ corresponding to CURR-POP, WEIGHTED-POP, CUMUL-POP schemes, respectively. As WEIGHTED-POP outperforms the other two, to give a more complete picture, we further experiment within the weighted scheme with $\gamma = 0.25$ and 0.75 (Figure 4). For all experiments in the main text, we choose $\gamma = 0.5$ for its strong performance and interpretability.




Figure 4: Recommendation results for varying the preprocessing discounting factor. $\gamma = 0.25$ and $\gamma = 0.5$ yield competitive results over the various datasets, while $\gamma = 0.75$ is slightly worse.

DATASET	MUSIC	OFFICE
PREPPEC N@10	0.553	0.334
w/o T N@10	0.514	0.334
LEARNABLE P N@10	0.546	0.330

Table 8: Ablation study for time and positional embeddings. We find that the relative time embedding is important for recommendation performance. On the other hand, we find that learnable positional embeddings do not perform as well as fixed embeddings.

C.3 Time and Positional Encoding Ablations

Our model architecture uses a relative time embedding by encoding the relative magnitude time interval between consecutive interactions. Here we assess the importance of this time embedding by comparing the full model, denoted as PREPPEC, to a model without it, denoted w/o T . We found that with the addition of relative time encoding T , the performance generally improves. In addition, previous works [21, 45] consider learnable as opposed to fixed positional embeddings. We experiment with learnable positional encodings, denoted LEARNABLE P , for the regular, in-domain setting. We also note that learnable embeddings may be prone to overfitting, and thus won’t generalize well to new domains in zero-shot transfer. We reason that fixed embeddings achieve better performance due to the smaller number of overall parameters our model has (Table 9), resulting in strong test performances for simpler models.

D MODEL SIZE ANALYSIS

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

In this section, we compare model complexities over different datasets. All the baseline methods learn item embeddings specific to their explicit item IDs, which scale with the number of items in the dataset. This can become a bottleneck for large-scale datasets and prevents zero-shot generalization to new datasets. In contrast, PREPPEC learns item representations by modeling their popularity dynamics, which are independent of the number of items and will

not scale with the number of items. We compare the model sizes of PREPREG and sequential recommendation baselines in Table 9.

We find that PREPREG uses significantly fewer learnable parameters than sequential recommendation baselines. Indeed, we can see the model size remains constant across datasets of varying sizes, as the number of model parameters does not scale with the dataset, making PREPREG more suitable for large-scale online platforms. Despite its much smaller size, PREPREG is able to achieve competitive performance with baselines.

E TIME LEAKAGE ANALYSIS

DATASET	OFFICE	TOOL	MOVIE	MUSIC	EPINIONS
# Future Actions	18.22	18.37	597.56	72.9	27.39
% Future Actions	30.46%	24.39%	45.96%	28.32%	28.70%

Table 10: Time leakage statistics. The first row measures the average number of future interactions of the associated test item included in the training set. The second row measures the average proportion of all of the associated item’s training set interactions that are future interactions.

Sequential recommendation baselines like SasRec, TiSasRec, and BERT4Rec are trained on the users’ sequences without considering the interaction time. As the models train over different user sequences, the item representation of a given item will be updated without any consideration of the exact time at which the interaction occurred. Concretely, since the validation and test sets are relative to each user, a given item v_j that interacted with user u_i at time t and user $u_{i'}$ at time t' ($t' > t$). The item v_j may be part of the training interactions for user $u_{i'}$ but the testing interactions for user u_i . So upon inference time for user u_i , the item embedding for v_j will include information about a future interaction with user $u_{i'}$, which would not be available in practice. In contrast, since our method represents items by popularity embeddings up to the time of the interaction, there is no time leakage because there’s no associated item ID, and the training has been conducted only on the *universal item representation* based on popularity dynamics.

F ZERO-SHOT TRANSFER ANALYSIS

The zero-shot transfer results in Table 4 show that the proposed method can generalize quite well from source to target datasets, achieving competitive performance with baselines and our model trained on the target dataset, despite having no access to the target dataset during training. In this section, we further analyze the performance of zero-shot transfer by comparing its performance to regularly trained PREPREG across different user groups. We consider the Movie dataset as the source and Music dataset as the target, and contrast our regular, in-domain model, denoted REG with our zero-shot, cross-domain model, denoted ZS. All statistics increase for larger group numbers, as represented by \rightarrow . Δ denotes the difference in metrics between ZS and REG. Statistical significance using the two-sided t-test for independence is indicated by * for $p < 0.05$ and ** for $p < 0.01$ in the difference rows.

We find statistically significant results for three different time-based metrics: the deviation in time between consecutive interactions, the time of the first interaction, and the time of the last interaction. Concretely, for each of these metrics, we sort all users

GROUP	1	2	3	4	5
CONSECUTIVE INTERACTIONS TIME DEVIATION \rightarrow					
REG R@10	0.757	0.751	0.781	0.785	0.813
ZS R@10	0.729	0.740	0.771	0.793	0.832
Δ R@10	-3.9%**	-1.5%	-1.2%	+1.0%	+2.3%**
REG N@10	0.518	0.522	0.555	0.567	0.603
ZS N@10	0.4999	0.508	0.546	0.578	0.623
Δ N@10	-3.7%*	-2.6%	-1.6%	+1.9%	+3.2%**
FIRST INTERACTION TIME \rightarrow					
REG R@10	0.795	0.782	0.757	0.762	0.791
ZS R@10	0.780	0.754	0.755	0.771	0.804
Δ R@10	-1.9%	-3.7%**	-0.3%	1.1%	+1.6%
REG N@10	0.568	0.559	0.541	0.535	0.560
ZS N@10	0.546	0.532	0.531	0.548	0.597
Δ N@10	-4.0%*	-5.1%**	-2.0%	2.4%	+6.2%**
LAST INTERACTION TIME \rightarrow					
REG R@10	0.656	0.780	0.816	0.750	0.885
ZS R@10	0.614	0.766	0.807	0.795	0.884
Δ R@10	-7.0%**	-1.9%	-1.0%	+5.6%**	-0.2%
REG N@10	0.431	0.548	0.633	0.500	0.652
ZS N@10	0.402	0.529	0.598	0.547	0.679
Δ N@10	-7.4%**	-3.6%*	-5.8%**	+8.7%**	+3.9%**

Table 11: Zero-shot Transfer Analysis. We compare the in-domain (trained on target) and zero-shot cross-domain (trained and source and transferred to target) performance of PREPREG. REG stands for the model performance trained on the target dataset, while ZS stands for the zero-shot cross-domain performance. We use the music as the target dataset and the movie as the source dataset. We divide users into 5 groups based on their interaction time deviation, first interaction time, and last interaction time.

by the metric and divide them into 5 groups, with Group 1 being the smallest metric values and Group 5 being the largest, and assess performance. For consecutive interaction deviation, REG performs better on users with smaller deviations or more frequent interactions, while ZS performs better on users with larger deviations or more spread out interactions. We posit that due to the larger amount of training data, the Movie-trained ZS model captures longer dynamic trends better, but doesn’t capture some shorter-term, idiosyncratic patterns. Also users with earlier first interactions and earlier last interactions also perform better with REG, while predictions for later first interactions and later last interactions are better with ZS. This could be due to items later in the dataset having more precise popularity data, leading to the pretrained ZS outperforming the in-domain REG model.