ExperimentsAblation Study

| Dataset | Metric | Only \mathcal{C} | Only ${\cal S}$ | Rand. | Oracle | NN | CRIS |
|----------|--------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| Toys | H@10 | 0.385 | 0.352 | 0.361 | 0.652 | 0.401 | 0.460 |
| | N@10 | 0.233 | 0.175 | 0.199 | 0.377 | 0.219 | 0.273 |
| Clothing | H@10 | 0.401 | 0.320 | 0.371 | 0.543 | 0.291 | 0.447 |
| | N@10 | 0.240 | 0.157 | 0.207 | 0.309 | 0.158 | 0.265 |
| Health | H@10 | 0.460 | 0.237 | 0.411 | 0.538 | 0.414 | 0.499 |
| | N@10 | 0.279 | 0.132 | 0.249 | 0.325 | 0.235 | 0.306 |
| Movies | H@10 | 0.705 | 0.554 | 0.678 | 0.793 | 0.690 | 0.725 |
| | N@10 | 0.458 | 0.299 | 0.446 | 0.518 | 0.433 | 0.469 |
| Yelp | H@10 | 0.887 | 0.429 | 0.890 | 0.961 | 0.879 | 0.906 |
| | N@10 | 0.632 | 0.193 | 0.629 | 0.738 | 0.617 | 0.657 |

- Only C is trained only the consumption-based loss L_C^P , shows similar performance of CML.
- Only S is trained only on the ISS-based loss L_S^P , shows the consistent degradation in the accuracy of recommendations.
- This result indicates that should utilize the ISSs along with the consumption-based objective, since modeling the ISS alone can't capture user's personalized preferences.
- Randomly ISSs (Rand.) hurt the model performance in all the cases as the representations of users and items will be wrongly learned by random ISSs.
- As oracle, set ISS p_i as 1 if item i appear in the test data and 0 else. It's provides the upper bound of the performance of CRIS.

ExperimentsAblation Study

| Dataset | Metric | Only \mathcal{C} | Only ${\cal S}$ | Rand. | Oracle | NN | CRIS |
|----------|--------|--------------------|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| Toys | H@10 | 0.385 | 0.352 | 0.361 | 0.652 | 0.401 | 0.460 |
| | N@10 | 0.233 | 0.175 | 0.199 | 0.377 | 0.219 | 0.273 |
| Clothing | H@10 | 0.401 | 0.320 | 0.371 | 0.543 | 0.291 | 0.447 |
| | N@10 | 0.240 | 0.157 | 0.207 | 0.309 | 0.158 | 0.265 |
| Health | H@10 | 0.460 | 0.237 | 0.411 | 0.538 | 0.414 | 0.499 |
| | N@10 | 0.279 | 0.132 | 0.249 | 0.325 | 0.235 | 0.306 |
| Movies | H@10 | 0.705 | 0.554 | 0.678 | 0.793 | 0.690 | 0.725 |
| | N@10 | 0.458 | 0.299 | 0.446 | 0.518 | 0.433 | 0.469 |
| Yelp | H@10 | 0.887 | 0.429 | 0.890 | 0.961 | 0.879 | 0.906 |
| | N@10 | 0.632 | 0.193 | 0.629 | 0.738 | 0.617 | 0.657 |

- Examine a neural transformation (fully-connect layer) to project (user, item) into a point in the space instead of the sum operation.
 - On all datasets, the neural transformation is worse than the sum-based transformation.
 - Suspect the additional parameters of the NN make the method to overfit compared to the parameter-free approach (i.e. sum).