3. Comparison with job recommendation models. (Con3, Q4)

A3: Thanks for your comments. Sorry that we didn't explain it clearly. We compared our approach with several baseline methods: BasicMF from Reference 15, and both PureSVD and ItemKNN from Reference 27, etc. These methods are included in our baselines. Additionally, we plan to incorporate more recent job recommender system baselines into our offline experiments, and the result can be seen in the table below. We can find that our methods also achieved the best performances.

	Shenzhen		Shanghai		Beijing	
	H@10	**M**@10	**H**@10	**M**@10	**H**@10	**M**@10
InEXIT[1]	0.4131	0.2936	0.4611	0.3762	0.5141	0.4033
DGMN[2]	0.4274	0.3178	0.4897	0.3992	0.5217	0.4125
APJFMF[3]	0.4352	0.3114	0.4863	0.3910	0.5254	0.4166
Ours	**0.5598**	**0.5467**	**0.6166**	**0.5152**	**0.6247**	**0.5131**

[1] Shao, Taihua, et al. "Exploring internal and external interactions for semi-structured multivariate attributes in job-resume matching." *International Journal of Intelligent Systems* 2023 (2023).

[2] Bian, Shuqing, et al. "Domain adaptation for person-job fit with transferable deep global match network." *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 2019.

[3] Jian, Ling, Chongzhi Rao, and Xiao Gu. "Your Profile Reveals Your Traits in Talent Market: An Enhanced Person-Job Fit Representation Learning." (2024).