

Highlights

Federated Recommender System with Data Valuation for E-commerce Platform

Jongwon Park, Minku Kang, Wooseok Sim, Soyoung Lee, Hogun Park

- We propose a federated learning method with subgraph-level clients.
- Our proposed model selectively exploits global data to learn local client models.
- Our experiments show robust results in both non-IID and IID scenarios.

Federated Recommender System with Data Valuation for E-commerce Platform

Jongwon Park^{a,1}, Minku Kang^{a,1}, Wooseok Sim^{a,1}, Soyoung Lee^{a,1}, Hogun Park^{a,*}

*^aCollege of Computing and Informatics, Sungkyunkwan University,
Suwon, Republic of Korea*

Abstract

Federated Learning (FL) is gaining prominence in machine learning as privacy concerns grow. This paradigm allows each client (e.g., an individual online store) to train a recommendation model locally while sharing only model updates, without exposing the raw interaction logs to a central server, thereby preserving privacy in a decentralized environment. Nonetheless, most existing FL-based recommender systems still rely solely on each client’s private data, despite the abundance of publicly available datasets that could be leveraged to enrich local training; this potential remains largely underexplored. To this end, we consider a realistic scenario wherein a large shopping platform collaborates with multiple small online stores to build a global recommender system. The platform possesses global data, such as shareable user and item lists, while each store holds a portion of interaction data privately (or locally). Although integrating global data can help mitigate the limitations of sparse and biased clients’ local data, it also introduces addi-

*Corresponding author.

Email address: hogunpark@skku.edu (Hogun Park)

¹These authors contributed equally to this work.

tional challenges: simply combining all global interactions can amplify noise and irrelevant patterns, worsening personalization and increasing computational costs. To address these challenges, we propose **FedGDVE**, which selectively augments each client’s local graph with semantically aligned samples from the global dataset. FedGDVE employs: (i) a pre-trained graph encoder to extract global structural features, (ii) a local valid predictor to assess client-specific relevance, (iii) a reinforcement-learning-based probability estimator to filter and sample only the most pertinent global interactions. FedGDVE improves performance by up to 34.86% on recognized benchmarks in FL environments.

Keywords: Federated learning, Recommender system, Graph neural network

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary information-abundant environment, the significance of recommender systems cannot be understated, given their ability to curate content tailored to individual tastes (Wang et al., 2023; Cui et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2021b). Collaborative Filtering (CF) has been a fundamental technique in this domain, primarily focusing on analyzing historical user-item interactions to predict personal preferences (He et al., 2017; Alharbe et al., 2023). A recent development in CF is represented by Graph Collaborative Filtering (GCF), which utilizes the principles of CF with the capabilities of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) (Li et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022; Jung & Park, 2025; Park et al., 2025). By conceptualizing the interaction dataset as a user-item bipartite graph, GCF harnesses GNNs to craft sophisticated node representations. A noteworthy strength of GCF lies in

its adeptness at employing an individual user’s subgraph structure, enhancing the learning of embeddings by pooling insights from a broad spectrum of users with congruent preferences Jung et al. (2023). However, this also introduces potential risks related to privacy leakage (Liu et al., 2022). To address privacy concerns, integrating Federated Learning (FL) within the recommendation domain has emerged as a pivotal development (Wu et al., 2021a; Wahab et al., 2022). FL is a technique to train a machine learning model to benefit from all data dispersed across multiple clients without centralizing, ensuring individual client data remains private. Although FL enables privacy-preserving model training, recommender systems in this setting still face a major hurdle: the limited size of each client’s local dataset significantly hampers recommendation quality (Wang et al., 2024).

Motivating Scenario. Large e-commerce platforms such as Google Shopping ², Shopify ³, and Naver Shopping ⁴ operate extensive ecosystems in partnership with many online stores. Each store seeks to deliver satisfying product recommendations to its customers, yet privacy requirements and country-level regulations (Tsoy & Konstantinov, 2023) oblige them to keep customer information strictly private. These constraints make it difficult to train a single recommender on all user-item interactions. Under these conditions, FL-based recommender systems become a compelling solution: online stores (clients) collaborate by training local models on their private interaction data and share only model parameters with a central server to update a global recom-

²<https://shopping.google.com>

³<https://www.shopify.com>

⁴<https://shopping.naver.com>




Figure 1: Illustration of a federated recommender system environment with distributed data across clients. (a) Existing Methods (Peng et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2021a): FL-based recommender systems that rely solely on each client’s private user-item interaction data without utilizing any external global data. Solid black lines denote observed interactions stored within each client’s local dataset, while red dashed lines indicate potential but unrecorded cross-client interactions. (b) Ours: FedGDVE, identifies and incorporates semantically aligned interactions from a publicly available dataset (e.g., reviews) to support local training. Blue dashed lines represent distributional alignment between local client data and selected global interactions, which are exploited indirectly for training via the graph data value estimator (GDVE) module.

recommendation model, thereby preserving data privacy. Nevertheless, prevailing FL recommenders (Ammad-Ud-Din et al., 2019; Banabilah et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2022; Yuan et al., 2023) are constrained by the local dataset available on each client, which hinders adequate representation learning and yields locally sub-optimal models (Figure 1 (a)). When such inferior models are aggregated, the gains from collaboration largely evaporate, thereby curbing the overall effectiveness of the federation.

In real-world e-commerce platforms, however, global data such as product reviews or anonymized logs is often available. These can potentially serve as supplementary training resources if used appropriately. Our approach aims to

take advantage of this possibility. As shown in Figure 1 (b), we incorporate a large, noisy global dataset into each client’s training process through selective data utilization. A naive approach might append the entire global dataset to each client’s local data. Owing to distributional mismatch and noise, simply merging the entire global dataset into the local data often triggers negative transfer. The client model is overwhelmed by irrelevant global patterns and drift away from its own distribution. In addition, processing the entire global dataset imposes significant computational costs, which may be infeasible for resource-constrained clients. Therefore, there is a clear need for a principled mechanism that can filter and utilize only the most useful parts of the global data.

To tackle these challenges, we propose the Federated Graph Data Value Estimator (FedGDVE), an FL framework for recommender systems that selectively incorporates global interactions aligned with each client’s data distribution. Our foundational setup parallels the work of (Zhao et al., 2018), where global data is available to enhance local models. Unlike earlier studies that attempted to reinstate IID property by merging each client’s data with a small global dataset (Zhao et al., 2018; Lv et al., 2023), FedGDVE enhances local training by augmenting each client’s dataset with interactions filtered from a large-scale public dataset that aligns with its own data distribution. This strategy is therefore far more practical, as it dispenses with the requirement for a carefully curated, limited global dataset and instead operates directly on the large, naturally occurring global knowledge.

To filter the global dataset effectively, we devise the Graph Data Value Estimator (GDVE), a specialized model designed to identify global interac-

tions that are useful for improving each client’s local model. GDVE comprises three modules: (i) a graph encoder pre-trained on the global dataset, (ii) a valid predictor pre-trained on the client’s local dataset, and (iii) a probability estimator that serves as GDVE’s training target. The graph encoder first transforms each global interaction into latent representations, furnishing rich graph-level features from the global view. Because these features alone cannot capture client-specific preferences, the valid predictor scores the same interactions to yield a local-belief signal. The probability estimator then fuses the encoder embeddings with these validity scores to compute a filtering probability for each interaction. Based on these probabilities, interactions are randomly sampled, enabling client-tailored selection of global data. However, because the stochastic sampling process is non-differentiable, the probability estimator cannot be optimized directly through backpropagation. To address this, we introduce an auxiliary task predictor and update the probability estimator using a reinforcement learning scheme. The task predictor is trained on the subset of global interactions selected by GDVE, and its performance on the client’s local data serves as a reward for the probability estimator. Interaction subsets that yield higher local performance receive larger rewards, thereby increasing their sampling probabilities in subsequent iterations. Once GDVE has converged, we proceed to train the recommendation model. At each training step, the global interactions sampled by GDVE are merged with the client’s local data, allowing the recommendation model to operate on an augmented graph that reflects both private and carefully selected global information. This selective augmentation unlocks the utility of the vast global dataset while sidestepping its noise and scale. It steers

each local model toward more optimal parameter estimates, and the ensuing refined updates boost the aggregated global model. Furthermore, by operating on this compact, relevance-filtered subset, FedGDVE exploits global data cost-effectively and remains scalable, as it can be applied regardless of the size of the global dataset.

Our contributions are outlined as follows:

- We conduct federated learning in a more realistic yet previously overlooked environment that combines a publicly shared dataset with each client’s private local data. To the best of our knowledge, there has been limited exploration in the field of federated recommender systems that considers such a hybrid data setting.
- We propose FedGDVE, a FL framework that selectively incorporates external data. This approach is designed to enrich user preference information in FL-based recommender systems, particularly in scenarios characterized by sparse local observations.
- We observe that FedGDVE outperforms recent FL recommender systems in both IID and non-IID settings, with performance gains of up to 34.86%.

2. RELATED WORK

2.1. Graph neural network for recommender systems

Graph recommender systems represent users and items as nodes in a graph, with their interactions as edges to capture an implicit relationship. The Graph Collaborative Filtering (GCF) techniques have transitioned from label propagation models such as ItemRank (Gori et al., 2007) to sophisticated graph embeddings, refining the prediction of user preferences. Early models focused on determining structural similarities in user-item interactions but fell short when optimizing against definitive recommendation objectives. Acknowledging the limitations, HOP-Rec (Yang et al., 2018) introduced a new blend of graph dynamics and embedding methods, leveraging random walks to broaden user interactions. However, this approach also encountered challenges in harnessing higher-order connectivity and was overly dependent on extensive fine-tuning processes.

The advent of models based on representative algorithms, notably STAR-GCN (Zhang et al., 2019) and NGCF (Wang et al., 2019), signaled a successful adaptation of GNN to the recommendation domain. STAR-GCN uses a reconstruction mechanism to connect multiple adjacent graph blocks with edge masking to avoid privacy problems. NGCF, propagating user-item graphs and aggregating information from Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) layers to capture high-order information Park & Neville (2020), drastically simplified the training process. Our model builds on NGCF by adding a graph-structured contrastive loss, which enhances the learning of implicit relationships in user-item interactions and improves recommendation accuracy in federated settings.

2.2. Federated learning for recommender systems

Federated Learning (FL) is a machine learning technique that promotes collaborative model training across multiple devices while strictly preserving user privacy (McMahan et al., 2017; Banabilah et al., 2022; Kang & Park, 2025). Contrary to conventional approaches that centralize data, FL prioritizes keeping user data localized while harnessing a centralized vision for improving performance. Each device refines its model based on local data and then shares model parameters with a centralized server. The server aggregates the shared parameters to enhance a global model, which is redistributed to devices for further refinement (Chen et al., 2019; Karimireddy et al., 2020).

FL has been explored in recommender systems (Yang et al., 2020; Yi et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2020). One noteworthy study is FCF (Ammad-Ud-Din et al., 2019), representing the initial attempt to apply FL to standard collaborative filtering methods. FCF demonstrated the stability of recommender system performance within the FL framework. FedMF (Chai et al., 2020) extends matrix factorization (MF) by enabling the local learning of user embeddings and transmitting only the gradients to the server. Subsequently, FedMVMF (Flanagan et al., 2021) has demonstrated that using multi-view matrix factorization complements the cold-start problem of standard collaborative filters. MetaMF (Lin et al., 2020) proposed a new MF method to learn the rating prediction in FL using a meta module that reduces the size of the matrix. FedPerGNN (Wu et al., 2022) is an FL recommender system using a Graph Neural Network (GNN) and displayed equivalent performance to the centralized model using the neighbor expansion technique with assistance

from a third party.

Recent research has notably emphasized personalized federated learning to address the unique statistical characteristics of each client. For instance, PerFedRec (Luo et al., 2022) clusters clients and maintains the distinct attributes of each group during aggregation for global model parameters. Meanwhile, HeteFedRec (Yuan et al., 2023) underscores the limitations of uniformly distributing global model parameters across clients with heterogeneous resources. As a remedy, it proposes modulating the global parameter size to better align with each client’s resources.

Our work differs from prior studies in extending the use of GNNs in recommender systems to a subgraph-level FL setting. In this setup, each client corresponds to a group of users and their associated local interaction subgraph. This formulation allows more expressive modeling of user-item relationships within clients, but also intensifies the challenge of limited interaction data available to each client. To address this, we leverage abundant global datasets available online—resources largely overlooked in existing FL-based recommender systems that rely solely on private client data.

2.3. Data valuation

The quantification of data value is significant in the field of machine learning. There is an increasing interest in explaining model predictions and discerning which data to assimilate or exclude to enhance model efficacy (Wu et al., 2023; Ghorbani & Zou, 2019; Kang et al., 2024; Park & Neville, 2023; Jung et al., 2025).

One standard method to tackle the challenge of data valuation is utilizing Shapley Value (SV) as the metric to assess the contribution of individual

data (Mitchell et al., 2022; Kwon & Zou, 2021). SV defines a profit allocation scheme that complies with a suite of properties, such as fairness, rationality, and decentralizability. The study by (Jia et al., 2019) aimed at reducing computation cost by promoting information sharing amongst diverse model evaluations, given that SV naturally exhibits sparsity, signifying that only a few numbers of data hold substantial values. In a different stride, (Ghorbani et al., 2020) introduced distributional Shapley, which measures value concerning an overall data distribution instead of a fixed dataset, offering a more dynamic valuation. Despite its merits, SV encounters limitations within FL frameworks, where it has difficulty evaluating the value of local data compared to other data sources and fails to consider the sequence in which data is presented.

Another approach to valuing data is integrating reinforcement learning (Yoon et al., 2020; Tay et al., 2022). This makes data valuation on large and complex Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) affordable. A proficient data value estimator can reprioritize the use of training samples and enable the training of high-performance predictors with noisy or out-of-domain training samples. The training is based on the predictor’s performance on a small validation data set. A batch of training samples is given as input, yielding a selection probability that effectively ranks the batches by importance.

Our work builds on these ideas by applying a reinforcement learning–based data valuation strategy specifically to filter large, noisy global datasets before augmenting each client’s local data in an FL-based recommender system. This selective filtering ensures that only semantically relevant global interactions are incorporated, mitigating noise and reducing computational

overhead.

3. METHOD

3.1. Notations

Throughout this section, we define the sets of users and items using the notations $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_P\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_Q\}$, respectively. Here, P and Q denote the total number of users and items. We consider the interactions between users and items, such as reviews or ratings, to construct a bipartite graph G , which is represented by an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{P \times Q}$. In this matrix, 1 indicates the presence of an interaction between a user and an item, while 0 signifies no interaction. Furthermore, each user and item is associated with an embedding vector of dimension d . These embedding vectors are denoted by $\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}(i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for the i -th user and $\mathbf{e}_{\text{item}}(j) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for the j -th item, where $\mathbf{E}_{\text{user}} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times d}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\text{item}} \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times d}$ are matrices containing the embedding vectors for all users and items, respectively.

Consider K clients participate in the training. Client k holds an internal local data set D_{local}^k that is not shared with other clients. This dataset comprises interactions between P_{local}^k users and Q_{local}^k items specific to client k . The collection of all clients' private datasets is denoted by $D_{\text{local}} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K D_{\text{local}}^k$, where \bigcup signifies the union of all private local datasets. In contrast, the platform maintains a global dataset D_{global} , which is available to all clients. The global dataset contains P_{global} users and Q_{global} items. We assume it is larger in scale than any individual local dataset, such that $P_{\text{global}} \geq P_{\text{local}}^k$ and $Q_{\text{global}} \geq Q_{\text{local}}^k$ for every client $k \in 1, \dots, K$. The distributions of D_{local} and D_{global} are not necessarily identical.




Figure 2: Overview of FedGDVE.

3.2. Overview of the FedGDVE framework

An overview of the FedGDVE framework is presented in Figure 2. As shown in the figure, client k maintains both a GDVE model and a local recommendation model. The GDVE is retained locally within each client and is never transmitted to the server. It filters interactions from D_{global} that are useful for the client’s data. The filtered interactions are used to augment the local dataset D_{local}^k , enabling each client to utilize global data more effectively than naively incorporating it in its entirety. This augmented dataset is then used to train the local recommendation model, which can be any arbitrary recommendation architecture. Once training is complete, the model parameters are transmitted to the server for aggregation.

3.3. GDVE Architecture

In this section, we describe the overall architecture of GDVE. As illustrated in Figure 3, the GDVE for client k comprises three modules: a graph




Figure 3: The overall architecture of the proposed GDVE^k for client k .

encoder g_{ϕ}^k , a valid predictor f_{ψ}^k , and a probability estimator h_{ϕ}^k . The graph encoder and the valid predictor share the identical NGCF backbone structure (Wang et al., 2019).

Specifically, the graph encoder for client k is pre-trained on the global interaction graph D_{global} , mapping global user-item interactions into a latent space and yielding the embedding matrices \mathbf{E}_{user}^k and \mathbf{E}_{item}^k . Reinforcement learning-based data value estimators typically rely on explicit feature vectors to assign a selection probability to each data point (Yoon et al., 2020; Tay et al., 2022). In recommender systems, however, individual user-item interactions lack such features, rendering a direct application of these estimators infeasible. The embeddings generated by the graph encoder serve as surrogate feature vectors that encode global interaction patterns, enabling reinforcement learning-based data value estimation to function effectively within a GCF-based recommender system.

Nevertheless, the representations produced by the graph encoder alone remain insufficient to fully capture the client’s specific preferences toward the global dataset. To this end, the valid predictor—pre-trained on the

client’s local dataset—assigns a validity score for each global interaction. These scores are collectively represented as the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^k$, where a higher value indicates a stronger client preference for the corresponding interaction.

Finally, the probability estimator combines the outputs of the graph encoder and the valid predictor to compute the selection probability for each interaction, after which interactions are stochastically sampled according to these probabilities. It is implemented as two sequential Multi Layer Perceptron (MLP), $h_{\phi_1}^k$ and $h_{\phi_2}^k$. The first network, $h_{\phi_1}^k$, transforms the embeddings into an intermediate representation, while the second, $h_{\phi_2}^k$, concatenates this representation with the associated validity score and maps the result to a scalar selection probability \mathbf{P}^k for each interaction. Based on these probabilities, client k derives a binary mask \mathbf{S}^k to filter the global interactions.

3.4. Learning Procedure of GDVE

In this section, we detail the learning procedure of GDVE. The complete learning pipeline is presented in Algorithm 1.

3.4.1. Pre-training of graph encoder and valid predictor

Prior to training the probability estimator, client k pre-trains the graph encoder g_{ϕ}^k on the global dataset D_{global} and the valid predictor f_{ψ}^k on the client’s local dataset D_{local}^k . Once this pre-training phase is complete, the parameters of both modules are kept frozen. Both modules are optimized using the Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) loss (Rendle et al., 2012). The BPR loss is a specialized ranking loss function tailored for recommender systems, especially when dealing with implicit feedback. It derives implicit negative feedback from unobserved interactions and optimizes the model to rank observed items higher than unobserved ones. This pairwise strategy

effectively captures user preferences and has been shown to deliver superior performance in settings where only positive interactions are available. Formally, the BPR loss is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BPR}} = - \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{m \in T} \sum_{n \notin T} \ln \sigma(\hat{y}_{um} - \hat{y}_{un}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{W}\|_2^2, \quad (1)$$

where U denotes the set of users and T denotes the set of items. Concretely, the BPR loss for the graph encoder is instantiated with the user and item sets of D_{global} . In contrast, the BPR loss for the valid predictor uses the corresponding user and item sets of the client k 's local dataset D_{local}^k . \hat{y}_{um} indicates the preference score for user u and item m , computed as the matrix multiplication of their corresponding embeddings predicted by the model. σ is the sigmoid function, λ is the regularization coefficient, and \mathbf{W} represents the model parameters. The first term, $\ln \sigma(\hat{y}_{um} - \hat{y}_{un})$, encourages the model to assign higher scores to observed interactions than to unobserved ones. This mechanism enables a nuanced modeling of user preferences and item affinities, effectively tailoring the learned embeddings to reflect the underlying interaction patterns. The second term $\lambda \|\mathbf{W}\|_2^2$ introduces regularization to mitigate overfitting by penalizing the magnitude of the parameters.

3.4.2. Task predictor

As depicted in Figure 3, the probability estimator g_φ^k of client k is updated by a reward guided by an auxiliary task predictor. To clarify the role of the task predictor, we first outline how GDVE derives the interaction mask \mathbf{S}^k for client k . GDVE processes each mini-batch \mathcal{B} consisting of β users sampled from the global dataset, rather than utilizing the entire D_{global} . For each mini-batch, the graph encoder g_φ^k produces user and item embedding matrices

$\mathbf{E}_{\text{user}}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta \times d}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\text{item}}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_{\text{global}} \times d}$. Similar to the graph encoder, the valid predictor f_{ψ}^k outputs user and item embedding matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{user}}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta \times d}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{item}}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_{\text{global}} \times d}$, respectively. The validity score matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta \times Q_{\text{global}}}$ is subsequently computed as the matrix multiplication of the user and item embeddings. The probability estimator derives the interaction mask $\mathbf{S}^k \in \{0, 1\}^{\beta \times Q_{\text{global}}}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{P}^k = h_{\phi_2}^k \left([h_{\phi_1}^k (\mathbf{E}_{\text{user}}^k \parallel \mathbf{E}_{\text{item}}^k)] \parallel \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^k \right), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{S}^k = \text{Bern}(\mathbf{P}^k), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{P}^k \in \mathbb{R}^{\beta \times Q_{\text{global}}}$ indicates selection probability, \parallel denotes concatenation, and Bern represents the Bernoulli distribution. The probability estimator stochastically selects the interactions used for training recommendation model according to their estimated probabilities.

However, the sampling operation of the probability estimator is non-differentiable, precluding direct optimization via gradient descent. We therefore update it indirectly with a reward signal derived from downstream performance on validation data. Serving as an intermediary, the task predictor f_{θ}^k , which adopts the NGCF backbone, estimates this reward and forwards it to the probability estimator. The task predictor is first optimized on the subset of interactions selected by \mathbf{S}^k , minimizing the following objective:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\theta}^k = \mathcal{L}_{\text{BPR}, \theta}^k + \mathcal{L}_{\text{struc}}^k, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{BPR}, \theta}^k$ refers to the BPR loss with respect to θ , as defined in Equation (1). In addition, to make the reward more discriminative, we incorporate

the structure loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{struc}}^k$, which is formulated as a contrastive objective following the InfoNCE (Oord et al., 2018) to encourage structurally informed representations. Specifically, let $\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(0)}(i)$ be the initial embedding of the i -th user and $\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(\ell)}(i)$ the embedding obtained from an even-numbered GNN layer $\ell \in \mathcal{E}$. For every user i in the current mini-batch \mathcal{B} we treat $(\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(0)}(i), \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(\ell)}(i))$ as a positive pair, while $(\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(0)}(i), \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(\ell)}(j))$ with $j \neq i$ forms a negative pair. The resulting structure loss is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{struc}}^k = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} \log \frac{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(\langle \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(0)}(i), \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(\ell)}(i) \rangle / \tau)}{\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{E}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{B}} \exp(\langle \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(0)}(i), \mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^{(\ell)}(j) \rangle / \tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where τ is a temperature and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product. This contrastive loss pulls together a user’s embeddings across layers while pushing apart those of different users within the batch \mathcal{B} . Without structure loss, the task predictor trained solely with the BPR loss is prone to overfitting sparse and biased interactions, which inflates reward noise and destabilizes the sampling policy. Structure loss regularizes the predictor by aligning each user’s embeddings across GNN layers while pushing apart those of unrelated users, thereby injecting higher-order structural cues that the BPR loss alone cannot capture. This sharpening effect renders the reward more discriminative, so interactions that align with the client’s underlying graph structure consistently receive larger rewards, whereas structurally irrelevant or noisy interactions are down-weighted.

3.4.3. Training of probability estimator

After training the task predictor, the performance of the client k ’s predictive model f_{θ}^k on the local data D_{local}^k is employed as a reward \mathcal{R}_h^k to update

the parameters of the probability estimator ϕ through a policy-gradient step $\nabla_{\phi}l(\phi)$, as detailed in the following equation.

$$\nabla_{\phi}l(\phi) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{R}_h^k(f_{\theta}^k(D_{\text{local}}^k)) \times \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \nabla_{\phi} \left\langle \mathbf{S}_b^k \odot \log \mathbf{P}_b^k + (1 - \mathbf{S}_b^k) \odot \log(1 - \mathbf{P}_b^k), \mathbf{1} \right\rangle \right], \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{B} denotes the mini-batch of users, \mathbf{P}_b^k is the selection probability vector for user b , \mathbf{S}_b^k is the corresponding binary interaction mask, and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of ones used to aggregate the element-wise log-likelihoods across items. Intuitively, the reward \mathcal{R}_h^k modulates the magnitude—and hence the direction—of the policy-gradient update. When the task predictor achieves stronger validation performance, \mathcal{R}_h^k becomes larger, amplifying the gradient term and increasing the likelihood that the probability estimator will reinforce the current sampling pattern of global interactions. Conversely, a weaker reward down-weights the update, discouraging policies that fail to improve the client’s local objective. In this way, GDVE progressively concentrates its sampling probability on interaction combinations that demonstrably boost downstream performance on local data. After the training of GDVE is completed, it remains unsynchronized with other GDVEs to preserve the unique properties of each local dataset.

3.5. Training recommendation model

Client k ’s GDVE first filters the global interactions that are expected to be most beneficial for improving the performance of its local model trained on D_{local}^k . To keep the large-scale global data from overwhelming local information, users in global dataset are sampled in mini-batches. The interactions

Algorithm 1 GDVE training on client k

- 1: **Inputs:** global data D_{global} (user set $\mathcal{U}_{\text{global}}$, item set $\mathcal{T}_{\text{global}}$), local data D_{local}^k ; learning rates η and γ ; mini-batch size β
 - 2: **Initialize:** task-predictor parameters θ , probability estimator parameters ϕ
 - 3: Pre-train graph encoder g_φ^k on D_{global} ▷ global structure
 - 4: Pre-train valid predictor f_ψ^k on D_{local}^k ▷ local preference
 - 5: **while** not converged **do**
 - 6: Sample mini-batch $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\text{global}}$ of β users
 - 7: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{batch}} \leftarrow 0$
 - 8: **for each** user $u \in \mathcal{B}$ **do**
 - 9: $(\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^k(u), \mathbf{E}_{\text{item}}^k) \leftarrow g_\varphi^k(u, \mathcal{T}_{\text{global}})$ ▷ user and item embeddings
 - 10: $(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\text{user}}^k(u), \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{item}}^k) \leftarrow f_\psi^k(u, \mathcal{T}_{\text{global}})$
 - 11: $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^k = \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{\text{user}}^k(u) \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\text{item}}^{k\top}$ ▷ validity score
 - 12: $\mathbf{P}_u^k = h_{\phi_2}^k([h_{\phi_1}^k(\mathbf{e}_{\text{user}}^k(u) \parallel \mathbf{E}_{\text{item}}^k)] \parallel \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^k)$
 - 13: $\mathbf{S}_u^k \sim \text{Bern}(\mathbf{P}_u^k)$ ▷ global interaction mask
 - 14: $\mathcal{L}_{\text{batch}} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{batch}} + (\mathcal{L}_{\text{BPR},\theta}^k(u) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{struc}}^k(u))$
 - 15: **end for**
 - 16: Update θ with batch-average loss:
 - 17: $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \frac{\eta}{\beta} \nabla_\theta(\mathcal{L}_{\text{batch}})$
 - 18: Compute reward $r^k = \mathcal{R}_h^k(f_\theta^k(D_{\text{local}}^k))$
 - 19: Policy update for ϕ :
 - 20: $\phi \leftarrow \phi - \gamma r^k \nabla_\phi l(\phi)$
 - 21: **end while**
-

Table 1: Summary of datasets.

Dataset	# of users	# of items	# of edges	Density
ml-100k	943	1,682	99,975	6.303%
Gowalla	29,858	40,981	1,027,370	0.084%
Yelp2018	31,668	38,048	1,561,406	0.013%

retained by GDVE are then used to augment the local dataset, and the local recommendation model is trained on this augmented dataset using both the BPR loss (Equation (1)) and the structure loss defined in Equation (5).

After the local training phase, the parameters of the local models are transmitted to the server and aggregated through a weighted average based on the original size of each local dataset (McMahan et al., 2017). Subsequently, the updated parameters of the global model are dispatched back to the clients. Each client integrates these shared parameters and resumes its local training. This iterative cycle repeats until the global models stabilize and converge.

4. EXPERIMENT

4.1. Experimental Setting

In this work, we conducted experiments using MovieLens-100k (Herlocker et al., 1999), Gowalla (Liu et al., 2013), and Yelp2018 (Wang et al., 2019) dataset benchmarks. Table 1 shows the summary of the datasets used. For data split, only NGCF (Wang et al., 2019) uses a 100% centralized split. All other FL models use 50% as global data, and the remaining 50% is equally distributed between 10 clients.

Two models were selected as baselines for comparison: FedMF (Chai

et al., 2020) and FedPerGNN (Wu et al., 2022). The FedMF serves as a fundamental approach to federated recommender systems. In contrast, FedPerGNN, a more contemporary model that has demonstrated commendable performance, stands as one of the most recent advancements in this field. For hyperparameters, we set temperature τ as 0.1, batch size B as 1024, learning rates η as 0.004 and γ as 0.007. In the architecture of our proposed model, the graph encoder, valid predictor, and task predictor are each configured with three graph convolution layers. These layers are uniformly initialized by an embedding dimensionality of 64. The probability estimator consists of three fully connected layers with an embedding dimension of 50, followed by two layers with sizes [30, 1].

4.2. Experimental Results and Analysis

Overall Performance Comparison. Table 2 presents a comparative analysis of FedGDVE’s performance with other established recommendation models. This study employs three widely recognized performance measures for top-k recommendation: precision, recall, and NDCG. Our analysis is centered on the performance associated with the top 100 recommended items. When considering the global data without any selection, FedPerGNN and FedNGCF exhibit commendable performance across all indicators. This suggests that considering neighbor embeddings enhances performance compared to solely relying on client-specific data. In contrast, FedGDVE, which integrates GDVE with a structural loss component to selectively leverage global data, significantly outperforms baseline models. Specifically, for the MovieLens-100k dataset, FedGDVE achieves a substantial increase of 34.86%

Table 2: Comparative performance analysis on three benchmark datasets. **P**, **R**, and **N** denote precision, recall, and NDCG respectively. In each column, the **boldfaced** score denotes the best result among the FL baselines, and the underlined score represents the second-best result among the FL baselines. We note that our model introduces a federated learning (FL) method, building upon the foundation of NGCF.

Methods	MovieLens-100k			Gowalla			Yelp2018		
	P@100	R@100	N@100	P@100	R@100	N@100	P@100	R@100	N@100
NGCF (Centralized)	0.0864	0.5368	0.3252	0.0187	0.2990	0.1488	0.0152	0.1654	0.0816
FedMF	0.0581	0.3784	0.1787	0.0152	0.2336	0.1235	0.0067	0.1323	0.0498
FedPerGNN	0.0641	0.4609	0.2317	0.0201	0.3257	0.1672	0.0088	0.0874	0.0425
FedNGCF	0.0630	0.4573	0.2266	0.0194	0.3120	0.1583	0.0113	0.1184	0.0585
FedGDVE (-GDVE)	0.0626	0.4596	0.2248	0.0196	0.3172	0.1593	0.0096	0.1027	0.0501
FedGDVE (-SL)	<u>0.0805</u>	<u>0.5040</u>	<u>0.2930</u>	0.0221	<u>0.3296</u>	<u>0.1800</u>	<u>0.0114</u>	0.1205	<u>0.0592</u>
FedGDVE	0.0850	0.5225	0.3115	<u>0.0213</u>	0.3363	0.1819	0.0139	<u>0.1253</u>	0.0631

in precision, 14.25% in recall, and 34% in NDCG compared to FedNGCF, while achieving over 90% of the centralized NGCF’s performance, validating its practicality under privacy constraints. Enhancements are evident with the Gowalla dataset, where FedGDVE achieves improvements of 9.89% in precision, 7.77% in recall, and 14.85% in NDCG. Additionally, the efficacy of FedGDVE is demonstrated on the larger Yelp2018 dataset, which is significantly more extensive, as indicated by a 51.98% increase in density compared to Gowalla. On this dataset, FedGDVE achieves a 23.01% enhancement in precision, a 5.83% increase in recall, and a 7.86% improvement in NDCG metrics. These consistent improvements across datasets of varying sizes and sparsity levels underscore the scalability and robustness of FedGDVE in practical federated environments. However, it is observed that FedGDVE(-GDVE), which excludes the GDVE component and relies

solely on structural loss, exhibits only a marginal impact on performance. This result highlights that contrastive structural learning alone is insufficient for effectively aligning heterogeneous local and global distributions and reinforces the critical role of GDVE in facilitating meaningful global knowledge transfer.

Convergence and Performance Comparison. Figure 4 presents a comparative analysis of convergence behavior and recommendation performance between the baseline models and FedGDVE, evaluated over 30 communication rounds using the same data partitioning as described in the experimental setup. FedGDVE consistently outperforms the baselines, primarily due to its selective data utilization strategy during each training iteration. While FedGDVE without the structural loss component (FedGDVE(-SL)) exhibits faster convergence, the full FedGDVE model achieves superior final performance upon completing the 30 rounds.

Influence of Client Number on Performance Variability. Table 3 presents the performance decrement as the number of clients increases on the MovieLens-100k dataset. This decline can be attributed to the reduced data size for each client and the subsequent increase in data sparsity, which deteriorates the local models’ performance. FedPerGNN mitigates this decline to some extent by leveraging 1-hop neighbor information from other clients. However, it is essential to note that the encryption utilized in FedPerGNN imposes significant computational overhead, particularly as the data volume expands, rendering it impractical for large-scale data scenarios. Finally, FedGDVE, which introduces a data selection model, shows the best performance among the three models. By selecting and inserting data tailored to each client,




Figure 4: Comparison of evaluation scores across 30 communication rounds: (a) Precision@100, (b) Recall@100, and (c) NDCG@100. The training of each model proceeds up to the 30th round, based on predefined criteria.

Table 3: Performance based on the number of clients using the MovieLens-100k dataset. The **boldfaced** score denotes the best result for each number of clients.

Method	Metric	5 Clients	10 Clients	20 Clients	50 Clients
FedNGCF		0.06305	0.06302	0.06246	0.06046
FedPerGNN	P@100	0.06451	0.06407	0.06411	0.06192
FedGDVE		0.08138	0.08499	0.07058	0.07359
FedNGCF		0.46104	0.45734	0.45494	0.44584
FedPerGNN	R@100	0.46348	0.46087	0.45928	0.45136
FedGDVE		0.50263	0.52249	0.46732	0.45981
FedNGCF		0.22735	0.22661	0.22603	0.21486
FedPerGNN	N@100	0.23330	0.23167	0.23182	0.22236
FedGDVE		0.29033	0.31150	0.24841	0.25239

Table 4: Heterogeneity score by partitioning method.

Distribution	Uniform	Dirichlet
Adjusted Mutual Information Score	0.63	0.53

we can achieve more robust training for the shared model. If the number of clients increases, the amount of local data available for learning is reduced, and the performance of FedGDVE starts degrading. However, the results of FedGDVE are still significantly better than those of the most recent baseline, FedPerGNN.

Data Partitioning and Heterogeneity Analysis. A comparative experiment was conducted in both the IID setting, marked by a uniform data distribution among clients, and the non-IID setting, characterized by varying data distributions across clients. To partition the data, we introduce an additional data segmentation technique grounded on node degree. This allows the data




Figure 5: Comparison of partitioned data distributions. The X-axis is node degree; the Y-axis is node count per degree. (a) Uniform: evenly spread degrees. (b) Dirichlet: skewed degrees with long-tail nodes.

to adopt a consistent distribution or display varying distributions.

Table 4 demonstrates the efficacy of the data partitioning based on node degree, evaluated by the adjusted mutual information score. We adopt a uniform distribution for the IID split, whereas a Dirichlet distribution with parameters $\alpha = 5$ and $\beta = 9$ is utilized for the non-IID split. The uniform distribution yields a consistent partition with a score of 0.63. Conversely, partition under the Dirichlet distribution registers a score of 0.53.




Figure 6: Performance comparison on two different data distributions. The X-axis corresponds to an index representing one of the ten clients. The Y-axis represents the recall value measured on the MovieLens-100k dataset.

Figure 5 illustrates the respective shapes of the data distributions after the split. Figure 5 (a) reveals uniformity across all nine data partitions, while Figure 5 (b) depicts considerable variation among them, underscoring the disparity visually. The Dirichlet distribution’s parameters afford control over the extent of heterogeneity in the data split.

Figure 6 presents the outcomes of our federated graph recommender system across ten distinct clients. The Figure 6 (a) illustrates performance under an IID data split, while the Figure 6 (b) shows results under a non-IID setting with heterogeneous data distributions. Although each client was assigned the same amount of data selected through GDVE, variations in local subgraph structures and user-item interactions naturally lead to performance differences among clients. This variability is expected in federated settings, as each client’s model is influenced by its unique data distribution. Notably, our method, FedGDVE, consistently outperforms its variant with-

Table 5: Performance evaluation with different global datasets such as MovieLens-100k, Gowalla, and Yelp2018. The MovieLens-100K is chosen as a dataset for local clients. The *Ratio* represents the ratio of interactions within the global dataset selected by GDVE. Items in local clients are virtually connected to the global dataset based on similarity.

Local dataset	Global dataset								
	MovieLens-100k			Gowalla			Yelp2018		
	R@100	N@100	Ratio	R@100	N@100	Ratio	R@100	N@100	Ratio
MovieLens-100k	0.2611	0.1524	11.96%	0.1869	0.1010	2.75%	0.2387	0.1420	2.21%

out GDVE across all clients, achieving more than 39% improvement in recall, with slightly higher gains observed under the non-IID condition.

5. Discussion

5.1. The challenging cases of varied subgraph structures in global datasets

In previous experiments, the global and local datasets were derived from the same source. However, in real-world scenarios, global datasets may display considerable variability in aspects such as item types, connectivity, and node counts. To assess the performance of FedGDVE amidst such diversity, we conducted additional experiments focused on the diversity between local and global datasets. For clients from the MovieLens-100k dataset, global datasets are chosen from the same source, as well as from completely different sources (e.g., Gowalla and Yelp2018). If the global dataset is the same as the client dataset, we arranged the datasets so that there is no overlap in interactions between the local and global datasets. These experiments involve computing the cosine similarity between local users and unknown global items. If the cosine similarity among them surpasses a predefined threshold of 0.4, a virtual link is established. As illustrated in Table 5, when

local and global datasets are highly correlated, resembling almost identical datasets, FedGDVE selects a significant number of interactions from the global dataset. Conversely, notable differences between the datasets, which reflect a high degree of diversity, result in fewer selected interactions.

Furthermore, although the personal data value estimator effectively selects beneficial global datasets, it does not guarantee consistent state-of-the-art performance when faced with high discrepancies between datasets. This issue could be addressed using strategies such as Data Banzhaf (Wang & Jia, 2023), which leverages the Banzhaf value from game theory for data valuation. Methods that enhance data security and robustness through Differential Privacy (DP) guarantees and sufficient statistics could also be considered (Sim et al., 2024). The Causal Attention Learning (CAL) strategy introduced by Sui et al. (2022) could also be applied. CAL differentiates causal from non-causal features in GNNs using attention mechanisms and causal theory techniques to enhance generalization and interoperability. Future research can potentially aim to develop a data value estimator that is resilient to the varied characteristics of global datasets, thus addressing the current limitations of FedGDVE.

5.2. Complexity analysis

We analyze the time complexity of the FedGDVE algorithm. Let $|E_{\text{global}}|$ denote the number of edges in the global dataset D_{global} , and $|E_{\text{local}}|$ denote the number of edges in the local dataset. Let d_1 refer to the GCN embedding dimension, and d_2 refer to the MLP embedding dimension. The time complexity of the centralized GCN is thus expressed as $\mathcal{O}((|E_{\text{global}}| + |E_{\text{local}}|) \cdot d_1^2)$. Considering the pre-trained components, the graph encoder g_{φ}^k and the valid-

Table 6: Using the Yelp2018 dataset, we compare the computational efficiency and training time of FedGDVE. The Global Ratio indicates the proportion of the global dataset used, and Time/Epoch refers to the time per epoch. Additionally, the Selected Data Ratio denotes the extent to which each local client selects and utilizes the global dataset.

	Global Ratio	Time/Epoch	Selected Data Ratio
FedGDVE	50%	7m 8s	8.81%
	80%	10m 30s	8.92%

ity predictor f_ψ^k , the task predictor f_θ^k , and the probability estimator h_ϕ^k are pivotal in our complexity analysis. The task predictor’s complexity is $\mathcal{O}((S \cdot |E_{\text{global}}| + |E_{\text{local}}|) \cdot d_1^2)$ where S is the selected global data ratio, and the probability estimator, consisting of three MLP layers, has a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(3 \cdot d_2^2)$. Compared to FedNGCF, which has a complexity of $\mathcal{O}((|E_{\text{global}}| + |E_{\text{local}}|) \cdot d_1^2)$, FedGDVE exhibits a complexity of $\mathcal{O}((S \cdot |E_{\text{global}}| + |E_{\text{local}}|) \cdot d_1^2 + d_2^2)$.

Two primary factors influence the time complexity of FedGDVE: S and the size of $|E_{\text{global}}|$. These elements are crucial for determining the algorithm’s efficiency. Smaller values of $|E_{\text{global}}|$ or the presence of non-IID properties may reduce the sample ratio S , thereby enhancing time efficiency. Table 6 presents a direct comparison of average training time across federated averaging rounds, illustrating the impact of variations in the size of D_{global} . Notably, as the size of the global dataset increases while maintaining a consistent data ratio S , the training time tends to increase accordingly.

5.3. Conclusion

This research introduces FedGDVE, a new federated learning framework that enhances recommender systems by selectively integrating global data with private client data, addressing the challenge of limited local dataset size and heterogeneity. Utilizing the Graph Data Value Estimator (GDVE), FedGDVE filters global user-item interactions to align with each client’s data distribution. In experiments, FedGDVE achieves up to 34.86% performance improvement over state-of-the-art federated learning methods. While dynamic data selection may slow convergence, the framework demonstrates robust accuracy and scalability across diverse e-commerce scenarios. Future work will explore subgraph-level federated learning tasks, such as node and link prediction, and investigate server-side client-adaptive data filtering to further optimize learning efficiency and model performance.

References

- Alharbe, N., Rakrouki, M. A., & Aljohani, A. (2023). A collaborative filtering recommendation algorithm based on embedding representation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *215*, 119380.
- Ammad-Ud-Din, M., Ivannikova, E., Khan, S. A., Oyomno, W., Fu, Q., Tan, K. E., & Flanagan, A. (2019). Federated collaborative filtering for privacy-preserving personalized recommendation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09888*, .
- Banabilah, S., Aloqaily, M., Alsayed, E., Malik, N., & Jararweh, Y. (2022). Federated learning review: Fundamentals, enabling technologies, and future applications. *Information Processing & Management*, *59*, 103061.
- Chai, D., Wang, L., Chen, K., & Yang, Q. (2020). Secure federated matrix factorization. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, *36*, 11–20.
- Chen, Y., Sun, X., & Jin, Y. (2019). Communication-efficient federated deep learning with layerwise asynchronous model update and temporally weighted aggregation. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, *31*, 4229–4238.
- Cui, Z., Xu, X., Fei, X., Cai, X., Cao, Y., Zhang, W., & Chen, J. (2020). Personalized recommendation system based on collaborative filtering for iot scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, *13*, 685–695.
- Flanagan, A., Oyomno, W., Grigorievskiy, A., Tan, K. E., Khan, S. A., & Ammad-Ud-Din, M. (2021). Federated multi-view matrix factorization

- for personalized recommendations. In *Proceedings of the Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference* (pp. 324–347).
- Ghorbani, A., Kim, M., & Zou, J. (2020). A distributional framework for data valuation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 3535–3544).
- Ghorbani, A., & Zou, J. (2019). Data shapley: Equitable valuation of data for machine learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 2242–2251).
- Gori, M., Pucci, A., Roma, V., & Siena, I. (2007). Itemrank: A random-walk based scoring algorithm for recommender engines. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 2766–2771). volume 7.
- He, X., Liao, L., Zhang, H., Nie, L., Hu, X., & Chua, T.-S. (2017). Neural collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 173–182).
- Herlocker, J. L., Konstan, J. A., Borchers, A., & Riedl, J. (1999). An algorithmic framework for performing collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (pp. 230–237).
- Jia, R., Dao, D., Wang, B., Hubis, F. A., Hynes, N., Gürel, N. M., Li, B., Zhang, C., Song, D., & Spanos, C. J. (2019). Towards efficient data

- valuation based on the shapley value. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (pp. 1167–1176).
- Jung, H., Kim, C., Han, G., & Park, H. (2025). Harnessing influence function in explaining graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*.
- Jung, H., Kim, S., & Park, H. (2023). Dual policy learning for aggregation optimization in graph neural network-based recommender systems. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference*.
- Jung, H., & Park, H. (2025). Balancing graph embedding smoothness in self-supervised learning via information-theoretic decomposition. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference*.
- Kang, H., Han, G., & Park, H. (2024). Unr-explainer: Counterfactual explanations for unsupervised node representation learning models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Kang, M., & Park, H. (2025). Curriculum guided personalized subgraph federated learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*.
- Karimireddy, S. P., Kale, S., Mohri, M., Reddi, S., Stich, S., & Suresh, A. T. (2020). Scaffold: Stochastic controlled averaging for federated learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 5132–5143).

- Kwon, Y., & Zou, J. (2021). Beta shapley: a unified and noise-reduced data valuation framework for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14049*, .
- Li, A., Liu, X., & Yang, B. (2023). Item attribute-aware graph collaborative filtering. *Expert Systems with Applications*, (p. 122242).
- Lin, Y., Ren, P., Chen, Z., Ren, Z., Yu, D., Ma, J., Rijke, M. d., & Cheng, X. (2020). Meta matrix factorization for federated rating predictions. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (pp. 981–990).
- Liu, X., Liu, Y., Aberer, K., & Miao, C. (2013). Personalized point-of-interest recommendation by mining users’ preference transition. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management* (pp. 733–738).
- Liu, Y., Fang, S., Wang, L., Huan, C., & Wang, R. (2022). Neural graph collaborative filtering for privacy preservation based on federated transfer learning. *The Electronic Library*, 40, 729–742.
- Luo, S., Xiao, Y., & Song, L. (2022). Personalized federated recommendation via joint representation learning, user clustering, and model adaptation. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management* (pp. 4289–4293).
- Lv, Y., Ding, H., Wu, H., Zhao, Y., & Zhang, L. (2023). Fedrds: federated learning on non-iid data via regularization and data sharing. *Applied Sciences*, 13, 12962.

- McMahan, H. B., Moore, E., Ramage, D., Hampson, S., & y Arcas, B. A. (2017). Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (pp. 1273–1282).
- Mitchell, R., Cooper, J., Frank, E., & Holmes, G. (2022). Sampling permutations for shapley value estimation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *23*, 2082–2127.
- Oord, A. v. d., Li, Y., & Vinyals, O. (2018). Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, .
- Park, H., & Neville, J. (2020). Role equivalence attention for label propagation in graph neural networks. In *Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Park, H., & Neville, J. (2023). Generating post-hoc explanations for skip-gram-based node embeddings by identifying important nodes with bridgeness. *Neural Networks*, .
- Park, J., Jung, H., & Park, H. (2025). Cimage: Exploiting the conditional independence in masked graph auto-encoders. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*.
- Peng, L., Wang, N., Dvornek, N., Zhu, X., & Li, X. (2022). Fedni: Federated graph learning with network inpainting for population-based disease prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, *42*, 2032–2043.
- Rendle, S., Freudenthaler, C., Gantner, Z., & Schmidt-Thieme, L. (2012). BPR: bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feed-

- back. *CoRR*, *abs/1205.2618*. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1205.2618>. arXiv:1205.2618.
- Sim, R., Zhang, Y., Hoang, N., Xu, X., Low, B. K. H., & Jaillet, P. (2024). Incentives in private collaborative machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *36*.
- Sui, Y., Wang, X., Wu, J., Lin, M., He, X., & Chua, T.-S. (2022). Causal attention for interpretable and generalizable graph classification. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. ACM.
- Tay, S. S., Xu, X., Foo, C. S., & Low, B. K. H. (2022). Incentivizing collaboration in machine learning via synthetic data rewards. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 9448–9456). volume 36.
- Tsoy, N., & Konstantinov, N. (2023). Strategic data sharing between competitors. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, & S. Levine (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Wahab, O. A., Rjoub, G., Bentahar, J., & Cohen, R. (2022). Federated against the cold: A trust-based federated learning approach to counter the cold start problem in recommendation systems. *Information Sciences*, *601*, 189–206.

- Wang, J. T., & Jia, R. (2023). Data banzhaf: A robust data valuation framework for machine learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* (pp. 6388–6421). PMLR.
- Wang, L., Zhou, H., Bao, Y., Yan, X., Shen, G., & Kong, X. (2024). Horizontal federated recommender system: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, *56*, 240:1–240:42.
- Wang, X., He, X., Wang, M., Feng, F., & Chua, T.-S. (2019). Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (pp. 165–174).
- Wang, Y., Gao, M., Ran, X., Ma, J., & Zhang, L. Y. (2023). An improved matrix factorization with local differential privacy based on piecewise mechanism for recommendation systems. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *216*, 119457.
- Wang, Z., Zhao, H., & Shi, C. (2022). Profiling the design space for graph neural networks based collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (pp. 1109–1119).
- Wu, C., Wu, F., Cao, Y., Huang, Y., & Xie, X. (2021a). Fedgnn: Federated graph neural network for privacy-preserving recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04925*, .
- Wu, C., Wu, F., Lyu, L., Qi, T., Huang, Y., & Xie, X. (2022). A federated

- graph neural network framework for privacy-preserving personalization. *Nature Communications*, 13, 3091.
- Wu, J., Wang, X., Feng, F., He, X., Chen, L., Lian, J., & Xie, X. (2021b). Self-supervised graph learning for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (pp. 726–735).
- Wu, M., Jia, R., Lin, C., Huang, W., & Chang, X. (2023). Variance reduced shapley value estimation for trustworthy data valuation. *Computers & Operations Research*, (p. 106305).
- Yang, J.-H., Chen, C.-M., Wang, C.-J., & Tsai, M.-F. (2018). Hop-rec: high-order proximity for implicit recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (pp. 140–144).
- Yang, L., Tan, B., Zheng, V. W., Chen, K., & Yang, Q. (2020). Federated recommendation systems. *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*, (pp. 225–239).
- Yi, J., Wu, F., Wu, C., Liu, R., Sun, G., & Xie, X. (2021). Efficient-fedrec: Efficient federated learning framework for privacy-preserving news recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Yoon, J., Arik, S., & Pfister, T. (2020). Data valuation using reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 10842–10851).

- Yuan, W., Qu, L., Cui, L., Tong, Y., Zhou, X., & Yin, H. (2023). Hetefedrec: Federated recommender systems with model heterogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12810*, .
- Zhang, J., Shi, X., Zhao, S., & King, I. (2019). Star-gcn: Stacked and reconstructed graph convolutional networks for recommender systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13129*, .
- Zhao, S., Bharati, R., Borcea, C., & Chen, Y. (2020). Privacy-aware federated learning for page recommendation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Big Data* (pp. 1071–1080). IEEE.
- Zhao, Y., Li, M., Lai, L., Suda, N., Civin, D., & Chandra, V. (2018). Federated learning with non-iid data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00582*, .