Structured Dynamics for Multi-Behavior and Sequential Recommendation

Abstract

Sequential And Multi-Behavior Recommendation is advancing through efforts to align performance with evidence quality, resource limits, and transfer across settings. The review develops an evidence-centered account of combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change. Its analysis connects 2 focal papers with 11 independently retrieved publications screened through Crossref or the named publisher. The analysis is organized around behavior graphs, contrastive learning, temporal dynamics, interest decay, and offline evaluation. The analysis declines to treat metrics from unlike protocols as commensurate, the review compares problem definitions, methodological assumptions, and validation boundaries. Across the literature, a robust inference is that advances in sequential and multi-behavior recommendation become credible when representation, objective, and evaluation protocol are evaluated together and when uncertainty about distribution shift is reported explicitly. The synthesis ties method selection to use-case risk and reveals common limits on generalization, and proposes a research agenda centered on auditable baselines, controlled perturbations, and replicable records.

Keywords

Sequential And Multi-Behavior Recommendation; Behavior Graphs; Contrastive Learning; Temporal Dynamics; Interest Decay; Offline Evaluation

1. Introduction

Studies of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation must negotiate scientific ambition and practical constraint. The objective includes not only stronger nominal performance but also explanations that explain both success and failure. The problem can be seen in combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change. A conclusion supported by one experimental medium, dataset, cohort, geography, or system load can lose force under a different data-generating process. For this reason, analysis must preserve the unit of analysis and the decision context. The analysis also distinguishes a mechanism from a correlation, a benchmark advantage from a deployment advantage, and an interpretable diagnostic from a causal explanation.

Five questions structure the synthesis: behavior graphs, contrastive learning, temporal dynamics, interest decay, offline evaluation. This set is useful because they jointly cover what is designed, how it is measured, and what must remain stable for the conclusion to transfer. Its governing principle is representation, objective, and evaluation protocol. Under that principle, new architecture does not by itself establish utility; the comparison also audits the baseline, uncertainty treatment, and resource or hazard boundary. The present article offers conceptual synthesis and reports neither a new empirical study nor invented measurements or metrics.

2. Methodological Foundations

The analytical chain starts from the input evidence, the transformation applied to it, the output used for evaluation, and the decision that follows. In sequential and multi-behavior recommendation, research often disconnects these components even though errors propagate across them. An expressive model can magnify noise or bias already present in its evidence; an apparently accurate output can still be poorly calibrated for the final decision. It follows that, ablation evidence should accompany aggregate performance. Sound comparative work specifies what the protocol fixes and what it lets move, then selects metrics that correspond to the intended use rather than to convenience alone.

The next requirement is control of scope. Behavior graphs defines the local design problem, while offline evaluation determines whether the design can survive outside that boundary. The middle of the chain includes contrastive learning and temporal dynamics connect those ends by exposing trade-offs that a single score conceals. Under this view, negative evidence and controlled perturbations locate the useful boundary of an explanation. For applied work, documentation of deployment constraints is therefore part of the scientific result, not an administrative afterthought.

3. Architecture and Learning Objectives

The target study ASA-02, Hypergraph-Enhanced Contrastively Regularized Transformer for Multi-Behavior E-commerce Product Recommendation [1], addresses a concrete part of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation through hypergraph modeling with contrastive regularization for multi-behavior product recommendation. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change, the paper is read as a case whose boundary must be retained: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis preserves that scope and tests its assumptions against neighboring work.

The target study ASA-04, Hamiltonian Spectral-Temporal Dissipative Dynamics for Sequential Recommendation [2], addresses a concrete part of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation through dissipative Hamiltonian spectral-temporal dynamics for sequential recommendation. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change, the paper is read as a case whose boundary must be retained: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis preserves that scope and tests its assumptions against neighboring work.

Across the focal studies, behavior graphs should be interpreted jointly with contrastive learning. A design can improve one yet redistribute uncertainty rather than remove it. A structured comparison takes the form of a matrix whose rows are operating conditions and whose columns are evidence quality, computation or process cost, robustness, and consequence of failure. That arrangement prevents an attractive mechanism from being detached from the circumstances that support it. It makes explicit which ablations are informative: an ablation should challenge a mechanistic claim, not simply produce a score.

Temporal dynamics translates method behavior into decision evidence. At the least, assessment should distinguish nominal behavior from stress response and show dispersion alongside averages, and test plausible alternative explanations. Where distribution shift is central, calibration or sensitivity is as important as ranking. Where costs or hazards are asymmetric, utility-weighted assessment is more revealing than undifferentiated accuracy. Such choices do not force uniformity; they make the reasons for their differences auditable.

4. Comparative Evaluation

A first comparison set connects Position-Awareness and Hypergraph Contrastive Learning for Multi-Behavior Sequence Recommendation [3]; HyperCLR: A Personalized Sequential Recommendation Algorithm Based on Hypergraph and Contrastive Learning [4]; Hypergraph-enhanced multi-interest learning for multi-behavior sequential recommendation [5]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation. Together they illuminate behavior graphs: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

The neighboring evidence base brings together A multi-intent based multi-policy relay contrastive learning for sequential recommendation [6]; MVC-HGAT: multi-view contrastive hypergraph attention network for session-based recommendation [7]; Multi-behavior collaborative contrastive learning for sequential recommendation [8]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation. Together they illuminate contrastive learning: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

A complementary strand is visible in Multi-view hypergraph contrastive learning for bundle recommendation [9]; CDHMb: Dynamic hypergraph learning with hierarchical contrastive learning for multi-behavior recommendat... [10]; Multi-Behavior Hypergraph Contrastive Learning for Session-Based Recommendation [11]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation. Together they illuminate temporal dynamics: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

For triangulation, the literature includes Multi-View Curriculum Contrastive Learning via Energy-Constrained Graph Diffusion and Hypergraph Transfo... [12]; Contrastive Hypergraph Flows With Multifaceted Gates for Cross-Domain Sequential Recommendation [13]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of sequential and multi-behavior recommendation. Together they illuminate interest decay: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

5. Deployment and Governance

Deployment decisions benefit from a sequence of checks. First, define the decision and its failure cost. Second, specify the evidence and operating envelope. Third, choose a method whose inductive assumptions match that evidence. Fourth, test interest decay and offline evaluation under controlled perturbations. Finally, retain provenance so that an unexpected outcome can be traced to data, configuration, material batch, environmental condition, or user interaction. The workflow connects combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change connected to observable requirements.

More generally, responsible progress in sequential and multi-behavior recommendation is constrained by the handoffs between components. Interfaces determine how uncertainty moves between measurement and inference, between algorithm and operator, or between microscopic design and system behavior. Joint work benefits from advance specification of acceptance criteria and falsifying evidence. When those agreements are explicit, optimization need not trade away validity, safety, or intelligibility without notice.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

Interpretation is bounded by heterogeneity in terminology, study design, and reporting granularity. Metadata confirmation secures the citation trail but does not reproduce measurements or results. Publication status can change after metadata collection. Focal strings verified through Scholar were kept verbatim; uncertain fields were flagged in a parallel record.

The next generation of work should preregister comparison protocols where feasible, publish machine-readable settings and test transfer under a substantively important shift in deployment constraints. Research should also group adverse cases by process and consequence. For sequential and multi-behavior recommendation, a valuable shared benchmark would combine baseline effectiveness, resource consumption, calibration, and disturbance response. Such a benchmark would reward designs that remain useful when evidence is incomplete or conditions change.

7. Conclusion

Research across sequential and multi-behavior recommendation becomes clearer when treated as a linked evidence chain rather than a collection of isolated scores. The focal studies show how combining relational supervision with dynamical models of stable preference, momentum, and abrupt change; the additional literature reveals the assumptions required to interpret those contributions. Across behavior graphs, contrastive learning, temporal dynamics, interest decay, and offline evaluation, credibility ultimately depends on alignment: the representation or mechanism must match the problem, the metric must serve the decision while deployment remains inside the tested boundary. Progress built on that alignment is easier to reproduce, safer to transfer, and more informative when it fails.

References

1. Liao, S., & Mok, P. Y. (2024). Hypergraph-Enhanced Contrastively Regularized Transformer for Multi-Behavior E-commerce Product Recommendation. 2024 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM), 767-772.

2. Liao, S., & Mok, P. Y. (2026). Hamiltonian Spectral-Temporal Dissipative Dynamics for Sequential Recommendation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.25755.

3. Yan, S., Zhao, C., Shen, N., & Jiang, S. (2024). Position-Awareness and Hypergraph Contrastive Learning for Multi-Behavior Sequence Recommendation. IEEE Access, 12, 185958-185970. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3513982

4. Zhang, R., Wang, H., & He, J. (2024). HyperCLR: A Personalized Sequential Recommendation Algorithm Based on Hypergraph and Contrastive Learning. Mathematics, 12(18), 2887. https://doi.org/10.3390/math12182887

5. Li, Q., Ma, H., Jin, W., Ji, Y., & Li, Z. (2024). Hypergraph-enhanced multi-interest learning for multi-behavior sequential recommendation. Expert Systems with Applications, 255, 124497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124497

6. Di, W. (2022). A multi-intent based multi-policy relay contrastive learning for sequential recommendation. PeerJ Computer Science, 8, e1088. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.1088

7. Yang, F., & Peng, D. (2024). MVC-HGAT: multi-view contrastive hypergraph attention network for session-based recommendation. Applied Intelligence, 55(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-024-05877-1

8. Chen, Y., Cao, Q., Huang, X., & Zou, S. (2024). Multi-behavior collaborative contrastive learning for sequential recommendation. Complex & Intelligent Systems, 10(4), 5033-5048. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40747-024-01423-1

9. Lv, G., Zhao, C., Chen, M., Shen, N., & Yan, S. (2025). Multi-view hypergraph contrastive learning for bundle recommendation. The Journal of Supercomputing, 81(15). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-025-07835-1

10. Alsaffar, M., Amer, H. B., Younes, O. S., Alsayfi, M. S., Aljuaidi, R., Solaiman, S., et al. (2026). CDHMb: Dynamic hypergraph learning with hierarchical contrastive learning for multi-behavior recommendation. Egyptian Informatics Journal, 34, 100970. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eij.2026.100970

11. Guo, L., Zhou, S., Tang, H., Zheng, X., & Luo, Y. (2025). Multi-Behavior Hypergraph Contrastive Learning for Session-Based Recommendation. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, 37(3), 1325-1338. https://doi.org/10.1109/tkde.2024.3523383

12. Sun, P., Ye, C., & Wang, Z. (2025). Multi-View Curriculum Contrastive Learning via Energy-Constrained Graph Diffusion and Hypergraph Transformer for Session Recommendation. IEEE Access, 13, 197001-197015. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2025.3631918

13. Su, J., Zheng, X., Lin, Z., Liu, W., Chen, C., & Yin, J. (2025). Contrastive Hypergraph Flows With Multifaceted Gates for Cross-Domain Sequential Recommendation. IEEE Transactions on Services Computing, 18(6), 3595-3608. https://doi.org/10.1109/tsc.2025.3620425