



浙江大學
ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY



中國科學技術大學
University of Science and Technology of China

The Pitfall of Scaling Up: Uncovering and Mitigating **Popularity Bias Amplification** in Scaling Transformer- based Recommenders


Weiqin Yang^{†1}, Yue Pan^{†1}, Chongming Gao², Sheng Zhou¹,
Xiang Wang², Can Wang¹, **Jiawei Chen^{*1}**

¹ Zhejiang University

² University of Science and Technology of China

Speaker: Chongming Gao
August 11, 2026 | Jeju, Korea

Scaling Laws in LLMs



GPT-2 (2019)
1.5B





GPT-3 (2020)
175B



GPT-4 (2023)
~1760B

Scaling Laws in Recommendation




Sequential recommenders are rapidly **scaling up**, delivering substantial performance gains! But... *is scaling really a free lunch?*


The Pitfall of Scaling Up

—●— NDCG@5 (SASRec++)

■ Fair-0.95 (SASRec++)



(1) Parameter Scaling




(2) Layer Scaling

Fair-0.95 denotes the ratio of bottom-95% long-tail items exposed in top-1 recommendations. SASRec++ follows advanced Llama architecture to facilitate scaling.


The Pitfall of Scaling Up

—●— NDCG@5 (SASRec++)

Fair-0.95 (SASRec++)



(1) Parameter Scaling




(2) Layer Scaling


Observation: The Pitfall of Scaling Up

When scaling model size, particularly by **increasing model depth**, **popularity bias is simultaneously amplified** and can become a **bottleneck to further scaling**.

Popularity Memorization



(a) The principal singular vector q_1 captures item popularity r




(b) Dimension reduction augments the relative prominence of the principal singular vector q_1

Popularity Memorization

Popularity r is captured in **principal singular vector** q_1 of user-item interaction matrix $\hat{Y}$, thus the **spectral norm** $\|\hat{Y}\|_2$, a.k.a. the maximum singular value $\sigma_1(\hat{Y})$, **dictates the magnitude of popularity bias**.

Lemma 3.1. (*Popularity Memorization*, Theorem 1 in [40]). If the item popularity r is sufficiently long-tailed (i.e., following a power-law distribution), the principal singular vector q_1 of the predicted score matrix $\hat{Y}$ is highly correlated with the item popularity r , i.e., $\cos(q_1, r) \approx 1$.

Spectral Collapse



Spectral Collapse in Deep Transformers

Deeper sequential recommenders inherently exacerbate **spectral collapse** (i.e., the **largest singular value dominates the spectrum**), forcing the **popularity** direction to **dominate** the representations.

Spectral Collapse

Why Do Deep Transformers Collapse?

We can decompose a simplified transformer into two components: [Attention Aggregation](#) and [Feed-Forward Projection](#). Surprisingly, we uncover that **these two components synergistically drive the spectral collapse!**

$$\mathbf{X}^{(L)} = \underbrace{\mathbf{S}^{(L)} \mathbf{S}^{(L-1)} \dots \mathbf{S}^{(1)}}_{\text{attention aggregation}} \mathbf{X}^{(0)} \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \mathbf{W}^{(2)} \dots \mathbf{W}^{(L)}}_{\text{feed-forward weights}}$$

Collapse! Collapse!

Collapse!


$\mathbf{X}^{(\ell)}$: ℓ -th layer hidden representation

$\mathbf{S}^{(\ell)}$: ℓ -th layer (block-diagonal) attention matrix

$\mathbf{W}^{(\ell)}$: ℓ -th layer feed-forward weight

Popularity-Prioritized Attention Aggregation

■ Top-20% Popular Items ■ Bottom-80% Long-tail Items



(1) ML-1M

(2) Beauty

Spectral Collapse in Attention

Popular items **dominate the attention scores**, leading to **exponential growth of spectral norm**.

Theorem 3.2. (*Spectral Collapse in Attention Aggregation*). Suppose that the attention score matrices $\mathbf{S}^{(\ell)}$ share similar singular vectors across layers up to an ϵ -perturbation, i.e., $\mathbf{S}^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{U}\Sigma^{(\ell)}\mathbf{V}^\top + \Delta^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$, where $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ are orthogonal matrices sharing the same principal singular vector¹ (i.e., $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1$), $\Sigma^{(\ell)} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{(\ell)}, \sigma_2^{(\ell)}, \dots)$ is the diagonal matrix of singular values satisfying $\sigma_1^{(\ell)} > \max\{1, \sigma_2^{(\ell)} + \delta\}$ and $\sigma_2^{(\ell)} \geq \eta$ for some constants $\delta, \eta > 0$, and $\Delta^{(\ell)}$ is a perturbation matrix bounded by $\|\Delta^{(\ell)}\|_2 \leq \epsilon \ll 1/\sqrt{L^2 \max_\ell \sigma_1^{(\ell)}}$. Then, the spectral norm of the stacked attention matrices is lower-bounded by:

$$\left\| \mathbf{S}^{(L)} \mathbf{S}^{(L-1)} \dots \mathbf{S}^{(1)} \right\|_2 \geq \prod_{\ell=1}^L \left(\sigma_1^{(\ell)} - \epsilon - O \left(\frac{\epsilon^2 \ell^2 \sigma_1^{(\ell)}}{\min\{\delta, \eta\}^2} \right) \right). \quad (3.2)$$

For a sufficiently small ϵ , the spectral norm of the attention aggregation grows exponentially with the network depth L .

Low-Rank Feed-forward Projection

Spectral Collapse in FFN

The derivative of singular value $|\mathrm{d}\sigma_k(t)/\mathrm{d}t|$ is positively correlated with the layer depth L and singular value $\sigma_k(t)$. Therefore, as layer depth L increases, the spectral norm $\sigma_1(t)$ grows faster and faster compared to other $\sigma_{k \geq 2}(t)$, leading to extreme low-rank.


Lemma 3.3. (*Spectral Collapse in Feed-forward Projection*, Theorem 3 in [2]). Denote the trajectory of the feed-forward weight product as $\mathbf{W}(t) = \mathbf{W}^{(1)}(t)\mathbf{W}^{(2)}(t) \cdots \mathbf{W}^{(L)}(t)$ during gradient descent training with an infinitesimally small learning rate. With a balanced initialization [1, 2], we have the following dynamics for the singular values $\sigma_k(t)$ of $\mathbf{W}(t)$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\sigma_k(t) = -L \cdot (\sigma_k^2(t))^{1-1/L} \cdot \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}(t)), \mathbf{u}_k(t)\mathbf{v}_k^\top(t) \rangle, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_k(t)$ and $\mathbf{v}_k(t)$ are the left and right singular vectors corresponding to $\sigma_k(t)$, and $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ can be any analytic loss.

Scalable **P**opularity **R**egularization **I**N **T**ransformers

Root Causes



Motivation of SPRINT

Constraint the **spectral norms** of the two components, i.e., (i) **attention aggregation** $\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_2$ and (ii) **feed-forward projection** $\|\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}\|_2$, **layer by layer**.

Scalable Popularity Regularization IN Transformers

Motivation of SPRINT

Constraint the spectral norms of the two components, i.e., (i) attention aggregation $\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_2$ and (ii) feed-forward projection $\|\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}\|_2$, layer by layer.

SPRINT Objective

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SPRINT}} = \underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{\text{rec}}}_{\text{rec loss}} + \underbrace{\lambda_{\text{attn}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log \|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_2}_{\text{attention regularization}} + \underbrace{\lambda_{\text{ffn}} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log \|\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}\|_2}_{\text{feed-forward regularization}}$$

layer-wise
upper bounding

$$\|\mathbf{s}^{(L)} \mathbf{s}^{(L-1)} \dots \mathbf{s}^{(1)}\|_2 \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^L \|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_2$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}^{(1)} \mathbf{w}^{(2)} \dots \mathbf{w}^{(L)}\|_2 \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^L \|\mathbf{w}^{(\ell)}\|_2$$

Spectral Norm Optimization

Attention Regularization

$$\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_\infty} = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_1}$$

hard to compute!

max column-sum

$$\|\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}\|_1 \leq \|\widetilde{\mathbf{s}^{(\ell)}}\|_1 \triangleq \frac{1}{\tau} \log \sum_{u,t} \exp(\tau \cdot \|\mathbf{s}_{u,t}^{(\ell)}\|_1)$$

non-smooth!

smoothing: max $\rightarrow$ logsumexp

Feed-Forward Regularization

$$\mathbf{v} \leftarrow \frac{\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}}{\|\mathbf{W}^\top \mathbf{u}\|_2} \quad \mathbf{u} \leftarrow \frac{\mathbf{W} \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{W} \mathbf{v}\|_2}$$

$$\|\mathbf{W}\|_2 \approx \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{v}$$

use power iteration method to efficiently estimate $\|\mathbf{W}\|_2$ for static weights $\mathbf{W}$

Theorem 4.1. (*Theoretical Guarantee of SPRINT*). With proper hyperparameters λ_{attn} and λ_{ffn} , the SPRINT regularization terms establish a rigorous upper bound on the spectral norm $\|\hat{\mathbf{Y}}\|_2$ of the final model predictions.

Benchmark Performance

Table 1: Overall performance comparison on SASRec++ and HSTU. The columns "N@K", "H@K", and "Fair" denote the NDCG@K, HitRatio@K, and Fair-0.8 metrics, respectively. The best results are highlighted in bold, and the strongest baselines are underlined. "Imp.%" indicates the relative improvement of SPRINT over the best baseline (cf. Table 6 for @10 results).

Methods	ML-1M			Beauty			Toy			Electronic			Clothing			Book		
	N@5	H@5	Fair	N@5	H@5	Fair	N@5	H@5	Fair	N@5	H@5	Fair	N@5	H@5	Fair	N@5	H@5	Fair
SASRec++	.0807	.1291	.2227	.0248	.0406	.2694	.0314	<u>.0539</u>	.3741	.0113	.0170	.0029	.0018	.0033	.3806	.0229	.0443	.4128
+DROS	.0830	.1320	.2172	.0251	.0410	.2592	.0282	.0482	.3478	.0114	.0175	.0035	.0020	.0038	<u>.4157</u>	.0228	.0439	.4154
+MOJITO	.0812	.1272	.2188	<u>.0294</u>	.0429	<u>.3202</u>	<u>.0363</u>	.0534	.3803	.0120	.0194	.0002	.0025	.0036	.3717	.0276	.0393	.2375
+TPAB	.0799	.1269	.1921	.0220	.0346	.2291	.0237	.0363	.3011	.0053	.0086	.0004	.0004	.0006	.3631	.0252	.0378	.2156
+R ² Rec	.0771	.1267	.1997	.0252	.0426	.3108	.0294	.0476	<u>.3878</u>	<u>.0133</u>	<u>.0203</u>	.0043	.0019	.0034	.3500	.0264	<u>.0471</u>	.3028
+D ² LR	<u>.0829</u>	.1277	<u>.2317</u>	.0246	.0432	.3152	.0288	.0489	.3543	.0112	.0169	.0031	.0017	.0030	.2994	.0245	.0467	<u>.4208</u>
+LogDet	.0849	<u>.1333</u>	.1792	.0272	.0431	.1071	.0322	.0507	.2833	.0122	.0190	.0006	.0025	.0040	.1528	.0249	.0403	.1832
+ReSN	.0739	.1253	.1223	.0281	<u>.0452</u>	.1016	.0343	.0520	.1515	.0126	.0193	<u>.0175</u>	<u>.0032</u>	<u>.0048</u>	.0850	<u>.0278</u>	.0379	.3572
+SPRINT	.0925	.1405	.2534	.0355	.0505	.4127	.0421	.0584	.4836	.0161	.0231	.1618	.0036	.0055	.4454	.0347	.0491	.4953
Imp.%	8.97%	5.35%	2.17%	21.09%	11.83%	9.25%	15.81%	8.25%	9.58%	20.52%	14.08%	14.43%	13.90%	15.05%	2.97%	24.67%	4.37%	7.45%
HSTU	.0784	.1250	.1902	.0267	.0417	.3369	.0310	.0473	.4215	.0159	.0248	.0014	.0022	.0035	.4179	.0269	.0393	.1815
+DROS	.0802	.1267	.1934	.0272	.0437	<u>.3861</u>	<u>.0320</u>	.0473	<u>.4951</u>	.0160	.0248	.0009	.0023	.0039	<u>.4582</u>	.0276	.0398	.1739
+MOJITO	.0799	.1299	.2035	.0277	.0422	.3174	.0318	.0441	.3753	.0168	.0264	.0001	.0026	.0039	.3856	.0282	.0412	.1768
+TPAB	.0751	.1219	.2240	<u>.0286</u>	<u>.0443</u>	.3781	.0299	.0448	.4133	.0114	.0188	.0001	.0010	.0015	.3834	.0290	.0429	.1383
+R ² Rec	.0705	.1180	.2128	.0255	.0423	.3269	.0312	.0475	.4429	.0169	.0263	.0021	.0024	.0038	.3430	.0272	.0417	.1679
+D ² LR	.0798	.1279	<u>.2305</u>	.0265	.0428	.3824	.0314	<u>.0497</u>	.4589	.0164	.0267	.0084	.0023	.0039	.4508	<u>.0294</u>	.0426	<u>.2490</u>
+LogDet	<u>.0828</u>	<u>.1306</u>	.1574	.0282	.0430	.3110	.0319	.0496	.4425	.0177	<u>.0273</u>	<u>.0116</u>	<u>.0028</u>	.0041	.3155	<u>.0294</u>	<u>.0435</u>	.1029
+ReSN	.0740	.1223	.1520	.0256	.0418	.1398	.0289	.0439	.2350	<u>.0186</u>	.0257	.0000	.0027	<u>.0043</u>	.1042	.0229	.0295	.0752
+SPRINT	.0871	.1357	.2503	.0362	.0514	.4449	.0438	.0589	.5173	.0204	.0297	.2150	.0036	.0055	.4744	.0346	.0481	.3237
Imp.%	5.14%	3.90%	1.99%	26.79%	16.07%	5.89%	36.98%	18.45%	2.22%	9.72%	8.75%	20.34%	30.41%	28.31%	1.62%	17.75%	10.55%	7.47%

avg. +15.70% in NDCG@K and HR@K

avg. +7.12% in long-tail exposure fairness

Breaking the Accuracy-Fairness Pareto Frontier





Figure 5: Pareto frontier of accuracy and fairness for SPRINT and representative baselines on the SASRec++ backbone.

Scaling Performance (ML-20M)



Fair-0.95 denotes the ratio of bottom-95% long-tail items exposed in top-1 recommendations. SASRec++ follows advanced Llama architecture to facilitate scaling.

Scaling Performance (Amazon)




Figure 4: Layer scaling results of SPRINT and representative baselines on the SASRec++ backbone, where the number of layers is varied from 2 to 8, and the accuracy and fairness metrics are reported. Refer to Figure 8 for results on other datasets.

Generalization to GR




Table 2: SPRINT in generative recommendation.

Backbones	Beauty			Toy		
	NDCG@5	HR@5	Fair	NDCG@5	HR@5	Fair
TIGER	0.0306	0.0450	0.1081	0.0318	0.0487	0.2055
+SPRINT	0.0343	0.0503	0.1609	0.0328	0.0504	0.2597
LETTER	0.0301	0.0450	0.0596	0.0330	0.0473	0.2162
+SPRINT	0.0324	0.0482	0.1216	0.0341	0.0493	0.2671

Conclusion & Future Work

Conclusion


- **Critical Pitfall in Scaling:** Scaling deep transformer-based sequential recommenders intrinsically *amplifies popularity bias*.
- **Root Causes:** Both *attention* and *feed-forward* layers synergistically drive *spectral collapse* as model deepens, leads to *popularity-dominant* representations.
- **SPRINT:** A highly efficient layer-wise regularization objective that achieves *superior accuracy-fairness scaling*.

Future Work


- Integrating SPRINT with SOTA *efficient attention mechanisms* (e.g., FlashAttention).
- Investigating *bias amplification across other scaling axes* (e.g., training data volume, embedding dimensionality, etc).

Thank You!


Contact us!



Wei Qin Yang
(1st auth.'s page)



Jiawei Chen
(corr. auth.'s page)



Chongming Gao
(Speaker's page)



Tiny Snow
江西 上饶



扫一扫上面的二维码图案，加我为朋友。