



SIGIR2026
MELBOURNE | NAARM
AUSTRALIA



浙江大学
ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY



香港中文大學(深圳)
The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen



BEAR: Towards *Beam-Search-Aware* Optimization for Recommendation with Large Language Models

Weiqin Yang¹, Bohao Wang¹, Zhenxiang Xu¹, **Jiawei Chen**^{*1},
Shengjia Zhang¹, Jingbang Chen², Canghong Jin³, Can Wang¹

¹ Zhejiang University

² CUHK, Shenzhen

³ Hangzhou City University

Speaker: *Weiqin Yang*


July 23, 2026 | Melbourne, Australia

LLM-based Recommendation



Instruction Template	
Instruction:	Given a list of movies the user has watched before, please recommend a new movie that the user likes to the user.
Input:	The user has watched the following movies before: Good Will Hunting , The Man Who Knew Infinity , ... , K-On! , Sound! Euphonium .
Output:	Bocchi the Rock! .





Beam Search




Beam Search



Beam Search




Training-Inference Inconsistency



(a) Beam search example with SFT-trained LLMs.

Training-Inference Inconsistency



Empirical analysis:

Among all the target items that possess *high overall probabilities*, an overwhelming majority (over 80%) are *prematurely pruned during beam search*.


Figure 4: An overwhelming majority of positive items with high overall probabilities (i.e., top- K ranked among candidates) are pruned during beam search, where failure to meet the necessary condition (3.2) is the primary cause (marked as red rectangles). Here, we set beam width $B = 10$ and number of recommended items $K \in \{5, 10\}$. "Prop" denotes the proportion of pruning cases attributable to necessary condition violations (red), consistently accounting for over 70% of all pruning cases (red and gray) across all settings.

Sufficient Solution


Beam Search Step 1



Beam Search Step 2



Beam Search Step 3



Prefix Probability

target $P_{\theta}(y_{<t}|x)$

#B-ranked candidate $P_{\theta}(b_{<t}^B|x)$

Sufficient Condition: each *prefix* of the target item should always stay within the top-*B* candidates at every decoding step

Objective:

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_{t=1}^{|y|+1} \mathbb{I} (P_{\theta}(y_{<t}|x) \geq P_{\theta}(b_{<t}^B|x))$$

x : prompt


y : target item (ground truth)

P_{θ} : sequence/token probability

$b_{<t}^B$: #B-ranked candidate prefix during beam search at t -th decoding time

Computational Inefficiency:
requires simulating beam search during training!

Necessary Condition



Necessary Condition:

each **token** of the target item should always stay within the top- B tokens at every decoding step

Objective:

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} \mathbb{I} \left(P_{\theta}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \geq \beta_t^B \right)$$

x : prompt

y : target item (ground truth)

P_{θ} : sequence/token probability

β_t^B : prob of #B-ranked candidate token with target prefix

Computational Efficiency:

requires no additional forward passes!

Necessary Condition




Figure 4: An overwhelming majority of positive items with high overall probabilities (i.e., top- K ranked among candidates) are pruned during beam search, where failure to meet the necessary condition (3.2) is the primary cause (marked as red rectangles). Here, we set beam width $B = 10$ and number of recommended items $K \in \{5, 10\}$. "Prop" denotes the proportion of pruning cases attributable to necessary condition violations (red), consistently accounting for over 70% of all pruning cases (red and gray) across all settings.

Empirical analysis:

Violating this necessary condition is actually the root cause for *over 70% of all premature pruning cases*.

Simple but effective & efficient solution:

Ensure that the *necessary conditions* are met!

BEam-Search-Aware Regularization

Necessary Condition: each *token* of the target item should always stay within the top- B tokens at every decoding step

Objective:

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} \mathbb{I} (P_{\theta}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \geq \beta_t^B)$$

Risk of Violating the Necessary Condition:

$$\mathcal{R}_t(x, y; \theta) = \log \mathbb{I} (\log \beta_t^B - \log P_{\theta}(y_t|y_{<t}, x) \geq 0)$$

- x : prompt
- y : target item (ground truth)
- P_{θ} : sequence/token probability
- β_t^B : prob of #B-ranked candidate token with target prefix

BEam-Search-Aware Regularization

Necessary Condition: each *token* of the target item should always stay within the top- B tokens at every decoding step

Objective:

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} \mathbb{I} (P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x) \geq \beta_t^B)$$

Risk of Violating the Necessary Condition:

$$\mathcal{R}_t(x, y; \theta) = \log \mathbb{I} (\log \beta_t^B - \log P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x) \geq 0)$$

Smoothed Risk (BEAR):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(x, y; \theta) = \sum_{t=1}^{|y|} \log \sigma_{\xi} (\log \beta_t^B - \log P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x))$$

x : prompt

y : target item (ground truth)

P_{θ} : sequence/token probability

β_t^B : prob of #B-ranked candidate token with target prefix

smoothing $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ to sigmoid

$\sigma(\cdot)$ in $\sum_{t=1}^{|y|} \mathcal{R}_t(x, y; \theta)$

BEam-Search-Aware Regularization

Necessary Condition: each *token* of the target item should always stay within the top- B tokens at every decoding step

Objective:

$$\max_{\theta} \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} \mathbb{I} (P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x) \geq \beta_t^B)$$

x : prompt

y : target item (ground truth)

P_{θ} : sequence/token probability

β_t^B : prob of #B-ranked candidate token with target prefix

Risk of Violating the Necessary Condition:

$$\mathcal{R}_t(x, y; \theta) = \log \mathbb{I} (\log \beta_t^B - \log P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x) \geq 0)$$

Smoothed Risk (BEAR):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(x, y; \theta) = \sum_{t=1}^{|y|} \log \sigma_{\xi} (\log \beta_t^B - \log P_{\theta}(y_t | y_{<t}, x))$$

Total Loss:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{BEAR}}(x, y; \theta) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}}(x, y; \theta) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}}(x, y; \theta)$$

incorporating SFT loss to simultaneously **improve the overall probability** and **reduce the risk of incorrect pruning**

Main Experiments

Table 2: Overall performance comparison with various baselines. The LLM-based RS methods are applied ("+") on the BIGRec [3] backbone. $N@K$ and $H@K$ denote $NDCG@K$ and $HitRatio@K$ metrics, respectively. The best results are highlighted in bold, and the best baselines are underlined. "**Imp.%**" indicates the relative improvement of BEAR over the best baseline.

Methods	Office				Book				Toy				Clothing			
	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10
SASRec	0.0127	0.0196	0.0223	0.0447	0.0061	0.0080	0.0100	0.0157	0.0089	0.0109	0.0148	0.0211	0.0022	0.0033	0.0036	0.0072
BERT4Rec	0.0164	0.0206	0.0264	0.0396	0.0100	0.0121	<u>0.0158</u>	0.0223	0.0101	0.0118	0.0137	0.0188	0.0028	0.0034	0.0033	0.0053
DROS	0.0195	0.0240	0.0265	0.0405	0.0072	0.0096	<u>0.0116</u>	0.0192	0.0105	0.0126	0.0148	0.0213	0.0038	0.0046	0.0048	0.0074
LLM-CF	0.0161	0.0200	0.0306	0.0426	0.0077	0.0100	0.0141	0.0212	0.0077	0.0101	0.0148	0.0223	0.0022	0.0034	0.0042	0.0078
DLLM2Rec	0.0166	0.0231	0.0322	0.0530	0.0068	0.0094	0.0112	0.0194	0.0080	0.0110	0.0156	0.0248	0.0028	0.0045	0.0056	0.0106
BIGRec	0.0105	0.0226	0.0213	0.0587	0.0068	0.0101	0.0128	0.0228	0.0122	0.0157	0.0200	0.0307	0.0043	0.0071	0.0086	0.0172
+ D ³	0.0142	0.0237	0.0291	0.0592	0.0057	0.0093	0.0112	0.0221	0.0163	0.0202	0.0257	0.0375	0.0045	0.0072	0.0088	0.0172
+ CFT	0.0183	0.0272	0.0306	0.0582	0.0051	0.0090	0.0107	0.0224	0.0138	0.0173	0.0217	0.0325	0.0045	0.0076	0.0086	0.0182
+ D ² LR	0.0243	0.0311	0.0395	0.0603	0.0070	0.0089	0.0128	0.0183	0.0142	0.0177	0.0227	0.0338	0.0051	0.0081	0.0098	0.0194
+ IGD	0.0187	0.0266	0.0312	0.0566	0.0061	0.0095	0.0125	0.0228	0.0191	0.0239	0.0273	0.0421	0.0059	0.0084	0.0098	0.0178
+ MSL	<u>0.0346</u>	<u>0.0388</u>	<u>0.0504</u>	0.0634	0.0087	0.0117	0.0137	0.0228	<u>0.0239</u>	<u>0.0301</u>	<u>0.0359</u>	<u>0.0551</u>	<u>0.0075</u>	<u>0.0115</u>	0.0136	0.0260
+ S-DPO	0.0209	0.0292	0.0374	0.0629	0.0082	0.0102	0.0125	0.0189	0.0181	0.0227	0.0288	0.0432	0.0054	0.0093	0.0110	0.0232
+ RosePO	0.0266	0.0338	0.0436	<u>0.0660</u>	<u>0.0117</u>	<u>0.0127</u>	0.0153	0.0185	0.0114	0.0174	0.0194	0.0378	0.0066	0.0110	<u>0.0138</u>	<u>0.0272</u>
+ SPRec	0.0249	0.0326	0.0416	0.0655	0.0072	0.0110	0.0130	<u>0.0244</u>	0.0148	0.0175	0.0234	0.0317	0.0047	0.0069	0.0082	0.0152
+ BEAR	0.0365	0.0421	0.0545	0.0717	0.0146	0.0177	0.0203	0.0297	0.0254	0.0316	0.0380	0.0574	0.0082	0.0127	0.0148	0.0290
Imp.%	+5.49%	+8.51%	+8.13%	+8.64%	+24.79%	+39.37%	+28.48%	+21.72%	+6.28%	+4.98%	+5.85%	+4.17%	+9.33%	+10.43%	+7.25%	+6.62%

Bridging Training-Inference Gap




Figure 6: Pruning Rate (PR@ K) comparison between SFT and BEAR. During beam search with beam size B , PR@ K measures the proportion of incorrectly pruned positive items with high overall probabilities (i.e., top- K ranked among candidates). A lower PR@ K indicates better training-inference alignment. Results show that BEAR significantly reduces PR@ K compared to SFT.

Rec Backbones & LLMs

Table 3: Performance comparison using different recommendation backbones, including LLaRA [38] and A-LLMRec [32]. We adopt MSL [64] as the representative SFT method. $N@K$ and $H@K$ denote $NDCG@K$ and $HitRatio@K$ metrics, respectively. The best results are highlighted in bold. "**Imp.%**" indicates the relative improvement of BEAR over the best baseline.

Methods	Office				Book				Toy				Clothing			
	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10
LLaRA	0.0110	0.0234	0.0234	0.0618	0.0068	0.0113	0.0135	0.0267	0.0129	0.0163	0.0204	0.0309	0.0036	0.0071	0.0074	0.0184
+ MSL	0.0380	0.0423	0.0561	0.0696	0.0078	0.0105	0.0132	0.0217	0.0230	0.0290	0.0346	0.0534	0.0082	0.0116	0.0146	0.0254
+ BEAR	0.0407	0.0457	0.0592	0.0748	0.0123	0.0157	0.0212	0.0315	0.0259	0.0315	0.0386	0.0559	0.0089	0.0129	0.0156	0.0284
Imp.%	+7.11%	+8.04%	+5.53%	+7.47%	+57.69%	+38.94%	+57.04%	+17.98%	+12.61%	+8.62%	+11.56%	+4.68%	+8.54%	+11.21%	+6.85%	+11.81%
A-LLMRec	0.0125	0.0247	0.0265	0.0639	0.0077	0.0111	0.0153	0.0256	0.0126	0.0160	0.0198	0.0305	0.0036	0.0068	0.0072	0.0172
+ MSL	0.0332	0.0373	0.0525	0.0655	0.0094	0.0118	0.0151	0.0224	0.0247	0.0302	0.0361	0.0532	0.0081	0.0124	0.0140	0.0276
+ BEAR	0.0392	0.0444	0.0561	0.0722	0.0106	0.0149	0.0189	0.0317	0.0255	0.0312	0.0373	0.0549	0.0087	0.0128	0.0164	0.0288
Imp.%	+18.07%	+19.03%	+6.86%	+10.23%	+12.77%	+26.27%	+23.53%	+23.83%	+3.24%	+3.31%	+3.32%	+3.20%	+7.41%	+3.23%	+17.14%	+4.35%

Table 4: Performance comparison on different LLMs, including Llama-3.2-1B and Llama-3-8B [24], on the BIGRec [3] backbone. We adopt MSL [64] as the representative SFT method. $N@K$ and $H@K$ denote $NDCG@K$ and $HitRatio@K$ metrics, respectively. The best results are highlighted in bold. "**Imp.%**" indicates the relative improvement of BEAR over the best baseline.

Methods	Office				Book				Toy				Clothing			
	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10	N@5	N@10	H@5	H@10
BIGRec (1B)	0.0095	0.0177	0.0203	0.0447	0.0058	0.0066	0.0114	0.0137	0.0088	0.0133	0.0159	0.0296	0.0032	0.0066	0.0068	0.0176
+ MSL	0.0201	0.0232	0.0322	0.0421	0.0070	0.0089	0.0116	0.0176	0.0165	0.0230	0.0267	0.0465	0.0071	0.0105	0.0136	0.0244
+ BEAR	0.0203	0.0270	0.0343	0.0556	0.0076	0.0096	0.0132	0.0194	0.0176	0.0240	0.0284	0.0484	0.0075	0.0116	0.0144	0.0270
Imp.%	+1.00%	+16.38%	+6.52%	+24.38%	+8.57%	+7.87%	+13.79%	+10.23%	+6.67%	+4.35%	+6.37%	+4.09%	+5.63%	+10.48%	+5.88%	+10.66%
BIGRec (8B)	0.0114	0.0213	0.0213	0.0514	0.0109	0.0137	0.0169	0.0258	0.0142	0.0189	0.0213	0.0357	0.0057	0.0081	0.0104	0.0180
+ MSL	0.0392	0.0417	0.0556	0.0634	0.0103	0.0135	0.0160	0.0260	0.0245	0.0298	0.0373	0.0538	0.0085	0.0128	0.0156	0.0292
+ BEAR	0.0407	0.0438	0.0608	0.0706	0.0140	0.0172	0.0256	0.0356	0.0262	0.0318	0.0401	0.0572	0.0090	0.0135	0.0162	0.0302
Imp.%	+3.83%	+5.04%	+9.35%	+11.36%	+28.44%	+25.55%	+51.48%	+36.92%	+6.94%	+6.71%	+7.51%	+6.32%	+5.88%	+5.47%	+3.85%	+3.42%

Efficiency & Sensitivity




Figure 9: Training efficiency comparison between BEAR and other baselines. The x-axis represents the training time per epoch, and the y-axis represents the NDCG@10 performance.




Figure 8: Sensitivity analysis of BEAR's hyperparameters λ (blue) and ξ (orange). The best result is highlighted with a star, and the baseline result is indicated with a dashed line.

Summary

- **Problem:** We identified the critical *training-inference inconsistency* caused by *incorrect premature pruning* of target item even with high overall probability during beam search.
- **Motivation:** We proposed *BEAR (BEam-Search-Aware Regularization)* to explicitly optimize a relaxed *necessary condition* for target items to survive beam search.
- **Effectiveness:** BEAR achieved *significant performance gains (+12.5%)* and *reduced incorrect pruning risks (-25%)* with negligible computational overhead.


Thank You!




浙江大学
ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY

1st auth. Email: futurelover10032@gmail.com


Contact Me!



Weiqin Yang
(1st auth.'s page)



Jiawei Chen
(corr. auth.'s page)



扫一扫上面的二维码图案，加我为朋友。