

Do LLM-judges Align with Human Relevance in Cranfield-style Recommender Evaluation?

Gustavo Penha
Spotify
United States
gustavop@spotify.com

Aleksandr V. Petrov
Spotify
United Kingdom
aleksandr@spotify.com

Claudia Hauff
Spotify
Netherlands
claudiah@spotify.com

Enrico Palumbo
Spotify
Italy
enricop@spotify.com

Ali Vardasbi
Spotify
Netherlands
aliv@spotify.com

Edoardo D’Amico
Spotify
Spain
edoardod@spotify.com

Francesco Fabbri
Spotify
Spain
francescof@spotify.com

Alice Wang
Spotify
United States
alicew@spotify.com

Praveen Chandar
Spotify
United States
praveenr@spotify.com

Henrik Lindström
Spotify
Sweden
henok@spotify.com

Hugues Bouchard
Spotify
Spain
hb@spotify.com

Mounia Lalmas
Spotify
United Kingdom
mounia@acm.org

Abstract

Evaluating recommender systems remains a long-standing challenge, as offline methods based on historical user interactions and train–test splits often yield unstable and inconsistent results due to exposure bias, popularity bias, sampled evaluations, and missing-not-at-random patterns. In contrast, textual document retrieval benefits from robust, standardized evaluation via Cranfield-style test collections, which combine pooled relevance judgments with controlled setups. While recent work shows that adapting this methodology to recommender systems is feasible, constructing such collections remains costly due to the need for manual relevance judgments, thus limiting scalability. This paper investigates whether Large Language Models (LLMs) can serve as reliable automatic judges to address these scalability challenges. Using the ML-32M-ext Cranfield-style movie recommendation collection, we first examine the limitations of existing evaluation methodologies. Then we explore the alignment and the recommender systems ranking agreement between the LLM-judge and human provided relevance labels. We find that incorporating richer item metadata and longer user histories improves alignment, and that LLM-judge yields high agreement with human-based rankings (Kendall’s $\tau = 0.87$). Finally, an industrial case study in the podcast recommendation domain demonstrates the practical value of LLM-judge for model selection. Overall, our results show that LLM-judge is a viable and scalable approach for evaluating recommender systems.

Keywords

LLM-judge for recommender systems, Cranfield-style collections, Completeness of relevance labels

1 Introduction

Evaluating *recommender systems* has long been a challenging task and remains an open problem in the field. Despite decades of work, there is still no widely accepted offline evaluation framework [46]. Existing evaluations typically rely on historical interaction data [5], sampled metrics [31, 43], and dataset splitting strategies [24, 52] that differ across studies, resulting in inconsistent and often non-reproducible assessments of model effectiveness. Moreover, issues such as exposure bias [15], popularity bias [6], and incomplete relevance labels [44] make it difficult to provide a generalizable answer to a fundamental question: *which recommendation model performs best?*

In contrast, the adjacent domain of *ad hoc retrieval*—traditional query-based document search—has long relied on a standardized evaluation framework, centered around *Cranfield-style test collections* [12]. These collections consist of queries, documents, and human relevance judgments, providing a foundation for reproducible and comparable system evaluations. This paradigm has been instrumental in establishing reliable evaluation methodologies for retrieval systems and forms the basis of large-scale shared evaluation campaigns such as TREC [59].

Recent work has begun to explore Cranfield-style evaluation frameworks to recommender systems [9, 26, 50, 56], demonstrating that such collections can help mitigate popularity and exposure biases while producing more reliable model rankings. However, these efforts remain costly and limited in scale. For example, extending MovieLens into a Cranfield-style collection required over \$10,000 CAD to obtain relevance labels for only 51 users [50], a sample size likely insufficient to capture variance in user preferences and demographics.

In ad hoc retrieval, similar scalability challenges have been addressed by employing Large Language Models (LLMs) as automatic judges capable of predicting relevance labels. While some concerns remain regarding potential biases, circularity, and robustness to adversarial inputs [1, 17], this approach has often shown high agreement with human assessors [2, 19, 44, 55, 57]. So far, however, this LLM-judge evaluation paradigm has been validated mostly on retrieval tasks, where relevance judgments are made for query-document pairs based on the semantic alignment between an information need (expressed through the textual query) and a corresponding document.

In contrast to the relatively objective nature of relevance in retrieval, relevance in recommendation is inherently subjective [47]; it depends on both context [39] and domain [53]. Unlike short, well-defined textual queries, recommendation tasks involve long and often noisy user profiles, represented by user-item interactions that reflect evolving preferences over time, which are more challenging to encode for LLMs. Moreover, signals such as popularity, trendiness, and collaborative filtering patterns may be underrepresented in an LLM’s parametric knowledge [42]. These differences raise an important question: *Can the LLMs judging ability be generalized from ad hoc retrieval to recommendation tasks?*

In this paper, we investigate whether LLM-judge can serve as a reliable evaluator for recommender systems within a Cranfield-style evaluation framework. We begin by motivating our work through an examination of the limitations of existing evaluation methodologies. We then explore: (1) the alignment between LLM-predicted and human-provided relevance labels; (2) the extent to which model rankings based on LLM labels agree with those derived from human judgments; and (3) the performance of LLM-judge in an industrial setting for model selection. We find that:

- (1) **Alignment with human labels:** The agreement between LLM-judge and human annotations increases when additional metadata fields (beyond the item title) are provided, suggesting that richer contextual information helps the model better match user preferences to recommended items. We also observe that incorporating more items from a user history as input to the model further improves alignment.
- (2) **Agreement in system rankings:** Using the LLM-judge relevance labels to rank different systems yields a Kendall’s τ agreement of 0.87, comparable to the alignment scores reported by Arabzadeh and Clarke [2] for ad hoc retrieval collections such as TREC-DL.
- (3) **Industrial applicability:** In an industrial context, LLM-judge proved useful for assisting with model ranking and selection before conducting human feedback sessions and A/B tests, as demonstrated in podcast recommendation.

Overall, our results indicate that LLM-judge offers a promising approach for scalable evaluation of recommender systems across domains such as movies and podcasts, provided that established best-practice guidelines [17] are followed to ensure validity and integrity of the assessments.

2 Related Work

The evaluation paradigms of ad hoc retrieval and recommender systems share structural similarities. In ad hoc retrieval, the Cranfield paradigm provides a standardized framework based on test collections composed of documents, queries, and human relevance judgments. Because exhaustively judging every query–document pair is infeasible, large-scale evaluation campaigns such as TREC introduced pooling, where assessors label documents drawn from the union of the top results from multiple retrieval systems.

The completeness of these pooled judgments—particularly for systems that did not participate in pooling—determines the reliability and reusability of a collection for future evaluations. Unpooled documents returned by non-participating systems may still be relevant, yet are treated as irrelevant by standard information retrieval metrics, potentially underestimating the effectiveness of newer models [3, 60]. Indeed, many commonly used evaluation measures are not robust to substantially incomplete relevance judgements [7].

In recommender systems, the situation is even more complex. Recommendation collections mirror IR test collections—comprising a corpus of items, a set of users, and user–item relevance signals—but these signals are derived from sparse historical interaction data rather than explicit human annotation.¹ While prior work suggests that assessors can serve as reliable judges on behalf of other users [4, 36], the standard practice continues to rely on offline evaluations using historical logs.

Typically, such evaluations withhold a portion of interactions for testing while using the remainder for training (e.g., global-time, leave-one-out splits, or user-based splits) [8, 30]. However, this methodology is prone to multiple biases: popularity bias arising from long-tail relevance distributions [6]; exposure bias driven by production logging policies [15]; and missing-not-at-random (MNAR) patterns [34, 48, 51], where users rate only items they particularly enjoy. Additionally, not all rejected recommendations are truly irrelevant [22]. Combined with data leakage from non-time-based splits [24] and the use of sampled metrics [31, 43], these issues can lead to inconsistent evaluations, where offline rankings often diverge from those observed in online or user studies [45], complicating the progress in the field [21].

To address these limitations, several efforts have sought to construct Cranfield-style collections for recommender systems, replicating the benefits of IR-style pooling [26, 50, 56]. Yet, such datasets remain expensive and small in scale. In ad hoc retrieval, LLMs have been shown to effectively fill judgment gaps [38] and predict relevance labels directly [2], though concerns persist regarding biases, circularity, and robustness to adversarial manipulation [1, 17]. Early work in recommendation further suggests that LLM-judge [18, 61] (and LLM rankers [14, 29]) can mirror offline evaluation trends. However, questions remain about their generalization, particularly given evidence that LLMs may memorize public datasets such as MovieLens [16], and the absence of studies replicating Cranfield-style recommendation collections with LLM judges.

¹The relevance of an item to a user can be determined either through pre-interaction judgments, implicit or explicit signals during interaction, or post-interaction feedback [53].

To explore these open questions, the next section outlines our experimental design for evaluating LLM-judge in a Cranfield-style recommender system setting.

3 Experimental Setup

In this section, we describe the experimental setup used to evaluate LLM-judge, including the datasets, recommender system models, and evaluation procedures employed.

Pooling-based evaluation for recommendation. To overcome the limitations of traditional train-test splits, we rely on a Cranfield-style extension of the popular MovieLens interaction dataset [25]. The ML-32M dataset² consists of 32 million ratings across 87,585 movies by 200,948 users, collected between 1995 and 2023 and released on 2024. The Cranfield-style extension of the ML-32M, introduced by Smucker and Chamani [50] and referred to as ML-32M-ext, was released in 2025 and is available exclusively to researchers. Access requires submitting a form confirming that the dataset will not be publicly shared nor used beyond research purposes. Consequently, we consider it unlikely that current LLMs have memorized this dataset.

ML-32M-ext consists of an additional 31,236 relevance judgments provided by 51 participants for movies that they had not rated before. The movies selected for evaluation were drawn from a pool of 22 recommender system models, each having access to the histories of the 51 participants and other users from the ML-32M dataset. During two labeling phases, each participant evaluated at least 600 movies based on metadata including the poster, title, plot summary, release year, running time, cast, directors, genres, and languages. Participants then rated their interest in watching, familiarity with, and predicted rating for each movie.

We use the primary relevance file from ML-32M-ext: *interest.qrels*, which captures participants' interest in watching movies. Interest levels range from 0 (Not interested), 1 (Somewhat interested), 2 (Interested), 3 (Very interested), 4 (Extremely interested), 5 (ranked 3), 6 (ranked 2), to 7 (Ranked 1), where 5–7 represent the top-three items selected by each user. For details on dataset construction, we refer readers to [9, 50].

Recommender system models. Following Smucker and Chamani [50], we use the RecBole framework [64]³ for model implementation. For models that participated in the pooling stage, we adopt the same hyperparameters as in [50]; for the rest, we train for 10 epochs using default settings. As recommended by the ML-32M-ext authors, we evaluate system effectiveness using the Compatibility measure [11], with the default value of $p = 0.95$ provided by *ir-measures* [37] library and the *interest.qrels* file which contains interest in watching relevance labels. The Compatibility metric is the maximum normalized rank biased overlap between the results and an ideal ranking, and p represents searcher patience or persistence. Full retrieval is performed over the entire item collection,

²<https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/32m/>

³We use RecBole (<https://github.com/RUCAIBox/RecBole>) because it provides access to a wide range of recommendation models through a unified API. While we acknowledge existing concerns about the reproducibility of third-party model implementations [27], these have limited impact on our results. Our focus lies in analyzing the alignment between LLM-judge predictions and human judgments, rather than the absolute effectiveness of individual models. Hence, the diversity of models available in the framework is more critical to our study than their specific performance levels.

LLM-judge prompt

Instruction:

Your task is to evaluate the relevance of a movie recommendation for a user, given the metadata of the movie and the user's previous interactions.

Inputs:

User profile: {USER_PROFILE}

Movie recommendation: {METADATA_RECOMMENDED_MOVIE}

Expected output:

reasoning: Reason for the interest in watching the movie considering their previous interactions.

interest_in_watching: The interest in watching the movie considering their previous interactions, on a scale of 0 to 7.

User profile structure

Movie metadata: {METADATA_MOVIE_0}

Movie metadata: {METADATA_MOVIE_1}

...

Movie metadata: {METADATA_MOVIE_N}

Movie metadata structure

Title + Average rating + Genres + Directors + Overview + Cast + Runtime + Number ratings + Year + Languages.

Figure 1: Prompt template, user profile structure, and movie metadata structure used for LLM-judge evaluations.

i.e. no sampled negatives are introduced for metric computation. Unjudged items are considered irrelevant in the evaluation metrics using both the LLM qrels and the human qrels.

For training, we sample 10,000 users from ML-32M, add the history of the 51 ML-32M-ext participants, and exclude items and users with less than 20 interactions. Preliminary experiments confirmed that this smaller training set yields comparable performance and model rankings on ML-32M-ext, allowing for more efficient experimentation.

LLM-judge. For the LLM-judge, we use *gpt-5-2025-08-07* with the default reasoning level set to *medium* as the LLM backbone. Each experiment is repeated three times, and we report averaged results. Unless stated otherwise, the LLM predicts relevance for up to 50 randomly selected movies per participant (all of which have human labels in ML-32M-ext). This sampling is adopted to reduce time and costs of experimentation, since a single run would otherwise require 93,708 ($3 \times 31,236$) LLM calls.

By default, we include 1000 movies for each user as part of their interaction history. Because timestamp information is unavailable for ML-32M-ext, we randomly sample items from each user's history rather than applying recency-based selection. The prompt used for LLM-judge evaluations is shown in Figure 1. The prompt was not iteratively optimized, and it is only different for the ablation experiments presented later (effect of movie metadata fields and criteria-based LLM-judge in Tables 3 and 4.).




Figure 2: Judged@100 by different distribution of train and test size in a historical interaction train-test split.

4 Limitations of Current Evaluation Methodologies

Evaluating recommender systems using traditional offline methodologies presents several fundamental limitations. In this section, we examine the main issues associated with historical train-test splits, the incompleteness of relevance labels, and the implications these have for the reliability of model comparisons.

Historical interactions train-test split. A key limitation of traditional train-test splits based on historical interactions is the incompleteness of relevance labels: not all items retrieved by the compared recommender systems have corresponding relevance labels. To illustrate this, we examine the proportion of judged items retrieved when applying different train-test split ratios to the ML-32M dataset, using three models with varying levels of effectiveness (Pop, EASE and MultiVAE).

We measure this proportion using Judged@100, defined as the average percentage of items with relevance labels among the top 100 ranked items for each user. User interactions are ordered chronologically (timestamp information is available for ML-32M), the oldest X% interactions are used for training and most recent (1-X%) for creating the relevance labels⁴. As shown in Figure 2, the percentage of judged items within the top 100 positions is low (< 15%) under the standard 80%-20% split.

For all three models we see that increasing the size of the test set slightly improves Judged@100, but this is not a viable solution: it reduces the size of the training set and introduces a greater temporal gap between training and testing interactions. The resulting sparsity of relevance labels, across different models, makes it difficult to reliably compare recommender system rankings, as confirmed by prior studies on partially complete collections [23, 43].

Next, we compare the completeness of traditional train-test splits with that of Cranfield-style collections and empirically demonstrate how low Judged@100 values lead to discrepancies in recommender system rankings.

Comparison with a Cranfield-style pooled collection. A Cranfield-style collection offers a compelling alternative to traditional historical train-test splits. By collecting explicit feedback from multiple recommender systems, such collections provide a more complete set of relevance judgments for models that participated in the pooling process, that is, models used to generate candidate recommendations during dataset creation. Incorporating a diverse set of models into the pool also helps mitigate the selection bias that would arise from relying on a single production recommender, thereby improving the completeness of judgments for models that were not part of the pooling.

In standard offline evaluation, user interactions are typically sorted by time and then split into train-test sets on a per-user basis [54].⁵ This approach can inadvertently cause temporal leakage, as each user has their own time cutoff between training and testing [24, 28, 30]. In contrast, Cranfield-style collections enable a global time split, where all interactions occurring before the dataset creation are used for training, and the relevance judgments collected during dataset construction are used for testing.

We argue that this setup more closely reflects real-world recommendation scenarios, offering both higher completeness of relevance labels and more reliable model rankings. To quantify this difference, we compare the completeness of relevance labels under the two methodologies.

As shown in Table 1, traditional train-test splits yield substantially lower Judged@100 scores compared to the Cranfield-style collection (ML-32M-ext [5]).⁶ All models on the left side of the table participated in the ML-32M-ext pooling process, and for these, the Cranfield-style setup provides markedly higher completeness of relevance labels than the conventional time-ordered split.

A similar trend is observed for models that did not participate in pooling (right side of the table): their Judged@100 values are also higher under the Cranfield-style evaluation, though overall scores are lower than for the pooled models.

Impact on model ranking reliability. An important consideration is how the evaluation methodology and the completeness of relevance labels affect the final rankings of recommender systems. We observe that the agreement between rankings derived from the historical interactions train-test split and those from the Cranfield-style collection with a global time split is notably low, with a Kendall's τ of 0.33. For comparison, an often cited threshold for acceptable agreement between system rankings based on independently created set of human relevance judgments is 0.90 [2, 58]. Furthermore, as illustrated in Figure 3, reducing the number of relevance labels per user, and thereby decreasing the completeness of the collection, leads to greater divergence in model rankings.


⁵For example, the widely used RecBole library does not implement a global time-based split and only supports time-ordering prior to splitting the data into training and test sets (see https://recbole.io/docs/user_guide/config/evaluation_settings.html).

⁶A key difference between our experimental setup and that of Smucker and Chamani [50] is the use of a global time-based split. Specifically, all relevance labels from the 51 assessors created before the collection of new relevance judgments are used for training, while all relevance judgments gathered during the pooling exercise are reserved for testing. This approach provides a clearer temporal separation between training and evaluation and avoids the information leakage inherent in the random train-test split [28].

⁴Equivalent to TimeOrdering (TO) in the RecBole [64] library.

Table 1: Judged@100 for models under historical interactions train-test split vs. Cranfield-style pooling (ML-32M-ext).

Model (participated in the pooling of ML-32M-ext)	ML-32M Historical interactions 80%-20% train-test split	ML-32M-ext [5] Cranfield-style pooling w. global time split	Model (did not participate in the pooling of ML-32M-ext)	ML-32M Historical interactions 80%-20% train-test split	ML-32M-ext [5] Cranfield-style pooling w. global time split
Judged@100			Judged@100		
Pop	0.0183	0.3754	ENMF	0.0043	0.1006
NeuMF	0.0314	0.8409	DGCF	0.0048	0.0725
CDAE	0.0506	0.4754	RaCT	0.0221	0.5365
MultiVAE	0.0838	0.7607	DiffRec	0.0247	0.5071
ADMMSLIM	0.0790	0.5313	AsymKNN	0.0622	0.7957
BPR	0.1326	0.6692	ItemKNN	0.0622	0.7957
EASE	0.1465	0.5331	NCEPLRec	0.1654	0.3153
Average	0.0774	0.5981	Average	0.0493	0.4462

**Figure 3: Effect on sampling from the full relevance labels from ML-32M-ext in terms of Judged@100 and agreement of the model rankings when using the complete set of labels.**

Limitations of pooled collections. While pooled collections improve the completeness of relevance judgements, they are inherently “frozen in time”: evaluation can only be conducted using a single time-based split (before and after the pooling process). In domains where user preferences evolve rapidly (e.g. short video consumption) reliable evaluation may require multiple temporal splits to capture such dynamics.

In addition, decisions regarding which models participate in pooling, how they are trained, and the pooling depth can influence both the completeness and longevity of the collection. Models that resemble those used during pooling may be inadvertently favored, while newer or substantially different models may be disadvantaged. Finally, constructing pooled collections is resource-intensive. For instance, generating ML-32M-ext with participants required approximately \$10,000 CAD. In contrast, using an LLM-judge could reduce this cost by an order of magnitude.⁷

⁷The estimate was obtained using GPT-5 mini, via the batch API, based on the average context length of a textified user history containing all metadata and 100 movies.

Table 2: Comparison of evaluation methodologies for recommender systems.

Historical interactions	Cranfield-style Pooling	LLM-judge
Selection bias towards production recommender system(s) and towards popular items	Selection bias towards systems used during pooling to generate relevance labels	No system selection/exposure bias. Prone to other biases and evaluation tropes.
Incomplete judge-ments	Incomplete judge-ments	“Complete” ⁸ judge-ments
Low cost	High cost	Medium cost
Low reliability for model ranking	High reliability for model ranking ⁹	Moderate reliability for model ranking

Summary. As summarized in Table 2, existing evaluation methodologies for recommender systems involve a trade-off between bias, completeness, and cost. Historical-interaction evaluations are inexpensive but suffer from biases and incompleteness, whereas Cranfield-style pooling offers higher reliability at the expense of substantial human-annotation cost.

The LLM-judge approach provides an appealing middle ground: assuming sufficient alignment with user judgments, it mitigates exposure and popularity biases by offering complete coverage of relevance labels at a moderate cost.

Optimizations on the number of LLM relevance predictions and which metadata to use could make the LLM-judge 2–3 orders of magnitude cheaper.

⁸By a complete set of relevance labels, we refer to the ability to run LLM-judge for any item retrieved by any recommender system within the top-k positions, rather than generating relevance predictions for every possible user-item pair in the collection.

⁹Cranfield-style collections provide high reliability when ranking recommender systems that participated in the pooling process, but their reliability decreases for models that did not participate and differ substantially from those included in the pool.

However, LLM-based evaluations introduce their own sources of bias [49, 63] and potential pitfalls that may lead to invalid conclusions [10, 17]. For example, popular entities or items may be overrepresented in an LLM’s parametric knowledge [33, 41]; test sets might inadvertently appear in the model’s training data [16, 62]; LLMs can be adversarially prompted to produce overly positive relevance labels [1]; and using LLM-judge within the evaluated systems themselves risks circularity issues [32].

These potential advantages and shortcomings motivate our investigation into whether LLMs can serve as scalable and reliable judges for recommender system evaluation.

5 Assessing LLM-judge Alignment and Agreement

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of LLM-judge as an automatic evaluator for recommender systems. Following the evaluation methodology of Arabzadeh and Clarke [2], we assess LLM-based relevance judgments along two dimensions: (1) their alignment with human labels, and (2) their agreement with recommender system rankings derived from human relevance judgments. Together, these analyses allow us to understand not only how closely LLM-judge mirrors human annotation behavior but also whether it preserves the relative ordering of model performance, both essential requirements for scalable, reliable evaluation.

5.1 Alignment with Human Labels

We first evaluate the alignment between LLM-judge predictions and the primary relevance file from ML-32M-ext. The LLM-judge receives a fixed number of randomly ordered historical user ratings as inputs,¹⁰ enabling it to infer how well a user’s preferences align with the metadata of a recommended movie. Both the LLM-judge predictions and the human labels are expressed on the same interest scale ranging from 0 to 7.

To quantify this alignment, we compute the Kendall’s τ between the LLM-judge predictions and the human labels. In addition, we calculate the proportions of agreement, tie and disagreement between label pairs. Specifically, for each user, we compare all pairs of items labeled as relevant (interest levels 1–7) versus non-relevant (interest level 0), and determine:

- **Agreement:** the LLM-judge ranks the items in the same order as the human judgments.
- **Tie:** the LLM-judge assigns equal scores to both items.
- **Disagreement:** the LLM-judge ranks the pair in the opposite order from the human judgments.

Effect of including different item metadata fields. We first examine how different metadata fields (used for movies in both the user’s history and the recommended movie) contribute to the alignment between LLM-judge and human labels.

As shown in Table 3, all metadata fields except average rating positively impact the pairwise agreement between LLM-judge predictions and human judgments. Overall, these results indicate that the model effectively leverages the content information from a

¹⁰The LLM-judge has access to the same metadata provided to participants during the relevance labeling process, with the exception of the cover image and the addition of two extra fields: average rating and number of ratings.




Figure 4: Effect of increasing the size of the user history on the LLM-judge pair agreement.

user’s movie profile and compares it against the metadata of recommended items; each additional metadata field independently helps improve alignment. At the same time, interaction-derived features such as average rating and number of ratings may inadvertently reinforce—or reintroduce—popularity biases into the evaluation.

When compared with prior work on LLM-based judges for ad hoc retrieval [2], our alignment scores (55–57%) are higher than those achieved by pointwise LLM-judges on the ANTIQUE dataset (~40%) but lower than those observed on TREC DL-19/20/21 (~80%). It is worth noting that our movie recommendation judge operates in a zero-shot setting without prompt iteration or in-context learning examples, which makes these results particularly encouraging.

Effect of the size of the user history. Because all available metadata are used for each movie, the context size of the user profile grows rapidly. On average, each user who participated in the ML-32M-ext pooling rated 1,425 movies, resulting in an average profile length of approximately 170k tokens, with a maximum of 1 million tokens for a user who rated 8,496 movies.


To understand the impact of profile size, we analyze how the number of items in a user’s history influences the alignment between LLM-judge and human relevance labels. As illustrated in Figure 4, larger user profiles lead to higher pairwise agreements and fewer disagreements between the two sets of judgments. This trend is consistent with early findings from LLM-judge evaluations in podcast recommendations [18]. We note that timestamp information for the user interactions was not available for ML-32M-ext, and therefore, profile items were not ordered by recency in this analysis. These results suggest that providing richer user context enables LLMs to better infer preference patterns, improving their ability to approximate human relevance judgments.

Effect of the difference in human label interest levels. Previous sections evaluate the LLM-judge agreement using not relevant (interest level of 0) vs relevant (interest levels from 1–7) pairs of items. Here we take a closer look at the agreement with unrestricted pairs of interest levels, considering more fine-grained differences, e.g. interested vs very interest.

We see in Figure 5 that it gets harder for the LLM-judge when the distances between the interest labels get smaller and potentially

Table 3: Effect of movie metadata fields on LLM-judge pair agreement metrics. (\pm) indicates the 95% confidence interval. Best per column in bold. \downarrow indicates worse than the baseline which only uses the *Title* of the movies as input.

Metadata	Agreement (%)	Tie (%)	Disagreement (%)
Title + Average rating	0.5398 \pm 0.0033 \downarrow	0.2565 \pm 0.0008	0.2037 \pm 0.0028 \downarrow
Title	0.5479 \pm 0.0019	0.2607 \pm 0.0017	0.1914 \pm 0.0011
Title + Genres	0.5516 \pm 0.0020	0.2596 \pm 0.0000	0.1888 \pm 0.0020
Title + Directors	0.5551 \pm 0.0006	0.2514 \pm 0.0024	0.1935 \pm 0.0024 \downarrow
Title + Overview	0.5529 \pm 0.0019	0.2645 \pm 0.0007	0.1826 \pm 0.0025
Title + Cast	0.5649 \pm 0.0033	0.2456 \pm 0.0008	0.1895 \pm 0.0030
Title + Runtime	0.5592 \pm 0.0005	0.2561 \pm 0.0012	0.1847 \pm 0.0015
Title + Number ratings	0.5612 \pm 0.0022	0.2489 \pm 0.0005	0.1899 \pm 0.0017
Title + Year	0.5590 \pm 0.0011	0.2536 \pm 0.0012	0.1874 \pm 0.0021
Title + Languages	0.5726 \pm 0.0008	0.2362 \pm 0.0021	0.1912 \pm 0.0013
Title + All metadata	0.5599 \pm 0.0031	0.2610 \pm 0.0013	0.1790 \pm 0.0021

**Figure 5: Effect of decreasing the interest level differences between the pairs of labels.**

subtler, with increased percentages of disagreement and ties in those scenarios.

Relevance decomposition into interest dimensions. Relevance is a complex and multidimensional concept [13, 40]. In ad hoc retrieval, positive results have been achieved using criteria-based LLM judges [20]. Following a similar approach, we designed a set of evaluation criteria for the LLM-judge and instructed it to generate output according to the schema shown in Figure 6. These criteria combine objective metadata features (e.g., genre, cast, release period) with more subjective dimensions such as tone and mood. To aggregate these criteria into a final rating, we explored two strategies. Chain-of-thought (COT) predicts each criterion individually and then produces an overall score, while Sum Aggregation derives the final rating by summing the individual criterion scores.

As shown in Table 4, the COT approach does not yield substantial improvements over the baseline. While the Sum Aggregation method achieves higher pairwise agreement percentages, it also results in greater disagreement, likely due to the increased number of distinct aggregated scores.

Criteria-based rubric

Genre & Subgenre: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for the category of film (action, romance, sci-fi, etc.).
Tone & Mood: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for movie tone, e.g., lighthearted, dark, intense, uplifting.
Story Complexity: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for simple vs. layered movies.
Pacing: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for slow vs. fast pacing movies.
Themes & Topics: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for underlying themes (friendship, dystopia, revenge).
Cast & Crew: How well does the recommendation align with the preference for actors, directors, writers, etc.
Cultural / Regional Context: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for a certain origin, language, or cultural lens.
Runtime / Commitment: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for movie length.
Release Period: How well does the recommendation align with the affinity for classics vs. modern movies.
Trend & Popularity: How well does the recommendation align with the interest in mainstream vs. niche movies.
Average Ratings: How well does the recommendation align with the user’s affinity for highly rated movies.

Figure 6: Dimensions used by criteria-based LLM-judge.

We hypothesize that incorporating supervised guidance or fine-tuned weighting of criteria could improve alignment with human judgments when using multi-dimensional relevance decomposition, in line with similar approaches that have led to successful results in the NLP field [35]. Nonetheless, this points to a promising direction for enhancing interpretability and control in LLM-based evaluators.

5.2 Agreement with Recommender System Rankings


We next examine how rankings of different recommender systems compare when derived from human labels versus the LLM-judge predictions. To assess this, we compute the Kendall’s τ between

Table 4: Criteria-based LLM-judge results. (\pm) indicates the 95% confidence interval. Best per row in bold.

Setting	Agreement (%)	Tie (%)	Disagreement (%)
No criteria	0.5599 \pm 0.0031	0.2610 \pm 0.0013	0.1790 \pm 0.0021
Criteria-based (COT)	0.5484 \pm 0.0180	0.2704 \pm 0.0079	0.1812 \pm 0.0102
Criteria-based (Sum Aggregation)	0.6931 \pm 0.0117	0.0329 \pm 0.0009	0.2740 \pm 0.0117

Table 5: Agreement between LLM-judge and human system rankings by the number of LLM-judge predictions per user.

Predictions per user	Kendall's τ	W-Kendall's τ
10	0.5556	0.5092
50	0.7333	0.6486
100	0.8667	0.9405
200	0.8444	0.9225

**Figure 7: Correlation of recommender system rankings between LLM-judge and human qrels.**

the ranking of 14 recommender systems using the human relevance labels and the corresponding rankings obtained from LLM-judge-predicted labels, considering unjudged items as not relevant.

As shown in Table 5, increasing the number of LLM-judge predictions per user from 10 to 100 substantially improves the ranking agreement with the complete set of human relevance labels. Beyond 100 predictions per user, the improvement plateaus, indicating a performance ceiling, as extending predictions to 200 movies does not further increase agreement.

The compatibility values presented in Figure 7 illustrate this relationship across individual systems. With 100 LLM-judge predictions per user (corresponding to approximately 5,100 relevance labels—about ~16% of the total human-labeled set), we obtain a

high Kendall's τ of 0.87 between LLM-judge and the human judgments. This level of agreement is comparable to the values reported by Arabzadeh and Clarke [2] for ad hoc retrieval collections such as TREC-DL, which range between 0.77 and 0.92.

These findings suggest that LLM-judge can approximate human-based model rankings with high fidelity, even when using a fraction of the human-labeled data.

6 Industrial Case Study: Applying LLM-judge for Model Selection

Up to this point, our experiments have focused on public datasets in the movie domain to evaluate LLM-judge for recommender systems. We now turn to a real-world application, examining how LLM-judge can be employed to evaluate recommender system variants in the podcast domain.

In industrial environments, evaluations based on logged user interactions are inherently biased toward the current production model. As a result, newly developed models that optimize for different objectives may appear less effective simply because users were never exposed to their recommendations. Moreover, fully developed Cranfield-style pooled collections are costly, time-consuming to construct, and static thus capturing user preferences only at a single point in time. This case study illustrates how LLM-judge can help overcome these challenges, providing a scalable and flexible alternative for industrial model evaluation.

LLM-judge for podcast recommendation. We employ a criteria-based LLM-judge designed to predict the degree of interest alignment between a user and a recommended podcast across multiple dimensions (topic, host & guest, style & format, and tone & genre) as well as to generate an overall interest alignment score.

Using a sample of 100 users, we compute the LLM-judge score for each of the top five recommendations produced by the candidate model. This criteria-based setup allows the evaluation to be interpretable, leading to an understanding of which sub-components of relevance models are able to capture.

Goal: Assisting model selection. During the offline experimentation preceding an A/B test, LLM-judge was employed as an additional evaluation tool to support model selection and assess the impact of model changes. Over a four-month development period, LLM-judge scores were computed alongside traditional offline metrics derived from historical interaction logs. In parallel, several rounds of human annotation were conducted, and both LLM-judge metrics and traditional offline evaluations were used to select the final candidate model for online testing.

LLM-judge vs. historical interaction metrics. We next compare the LLM-judge interest alignment metric compares with traditional




Figure 8: Correlation of recommender system rankings between LLM-judge and offline metrics based on historical interactions global train-test split.

Table 6: Comparison between two podcast recommender system models using different evaluation metrics in the context of model selection.

	Model 1	Model 2
Train-test time based split metric	0.512	0.295
LLM-judge metric	0.734	0.890
Employee preference metric	0.286	0.524

offline metrics derived from logged interactions (calculated using global time train-test splits), focusing on their ability to rank different model variants.

As shown in Figure 8, the agreement between LLM-judge and conventional offline metrics is low. One explanation for this disparity is that LLM-judge mitigates exposure and popularity biases that arise from the incompleteness of relevance labels in historical interaction data. In fact, when evaluating a model that applied a popularity debiasing technique, we observed diverging behaviors between the two evaluation methods. Offline metrics based on logged interactions decreased notably, whereas LLM-judge scores increased. Consequently, the model performing best according to LLM-judge was not the same as the one ranked highest by traditional offline metrics.

To further investigate, we conducted an internal evaluation with 20 employees, who compared the recommendations produced by two model variants. The results, summarized in Table 6, show that the model preferred by employees was the same as the one favored by LLM-judge (the variant incorporating a popularity debiasing mechanism), rather than the model ranked higher by conventional offline evaluation.

These findings suggest that the LLM-judge can provide a less popularity biased assessment of model quality compared to historical interaction-based evaluations.

Summary. During model development, we found that LLM-judge provided valuable additional insights to investigate model quality when used alongside traditional offline metrics. While historical interactions train-test splits are indicative of how well the candidate models can fit the existing trends in the logged data coming from production recommender systems, the LLM-judge is able to evaluate recommendations tailored for new objectives—such as interest diversity, new interest alignment, etc. A more holistic evaluation view using metrics coming from both evaluation approaches proved effective for prioritizing models for human review and ultimately for selecting candidates for A/B testing. This demonstrates the practical utility of LLM-judge as a scalable, bias-aware complement to conventional evaluation methods in industrial recommendation settings. We highlight though that drawing correlations between offline metrics, such as LLM-judge or conventional historical interaction splits, and online A/B test metrics is a challenging task, which requires further work.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the potential of LLMs to serve as automatic judges for recommender system evaluation, addressing long-standing challenges of scalability and incompleteness in existing offline methodologies. Using the ML-32M-ext Cranfield-style collection, we demonstrated that traditional historical train-test splits suffer from label sparsity, leading to unstable and unreliable model rankings. In contrast, the LLM-judge approach produces complete relevance estimations across systems, mitigating selection and exposure biases at a moderate cost.

Our results show that the alignment between LLM-judge predictions and human labels improves when richer item metadata and longer user histories are provided. We further demonstrate that rankings derived from LLM-judge relevance labels achieve high agreement with human judgments (Kendall’s $\tau = 0.87$), comparable to those observed in ad hoc retrieval benchmarks. In addition, our industrial case study in the podcast domain illustrates that LLM-judge can assist model selection and evaluation in real-world settings, offering a scalable complement to human annotation and traditional offline metrics.

Looking ahead, several directions warrant exploration. First, incorporating human-in-the-loop frameworks could strengthen reliability and accountability, particularly given the risks of relying solely on automated judgments. Second, systematically studying biases introduced by LLM-judges, for example, through popularity, domain representation, or prompt design, will be critical for ensuring fairness and validity in evaluation. Finally, advancing human-LLM alignment through techniques such as prompt optimization, supervised fine-tuning, or reinforcement learning could further enhance agreement and interpretability.

Overall, our findings suggest that LLM-judge represents a promising step toward scalable, bias-aware, and robust evaluation frameworks for recommender systems, bridging the gap between controlled experimental setups and real-world industrial practice.

References

- [1] Marwah Alaofi, Paul Thomas, Falk Scholer, and Mark Sanderson. 2024. LLMs can be Fooled into Labelling a Document as Relevant: best café near me; this paper is perfectly relevant. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region* (Tokyo, Japan) (SIGIR-AP 2024). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 32–41. doi:10.1145/3673791.3698431
- [2] Negar Arabzadeh and Charles LA Clarke. 2025. Benchmarking LLM-based relevance judgment methods. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 3194–3204.
- [3] Negar Arabzadeh, Alexandra Vtyurina, Xinyi Yan, and Charles LA Clarke. 2022. Shallow pooling for sparse labels. *Information Retrieval Journal* 25, 4 (2022), 365–385.
- [4] Peter Bailey, Nick Craswell, Ian Soboroff, Paul Thomas, Arjen P de Vries, and Emine Yilmaz. 2008. Relevance assessment: are judges exchangeable and does it matter. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 667–674.
- [5] Christine Bauer, Eva Zangerle, and Alan Said. 2024. Exploring the landscape of recommender systems evaluation: Practices and perspectives. *ACM Transactions on Recommender Systems* 2, 1 (2024), 1–31.
- [6] Alejandro Bellogin, Pablo Castells, and Iván Cantador. 2017. Statistical biases in information retrieval metrics for recommender systems. *Information Retrieval Journal* 20, 6 (2017), 606–634.
- [7] Chris Buckley and Ellen M Voorhees. 2004. Retrieval evaluation with incomplete information. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 25–32.
- [8] Rocío Cañameres, Pablo Castells, and Alistair Moffat. 2020. Offline evaluation options for recommender systems. *Inf. Retr.* 23, 4 (March 2020), 387–410. doi:10.1007/s10791-020-09371-3
- [9] Houmaan Chamani. 2024. *A Test Collection for Offline Evaluation of Recommender Systems*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Master's thesis. University of Waterloo. <https://hdl.handle.net/10012/21175>.
- [10] Charles LA Clarke and Laura Dietz. 2024. LLM-based relevance assessment still can't replace human relevance assessment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.17156* (2024).
- [11] Charles L. A. Clarke, Alexandra Vtyurina, and Mark D. Smucker. 2021. Assessing Top- Preferences. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 39, 3 (2021), 33:1–33:21. doi:10.1145/3451161
- [12] Cyril Cleverdon. 1967. The Cranfield tests on index language devices. In *Aslib proceedings*, Vol. 19. MCB UP Ltd, 173–194.
- [13] Erica Cosijn and Peter Ingwersen. 2000. Dimensions of relevance. *Information Processing & Management* 36, 4 (2000), 533–550. doi:10.1016/S0306-4573(99)00072-2
- [14] Sunhao Dai, Ninglu Shao, Haiyuan Zhao, Weijie Yu, Zihua Si, Chen Xu, Zhongxiang Sun, Xiao Zhang, and Jun Xu. 2023. Uncovering ChatGPT's Capabilities in Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '23)*. ACM, 1126–1132. doi:10.1145/3604915.3610646
- [15] Romain Deffayet, Thibaut Thonet, Jean-Michel Renders, and Maarten De Rijke. 2023. Offline evaluation for reinforcement learning-based recommendation: a critical issue and some alternatives. In *Acm sigir forum*, Vol. 56. ACM New York, NY, USA, 1–14.
- [16] Dario Di Palma, Felice Antonio Merra, Maurizio Sfilio, Vito Walter Anelli, Fedelucio Narducci, and Tommaso Di Noia. 2025. Do LLMs Memorize Recommendation Datasets? A Preliminary Study on MovieLens-1M. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '25)*. ACM, 2582–2586. doi:10.1145/3726302.3730178
- [17] Laura Dietz, Oleg Zendel, Peter Bailey, Charles L. A. Clarke, Ellese Cotterill, Jeff Dalton, Faegheh Hasibi, Mark Sanderson, and Nick Craswell. 2025. Principles and Guidelines for the Use of LLM Judges. In *Proceedings of the 2025 International ACM SIGIR Conference on Innovative Concepts and Theories in Information Retrieval (ICTIR) (ICTIR '25)*. ACM, 218–229. doi:10.1145/3731120.3744588
- [18] Francesco Fabbri, Gustavo Penha, Edoardo D'Amico, Alice Wang, Marco De Nadai, Jackie Doremus, Paul Giglioli, Andreas Damianou, Oskar Stål, and Mounia Lalmas. 2025. Evaluating Podcast Recommendations with Profile-Aware LLM-as-a-Judge. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '25)*. ACM, 1181–1186. doi:10.1145/3705328.3759305
- [19] Guglielmo Faggioli, Laura Dietz, Charles LA Clarke, Gianluca Demartini, Matthias Hagen, Claudia Hauff, Noriko Kando, Evangelos Kanoulas, Martin Potthast, Benno Stein, et al. 2023. Perspectives on large language models for relevance judgment. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGIR international conference on theory of information retrieval*. 39–50.
- [20] Naghme Farzi and Laura Dietz. 2025. Criteria-Based LLM Relevance Judgments. In *Proceedings of the 2025 International ACM SIGIR Conference on Innovative Concepts and Theories in Information Retrieval (ICTIR) (ICTIR '25)*. ACM, 254–263. doi:10.1145/3731120.3744591
- [21] Maurizio Ferrari Dacrema, Paolo Cremonesi, and Dietmar Jannach. 2019. Are we really making much progress? A worrying analysis of recent neural recommendation approaches. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 101–109.
- [22] Shir Frummerman, Guy Shani, Bracha Shapira, and Oren Sar Shalom. 2019. Are All Rejected Recommendations Equally Bad? Towards Analysing Rejected Recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization (Larnaca, Cyprus) (UMAP '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 157–165. doi:10.1145/3320435.3320448
- [23] Chongming Gao, Shijun Li, Wenqiang Lei, Jiawei Chen, Biao Li, Peng Jiang, Xiangnan He, Jiaxin Mao, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2022. KuaiRec: A Fully-observed Dataset and Insights for Evaluating Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '22)*. ACM, 540–550. doi:10.1145/3511808.3557220
- [24] Danil Gusak, Anna Volodkevich, Anton Klenitskiy, Alexey Vasilev, and Evgeny Frolov. 2025. Time to Split: Exploring Data Splitting Strategies for Offline Evaluation of Sequential Recommenders. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 874–883.
- [25] F. Maxwell Harper and Joseph A. Konstan. 2015. The MovieLens Datasets: History and Context. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.* 5, 4, Article 19 (Dec. 2015), 19 pages. doi:10.1145/2827872
- [26] Seyyed Hadi Hashemi, Jaap Kamps, Julia Kiseleva, Charles LA Clarke, and Ellen M Voorhees. 2016. Overview of the TREC 2016 Contextual Suggestion Track.. In *TREC*.
- [27] Balázs Hidasi and Ádám Tibor Czapp. 2023. The Effect of Third Party Implementations on Reproducibility. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '23)*. ACM, 272–282. doi:10.1145/3604915.3609487
- [28] Balázs Hidasi and Ádám Tibor Czapp. 2023. Widespread Flaws in Offline Evaluation of Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys '23)*. ACM, 848–855. doi:10.1145/3604915.3608839
- [29] Yupeng Hou, Junjie Zhang, Zihan Lin, Hongyu Lu, Ruobing Xie, Julian McAuley, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2024. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Rankers for Recommender Systems. *arXiv:2305.08845 [cs.LG]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08845>
- [30] Yitong Ji, Aixin Sun, Jie Zhang, and Chenliang Li. 2023. A Critical Study on Data Leakage in Recommender System Offline Evaluation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 41, 3 (Feb. 2023), 1–27. doi:10.1145/3569930
- [31] Walid Krichene and Steffen Rendle. 2020. On sampled metrics for item recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1748–1757.
- [32] Dawei Li, Renliang Sun, Yue Huang, Ming Zhong, Bohan Jiang, Jiawei Han, Xiangliang Zhang, Wei Wang, and Huan Liu. 2025. Preference leakage: A contamination problem in llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01534* (2025).
- [33] Jan Malte Lichtenberg, Alexander Buchholz, and Pola Schwöbel. 2024. Large language models as recommender systems: A study of popularity bias. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01285* (2024).
- [34] R.J.A. Little and D.B. Rubin. 2002. *Statistical analysis with missing data*. Wiley. <http://books.google.com/books?id=aYPwAAAMAAJ>
- [35] Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chengguang Zhu. 2023. G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634* (2023).
- [36] Hongyu Lu, Weizhi Ma, Min Zhang, Maarten De Rijke, Yiqun Liu, and Shaoping Ma. 2021. Standing in your shoes: External assessments for personalized recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1523–1533.
- [37] Sean MacAvaney, Craig Macdonald, and Iadh Ounis. 2022. Streamlining Evaluation with ir-measures. In *Advances in Information Retrieval - 44th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2022, Stavanger, Norway, April 10-14, 2022, Proceedings, Part II (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 13186)*, Matthias Hagen, Suzan Verberne, Craig Macdonald, Christin Seifert, Krisztian Balog, Kjetil Nørkvåg, and Vinay Setty (Eds.). Springer, 305–310. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-99739-7_38
- [38] Sean MacAvaney and Luca Soldaini. 2023. One-Shot Labeling for Automatic Relevance Estimation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '23)*. ACM, 2230–2235. doi:10.1145/3539618.3592032
- [39] Pablo Mateos and Alejandro Bellogin. 2024. A systematic literature review of recent advances on context-aware recommender systems. *Artificial Intelligence Review* 58, 1 (2024), 20.
- [40] Stefano Mizzaro. 1998. How many relevances in information retrieval? *Interacting with Computers* 10, 3 (1998), 303–320. doi:10.1016/S0953-5438(98)00012-5 HCI and Information Retrieval.
- [41] Shiyu Ni, Keping Bi, Jiafeng Guo, and Xueqi Cheng. 2025. How Knowledge Popularity Influences and Enhances LLM Knowledge Boundary Perception. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17537* (2025).
- [42] Gustavo Penha and Claudia Hauff. 2020. What does bert know about books, movies and music? probing bert for conversational recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM conference on recommender systems*. 388–397.

- [43] Bruno L Pereira, Alan Said, and Rodrygo LT Santos. 2025. On the Reliability of Sampling Strategies in Offline Recommender Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 360–369.
- [44] Hossein A. Rahmani, Clemencia Siro, Mohammad Aliannejadi, Nick Craswell, Charles L. A. Clarke, Guglielmo Faggioli, Bhaskar Mitra, Paul Thomas, and Emine Yilmaz. 2025. Judging the Judges: A Collection of LLM-Generated Relevance Judgements. arXiv:2502.13908 [cs.LR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.13908>
- [45] Marco Rossetti, Fabio Stella, and Markus Zanker. 2016. Contrasting Offline and Online Results when Evaluating Recommendation Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (Boston, Massachusetts, USA) (*RecSys '16*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 31–34. doi:10.1145/2959100.2959176
- [46] Alan Said and Alejandro Bellogín. 2014. Comparative recommender system evaluation: benchmarking recommendation frameworks. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Recommender systems*. 129–136.
- [47] Markus Schedl, Elisabeth Lex, and Marko Tkalcić. 2025. Psychological Aspects in Retrieval and Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 4114–4117.
- [48] Tobias Schnabel, Adith Swaminathan, Ashudeep Singh, Navin Chandak, and Thorsten Joachims. 2016. Recommendations as Treatments: Debiasing Learning and Evaluation. arXiv:1602.05352 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.05352>
- [49] Bruno Sguerra, Elena V Epure, Harin Lee, and Manuel Moussallam. 2025. Biases in LLM-Generated Musical Taste Profiles for Recommendation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 527–532.
- [50] Mark D Smucker and Houman Chamani. 2025. Extending MovieLens-32M to Provide New Evaluation Objectives. In *Proceedings of the 48th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 3520–3529.
- [51] Harald Steck. 2010. Training and testing of recommender systems on data missing not at random. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 713–722.
- [52] Aixin Sun. 2023. Take a fresh look at recommender systems from an evaluation standpoint. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2629–2638.
- [53] Aixin Sun. 2025. Are We Solving a Well-Defined Problem? A Task-Centric Perspective on Recommendation Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21188* (2025).
- [54] Zhu Sun, Di Yu, Hui Fang, Jie Yang, Xinghua Qu, Jie Zhang, and Cong Geng. 2020. Are we evaluating rigorously? benchmarking recommendation for reproducible evaluation and fair comparison. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 23–32.
- [55] Paul Thomas, Seth Spielman, Nick Craswell, and Bhaskar Mitra. 2024. Large language models can accurately predict searcher preferences. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1930–1940.
- [56] Kazutoshi Umemoto. 2022. ML-1M++: MovieLens-compatible additional preferences for more robust offline evaluation of sequential recommenders. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 4540–4544.
- [57] Shivani Upadhyay, Ronak Pradeep, Nandan Thakur, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Ian Soboroff, Hoa Trang Dang, and Jimmy Lin. 2024. A large-scale study of relevance assessments with large language models: An initial look. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.08275* (2024).
- [58] Ellen M Voorhees. 1998. Variations in relevance judgments and the measurement of retrieval effectiveness. In *Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 315–323.
- [59] Ellen M Voorhees. 2019. The evolution of cranfield. In *Information Retrieval Evaluation in a Changing World: Lessons Learned from 20 Years of CLEF*. Springer, 45–69.
- [60] Ellen M Voorhees, Nick Craswell, and Jimmy Lin. 2022. Too Many Relevant: Whither Cranfield Test Collections?. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2970–2980.
- [61] Zhuo Wu, Qinglin Jia, Chuhan Wu, Zhaocheng Du, Shuai Wang, Zan Wang, and Zhenhua Dong. 2024. RecSys Arena: Pair-wise Recommender System Evaluation with Large Language Models. arXiv:2412.11068 [cs.LR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.11068>
- [62] Cheng Xu, Shuhao Guan, Derek Greene, M Kechadi, et al. 2024. Benchmark data contamination of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04244* (2024).
- [63] Jiayi Ye, Yanbo Wang, Yue Huang, Dongping Chen, Qihui Zhang, Nuno Moniz, Tian Gao, Werner Geyer, Chao Huang, Pin-Yu Chen, et al. 2024. Justice or prejudice? quantifying biases in llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02736* (2024).
- [64] Wayne Xin Zhao, Shanlei Mu, Yupeng Hou, Zihan Lin, Yushuo Chen, Xingyu Pan, Kaiyuan Li, Yujie Lu, Hui Wang, Changxin Tian, Yingqian Min, Zhichao Feng, Xinyan Fan, Xu Chen, Pengfei Wang, Wendi Ji, Yaliang Li, Xiaoling Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. RecBole: Towards a Unified, Comprehensive and Efficient

Framework for Recommendation Algorithms. In *CIKM*. ACM, 4653–4664.