<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a chapter published in *Computational Social Network: Tools, Perspectives and Applications*.

Citation for the original published chapter:

Al Falahi, K., Mavridis, N., Atif, Y. (2012)
Social Networks and Recommendation Systems: A World of Current and Future Synergies.
In: Ajith Abraham, Aboul-Ella Hassanien (ed.), *Computational Social Network: Tools, Perspectives and Applications* (pp. 445-465). Springer London
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-4048-1_18

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published chapter.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:his:diva-12831>

Social Networks and Recommendation Systems: A World of Current and Future Synergies

Kanna Al Falahi¹, Nikolaos Mavridis² and Yacine Atif³

¹ UAE University, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates K.alfalahi@uaeu.ac.ae

² UAE University, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates NikolaosM@uaeu.ac.ae

³ UAE University, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates Yacine.Atif@uaeu.ac.ae

Summary. Recently, there has been a significant growth in the science of networks, as well as a big boom in Social Networking Sites (SNS), which has arguably had a great impact on multiple aspects of everyday life. Since the beginnings of the World Wide Web, another fast-growing field has been that of recommendation systems (RS), which has furthermore had a proven record of immediate financial importance, given that a well-targeted online recommendation often translates into an actual purchase. Although in their beginnings, both SNSs as well as RSs had largely separate paths as well as communities of researchers dealing with them, recently the almost immediate synergies arising from bringing the two together have started to become apparent in a number of real-world systems. However, this is just the beginning; and multiple potentially beneficial mutual synergies remain to be explored. In this chapter, after introducing the two fields, we will provide a survey of their existing interaction, as well as a forward-looking view on their potential future.

1 Introduction

Network Science, arguably having its beginnings in the 1700's with Euler's Seven Bridges of Knigsberg [1], has passed through a number of important stages, including the creation of graph theory [2], the sociogram and the advent of social network analysis [3], culminating to its recent boom and solidification as a discipline. Just a little after, some of the most important recent results, such as the development of scale-free networks [4], the first social networking sites (SNS), started to appear [5], and within less than a decade, FaceBook has more than 6% of the world's population as active users ⁴.

In parallel to these developments, since its early ARPAnet days (1969), the Internet, even more so after the creation of the world-wide-web (1991) and the widespread use of early graphical browsers (mosaic, 1993), has rapidly been utilized as an important platform for a host of activities that are essential to modern daily life: communication, information-seeking, education, as well as, quite importantly,

⁴ <http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics>

business and e-commerce. One of the most important aspects implicated in successful e-commerce, is the ability to identify products or services (items) in which people (users) might be interested in, to estimate their interest ratings, and then to recommend such items to users, in order to have the users potentially purchase the items.

This is the central problem that recommender systems (RS) are targeting and it is quite an important problem, for users, merchants, as well as society at large. When it comes to merchants, the immediate and tangible economic benefits of a successful recommendation in terms of increasing sales and creating revenue are obvious. When it comes to users (potential buyers), nowadays, they are often overwhelmed with a multitude of choices and options in their on-line business experiences, while at the same time they have limited resources and free time to invest in the selection process. Hence, there is an increasing need for using recommendation support to overcome this problem and provide users with personalized recommendations on different items such as books, movies, music and news. Furthermore, the basic ideas behind recommendation systems can be applied not only narrowly to purchasing and business, but can be extended to a wider context, for example within the social realm, in which such systems could recommend acquaintances for personal or professional relations, which could potentially increase collective social capital [6].

In terms of their underlying theory driving their implementation, Recommender Systems (RS), although having their roots in a number of disciplines, such as forecasting theories [7], information retrieval [8], approximation theory [9] and consumer choice modeling [10], started solidifying as an area in the nineties, and today are at the heart of many multi-billion dollar e-businesses, such as Amazon [11], Netflix and MovieLens [12]. At the heart of the problem of creating a successful recommendation, is the ability to generalize from known or estimated attributes of items and users, and possibly also from existing ratings, in order to predict yet unknown ratings of items from users, towards the ultimate goal of a successful purchase. Thus, in order to create such a successful recommendation, one needs to possess information (data) as well as processes (algorithms): the required information usually consists of a database of users and items, together with adequate attributal information about them, and possibly similarity spaces for the two domains (users and items), as well as an algorithmic / mathematical means of creating and updating predictions on the basis of this information.

And this is exactly the first obvious point of beneficial contact between social networking sites (SNS) and recommender systems (RS): there is a wealth of information about users, their attributes and preferences, as well as their relations, within social networking sites (Synergy I). Furthermore, a second easy observation that provides a strong basis for synergies has to do with Social Networking Sites as a popular locus for online life: users spend an important percentage of their online time [13] in SNS's. Thus, SNS's are an ideal platform, not only for gathering information useful for creating recommendations, but for actually presenting these recommendations to users (Synergy II). Furthermore, in social networking sites, there is a need for recommendation not only of products and services but of individuals or groups, with which the user can potentially become related to, in a personal or professional fashion. And this creates the third domain of strong potential synergies (Synergy III) between RS and SNS, as we shall discuss, together with other potential synergies.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows: Section II presents background on relevant research on social networks and sites, while Section III and Section IV

discusses recommendation systems with their underlying techniques and algorithms as well as the limitations in these systems. In Section V, after talking about shortcomings of recommendation systems, we discuss how these have been and can be potentially further addressed through their synergies with social networks, followed by a future work and conclusion in Section VI and Section VII.

2 Social Networks

In the traditional way, businesses use to reach consumers via advertisements through TV and radios cannot satisfy all users as they are generally broadcasted to all users regardless of their personal preferences. The online space provides more efficient approach by allowing users to view products based on their desires especially with the usage of social networks. The Web has become more social and data is generated in real-time. Famous social networks, such as Facebook and Twitter are good examples for such evolving social Web. These social network websites provide a rich environment for performing recommendations.

2.1 Social Networks Definition

Social networks are built from group of people who share the same interests, backgrounds and activities. In social networks, people can communicate with each other in many ways. They can socially share and upload files such as images, videos, and audios to their profiles. Social Networks are consists of nodes that are the actors in the network. These nodes might be a user, a company etc. The nodes are linked to each other through connections or ties. In social networks these connections represents the relationships between nodes as friendship, partnership, kinship etc. The number of nodes is changing and expanding specially on the web as new web pages and profiles created everyday [14].

There are different properties that social networks provide here we will define two main concepts:

1. Profiling where each user has his own profile which represents the user's preferences and interests
2. Linking between users, which make it easier to analyze relationships among users
3. The ease of data extraction from social network sites

User Profile

Usually individual corporations such as Google and Yahoo! moderate online social networks sites. Most of social networks provide their functionalities for free to the users. Though some social networks need the users to register in order to gain access to the full facilities of the website. Personal information about each user is stored in his/her profile. A profile is a collection of user information that shapes the user identity on the Internet [15]. These profiles contain information about the user as well as his/her interests.

User Connections

The main goal of social networks is to connect people, thus each user in a social network can establish a link with other users in the network. Figure 1 shows the different relationships occur in social networks. An example would be the concept of following in Twitter where a user (creator) can follow other users (targets). A full connection between the creator and the target is established if both are following each other. In the case of Twitter example, the full connection will allow additional functionalities such as the ability of sending private messages between users. Users create these connections in order to follow each other contributions specially if they are of the same interest.

Social Graphs

The Pattern of Social Relationships in Social Networks

Fig. 1. Social Graph: The Pattern of Social Relationships in Social Networks

Data Extraction

The ease of data extraction from social network sites, as many studies done in the field of data collection and extraction from social network where many datasets introduced. One dataset is presented in [16] where they introduced a social network data-set based on Facebook.com. They studied the users interest as well as the relationships between them.

Understanding the structure of social networks will help evaluating the strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats associated with them. Many such works have

been done in the field of social networks analytics. One of the most popular papers is by Milgram "The Small-World Problem" [17] where the earliest experiment about the six degrees of separation was investigated. Milgram studied the average path length for social networks in the United States and suggested that we live in a small world. Watts also studied the mathematical analyses of the small world structure [18] as he examined the small world systems and discussed the problem of measuring the distances in social world and he studied examples of real small-world networks.

3 Recommendation Techniques

In mid-90s recommender systems started to evolve as an independent research area as researchers started to focus on business ratings [19], [20], [21], [22]. The problem with recommender systems is related to rating items that have not been seen by the user. When the recommender can estimate the rating for these unrated items then it can recommend new and varied items to the users [19]. Different algorithms have been introduced over the last decade, both in academia and industry. Online vendors such as Amazon and Netflix, used some of these recommendation systems for commercial purposes. These systems are used to predict user's interest in a new item based on his previous ratings on other items. Customers become more satisfied when the system predicts more.

These companies invest in improving such systems to have accurate items recommendations. For example Netflix announced an open competition in 2006 with a prize of \$1,000,000 for the best algorithm that predicts user interests in a movie⁵. Recommender systems have attracted much attention since introducing the first papers in collaborative filtering [20], [21], [22], but they still need further improvement in order to produce more effective results [19]. These improvements include better methods to represent user behavior and improve the prediction accuracy. Recommender systems are now an important part of many e-commerce sites and in this chapter we will study the current methods of recommendation systems for social networks with their different limitations.

In general, recommendation environment can be represented as follows [19]: Let U be the set of all users and let I be the set of all items that can be recommended. The spaces U and I can be very large as the number of users and items respectively might be over a million in some cases [19]. u is the user for whom recommendation needs to be generated and i is some item for which we would like to predict u 's preferences. And let f be the utility function that measures the importance of item i to user u ($f: U \times I \rightarrow R$), where R is a set of nonnegative ordered values within a specific range, where the utility function for a specific item is represented by ratings. We need to select the item $i' \in I$ that maximizes each user $u \in U$ utility. This can be represented through the following formula.

$$\forall u \in U, i'_u = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in I} f(u, i) \quad (1)$$

There are different ways to calculate the utility function. It can be defined by the user or calculated by an application [19]. User ratings are triplets (u, i, r) where r is the value assigned by the user u , to a particular item i . Usually this value is

⁵ <http://www.netflixprize.com>

a fixed subset of the real numbers or a binary variable. In the users space U , each user is represented by a profile that includes different attributes such as the user ID, age, gender, income, etc. a simple profile could contain the user ID only. Also each item in the items space I is represented by a set of characteristics. For example when recommending books each book can be represented by its ID, title, author, etc. Figure 2 shows the users and items in the $U \times I$ space.

Fig. 2. Users and Items in the $U \times I$ space

The problem with recommender systems is that the utility function f is not defined on the whole space $U \times I$ but on part of it [19]. When the utility function is

represented by ratings generated by the users then the users will rate items that they previously seen while the other set of items is still unexplored and unrated. An example of user-item rating matrix is represented in Table 1 for a book recommendation application as on Amazon.com. Ratings are scaled from 1 to 5. The symbol ϕ indicate that the user did not rate the corresponding book. Therefore, the recommender system must predict the missing ratings for each user-book combination and perform an appropriate recommendation based on that.

Table 1. A Fragment of A Rating Matrix For A Book Recommender System

User	Freedom	The Warmth of Other Suns	Unbroken	Matterhorn
John	1	5	4	ϕ
Alice	3	3	5	2
Mark	ϕ	4	ϕ	4
Bill	4	5	1	3

The problem of unrated has been approached in two different ways: (1) specifying heuristics that define the utility function and empirically validating its performance and (2) estimating the utility function that optimizes certain performance criterion, such as the mean square error. Recommender systems are classified according to their way of estimating unrated ratings. Next we will present the different classifications and will survey these different techniques used to perform recommendations. Table 2 summarizes the recommendation techniques used in content-based recommendation and collaborative recommendation . Recommendation systems are classified into the following types [9]:

1. Content-based recommendations
2. Collaborative recommendations
3. Hybrid approaches

Table 2. Recommendation Techniques

Technique	Background	User Input	Process
Content-Based	Features on items in I	U 's ratings of items in I	Generate a classifier that fits u 's ratings behavior and use it on i
Collaborative	Ratings from U on items in I	Ratings from u on items in I	Identify users in U similar to u , and extrapolate from their ratings on i

3.1 Content-based Recommendation

In content-based recommendation users are recommended items based on their previous preferences [23], [24], [25]. In another way the utility function $f(u, i)$ of an item i for a user u can be estimated based on the ratings assigned by the user u to all the items $i_n \in I$ that are similar to item i . For example, to recommend a book i to user u , the content-based recommender system will get the previously rated books by user u and then the books with highest similarity to the user preferences are recommended. In content-based recommenders the recommendation is based on the item itself rather than the preferences of other users [26], [24], [23]. Moreover, in this approach users can help the system in providing initial ratings and the system can build a unique characteristic for the users preferences without matching them with someone else's interests [24]. Figure 3 represent the content-based recommendation approach.

A typical system would show a summary of items to the user and allow the user to click on an item to get detailed information. For example, Amazon.com would present a page with books summary then the user would select one book to read the details and purchase the book if interested. As web sites represent the items in a graphical way, but in the server these items are stored in databases. As we said earlier there could be millions of items in the database, so we need to find a way to show part of them to the user [27].

Content-based systems are based on previous researches done in the field of information retrieval, so they focuses on recommending items that contains textual information as in documents and web sites (URLs) [19]. They improved over the traditional information retrieval approaches by using user profiles [19], which contain information about the user tastes and preferences. These profiles can be generated using implicit (learning from users behaviors) or explicit (through questionnaires) approaches. Items are stored usually in databases. Each item is represented by a set of variables, attributes or characteristics. And each record will contain a value for each attribute. The table uses a unique identifier for each item to distinguish items that have common values such as title. The data is called structured if the items are described by the same set of attributes and the value range of these attributes is known [27]. The data is unstructured if there is no attribute names with well-defined values. Instead they contain a paragraph or a text that describes the item, such as news articles Analyzing natural language is very complex as the same word could have many meanings. For example Grey would represent a color and a name, and power and electricity would refer to the same thing. Some data is represented in a semi-structured way as they have some attributes with defined values and free text fields [27].

As we mentioned before content-based recommender uses text-based items. The content of these items is represented through keywords. One example is LIBRA which is a content-based book recommender proposed by [24] that uses information extraction techniques in order to extract information from Amazon for each title. Also in Fab System [28] the content is represented by the most 100 major words in order to recommend web pages to users. Similarly, [29] they represented items through keywords and the Syskill and Webert system [23] represents documents with the 128 most informative words. The importance of a keyword in a document can be measured by using some weighting measures such as term frequency/inverse

Fig. 3. Content-based Recommendations

document frequency (TF-IDF) measure [8], [30]. The TF-IDF value for a keyword k in a document d is defined as follows:

$$w_{k,d} = tf_{k,d} * \log\left(\frac{n}{df_i}\right) \quad (2)$$

Where $tf_{k,d}$ is the number of occurrences of k in d , N is the total number of documents and df_i is the number of documents containing k . Other methods presented in [31], they represent each term t by a distribution of terms (vector) that is typical for the documents in which t occur. Limitation of content-based recommender will be described in the discussion section.

3.2 Collaborative Recommendations

In collaborative recommendations the user is recommended items that people with similar tastes and preferences liked in the past [32], [21]. In another words the utility $f(u,i)$ of item i for user u can be estimated based on the ratings assigned to item i by users $u_n \in U$ who are similar to u . For example, to recommend a book i to user u , the collaborative recommender system will find the set of users who share the same interest in books with user u then the books that are most liked by the similar users is recommended to user u . Figure 4 shows the collaborative recommendation approach. The first collaborative recommender system is Grundy [14], which uses stereotypes to build models for users by building the individual user models and then use them to recommend books to each user. Another system is Tapestry that uses individual users to identify other similar users manually [15]. GroupLens [33] also one of the first groups who started to use collaborative filtering for Usenet news. Other early collaborative filtering recommender systems are Video Recommender [20] and Ringo [22]. Other recommender systems proposed such as Amazon.com book recommendation systems, PHOAKS that is used to help people find information on the WWW [34] and the joke recommender system Jester [35].

Collaborative recommendation can be divided into two categories: (1) Memory-based and (2) Model-based. In memory-based algorithms [32], [36],[37], [21], [22] the unknown rating of an item i for a user u is calculated based on the ratings of other users, who are similar to user u , for the same item i . The similarity between users is calculated as a distance measures. Different user similarity measures could be used as long as the result is normalized with a normalization factor [19]. One of the similarity measures that could be used is the correlation where Pearson correlation coefficient is used to measure similarity [21], [22]. Another similarity measure is cosine-based [32], [25] where the two users are represented as two vector in m -dimensional space and the similarity is measured by computing the cosine angle between them [19]. Model-based algorithms [38], [32], [39], [35], [40], [41], [42], [43] use ratings to build a model, which is used then in predictions [19]. Different approaches are introduced to learn the model such as [32] that proposed two probabilistic models: cluster model (where similar users are clustered into classes) and Bayesian network, where the rating value of each item is determined through the states of each node. Statistical model is proposed in [43] where they compared different algorithms such as K-means and Gibbs sampling that are used to predict the model parameters. Other collaborative filtering techniques are proposed such as Bayesian model [44], probabilistic relational model [39], linear regression [25], and maximum entropy model [42]. The main difference between memory-based and model based is that model-based algorithms estimates the ratings through using statistical and machine learning approaches to learn a model from the underlying data, while memory-based uses some heuristic rules to predict the ratings. It is possible to combine both techniques [45] (memory-based and model-based), which will result in more reliable recommendations than using one technique alone. Collaborative recommendation systems also suffer from their limitations as mentioned in [28] and [46]. We will describe these limitations in the discussion section.

Fig. 4. Collaborative Recommendations

3.3 Hybrid recommendations

In hybrid recommendations the systems use a combination of collaborative and content-based methods that tries to get over the limitations of content-based and collaborative systems by combining them [28]. These systems can be classified according to the following list [19]:

1. Implementing collaborative and content-based methods separately and then combining their predictions
2. Integrate some of the content-based features into a collaborative approach
3. Integrate some of the collaborative features into a content-based approach
4. Combines both collaborative and content-based methods

1) Implementing collaborative and content-based methods separately and then combining their predictions In this type of hybrid recommendation, content-based and collaborative systems are implemented separately then the recommendation results are combined using linear combination, ratings [47] or voting scheme [48]. Some quality metrics could be applied to choose the best way that give recommendation with quality.

2) Integrate some of the content-based features into a collaborative approach Many hybrid recommendation systems such as Fab [28] and collaboration via content [48] are using the traditional collaboration with the aid of content-based approach for maintaining users profiles. These profiles are used then to measure similarity between users. This will solve different problems as when not many users have enough number of commonly rated items [48]. Also users will be recommended items directly when the items have high score against the user profile [28].

3) Integrate some of the collaborative features into a content-based approach The dimensionality reduction technique on content-based profiles is the most used approach in this kind of recommendations. Users profiles are represented as vectors and some normalization techniques is used to reduce the dimensionality as in [49] that uses latent semantic indexing (LSI) to create a collaborative view of a collection of user profiles which results in improving the performance that using only content-based approach.

4) Combines both collaborative and content-based methods Many researchers use this approach as they propose to combine collaborative and content-based approaches as in [50], [51] where a combined probabilistic method is proposed to combine collaborative and content-based recommendations. Knowledge-based techniques [52] could be used in hybrid recommendation to address some of the limitations such as new user and new item problems [19]. One example of knowledge-based recommendation systems is Entre [53] that uses the knowledge cuisines and food to recommend restaurants to the users. Just these types suffer from the need for knowledge acquisition [19].

Different researchers [28], [48], [49] and [54] compared the performance of hybrid recommendations against the collaborative and content-based approaches. They found that hybrid approaches can provide more accurate recommendations than using just collaborative or content-based methods [19].

4 Recommendation Systems Limitations

There are different limitations for using recommender systems . The most two distinct but related well problems are new user and new item problems. A new user with few ratings becomes hard to recognize in recommender systems . Similarly a new item with few ratings cannot be easily recognized by the recommendation system, so there is a need to encourage users to rate items in such systems [53]. In this section we will discuss these limitations for each recommendation technique and we discuss how to extend these systems.

4.1 Content-based Recommendation

Content and Keywords Limitations

To perform content-based recommendation, the system needs the list of important keywords associated to an item. To find this list, items contents need to be represented in a format that is automatically parsed by computers as in texts or assign the keywords manually to the items [19]. Keyword extraction techniques such as information retrieval are used in recommendation systems. But these techniques cannot be applied on data types other than texts such as video, audio or graphics, which lead to a limitation in content-based recommendation systems. Another problem occur when two items assigned the same set of keywords, which makes them indistinguishable since the content-based systems uses these keywords to predict recommendations. Using the same set of keywords will lead to inaccurate results as the systems will not be able to distinguish between well written book for example and badly written book [22].

Insufficient Recommendations for New Users

To have accurate a reliable recommendations the user need to rate sufficient number of items, as this is the base for content-based recommendations. The system will not be able to predict good recommendations if the user is new in the system and he rated few items.

4.2 Collaborative Recommendation

Insufficient Recommendations for New Users

As with the content-based recommendation, in order for the system to predict accurate recommendations it needs first to understand the user's preferences based on the ratings he gave. Researchers used different ways to solve this problem, such as using hybrid recommendation approaches through combining content-based and collaborative based techniques as discussed in Section II: Recommendation Techniques.

Insufficient Ratings for New Users

Collaborative recommender systems are perform recommendation based on users preferences, so for a new item to be seen and recommended by the system a sustainable number of users must rate it. Hybrid recommendation approaches also used to solve this problem as discussed in Section II: Recommendation Techniques.

5 Recommendation Systems in Social Networks

5.1 What Can Social Networks Provide to Recommender Systems?

In our daily life we rely on recommendations from other acquaintances to choose the best products to buy. Nowadays people are depending on the Internet to make their

decisions. The Internet alone could not provide the users with sufficient suggestions for their needs as it contains many products and services. So social networks becomes pivotal for generating recommendations, as integrating recommender systems in social networks will add new intuitions and observation that can not be achieved through using traditional recommenders. Which produce more accurate and efficient recommendations results. We will summaries these intuitions in the following points: 1) relations between users 2) improve performance 3) better recommendation for unrated Items 4) user content-based as recommendation source.

Relations Between Users (Social Influences)

Traditional recommender systems do not take the social relationships between users into consideration [55] even though the studies of measuring the importance of social influence [56], [57] has been performed long time ago. When friends tend to recommend products other friends will accept these recommendations most of the times, as they trust each other. Businesses that adopted in their recommender systems the relation between human gain huge success. For example, Hotmail used social influence to achieve 12million subscriber just in 18 months with a marketing budget of \$50,000 US dollars. Hotmail spread allover the world even in countries they did not make any advertisements such as Sweden and India [58]. This shows that people relations are powerful when making decision on buying products [55].

Improve performance

Integrating social networks will improve the performance of recommender systems on different levels as 1) prediction accuracy and 2) similarity between friends [55].

Prediction Accuracy

Understanding the relations between users and their friends as well as the information obtained about them can improve the knowledge about users behaviors and ratings [55]. As a result, predicting users preferences will become easier to infer. Which will improve the prediction accuracy.

Similarity between friends

Through using social networks recommender systems will no longer need to use similarity measures in order to measure the similarity between users [55]. When two people are friends, in social networks, we can infer that they share the same interest.

Better recommendation for unrated items

When integrating recommendation systems with social networks, the recommender system will be able to recommend items to users even if they have not rated them. This happens based on the preferences of the user's friends [55].

User Content-based as recommendation Source

There are two main sources for traditional recommender systems, which are the free-text-fields and the ratings [59]. Comments are used in e-commerce websites to increase the revenue [60], [61], they allow users to get the experience of other users with a certain product [62]. Which make this method very popular to be integrated in e-commerce websites. But those customers reviews are not accurate as a study showed that the ratings are either of extremely high or extremely low [63]. For that some studies proposed to use social networks as a data source [59]. They used different text mining techniques, as well as web logs and trustful social networks for allowing the customers to get accurate and satisfaction reviews.

5.2 How Can Recommender Systems Use Social Networks to Perform Recommendations?

The different properties of social networks encourage the research in the field recommender systems integration with social networks. These studies are varied and spread over wide areas such as, network value, trust, social tagging, etc.

There are different studies [64], [65] for measuring the network value from analyzing the ability of the customers to influence their friends to buy new products. According to [64] the customers with high influence could leverage the profit of the company.

Trust is also another field related to integrating recommender systems with social networks. It is defined by [66] as the level of subjective probability where each agent helps another agent to accomplish a future behavior. And in social networks the users prefer to get recommendations from their friends. The social relations between users in social networks infer new studies in the field of recommending with trust. People prefer to get recommendations from their friends rather than from a general recommender system [67] moreover users prefer to get recommendations from trusted systems [68] and there is a strong relationship between users similarity and trust [69]. In [70] they proposed a distributed trust-based recommendation system on a social network. In their method the social network need to have friendship-trust values associated with each field. Then they used a model to compute the trust values between non-adjacent nodes. Each node is assigned a knowledge base to list the vendor preferences (assigned with rating) that the node has for various products and services.

5.3 Recommending Users and Groups

In social networking sites, there is a need for recommending users or groups with which the user can potentially become related to, in a personal or professional fashion. There are many researches related to recommending users. Most of these researches build their models based on Facebook and Twitter as they are the most well known social networks nowadays. One research [71] proposed Twittomender that recommends twitter users to each other. They used content-based to check the content of the tweets and collaborative filtering to check the followees and followers of users as well as some hybrid strategies to perform the recommendation. In [72] they implemented a system to recommend friends on MySpace. They address issues

related to the size of the graph, as it was very huge, keeping the graph up-to-date and producing friends recommendations using the graph. The system consists of the friend graph manager that manages corresponding portion of the friend graph, the recommendation generator, the recommendation repository manager and the feedback manager. The challenge with recommending users is how to preserve the privacy of those users specially with the increasing of identity theft and web crimes. If the users do not trust the systems there will be missing attributes that will weaken the generated recommendations.

6 Future Works

Recommender systems have bright future especially when they combined with social networks. These social networks can provide real time information, relations and connections between different users in the network. Moreover social networks improved the recommendation systems and leveraged them to a new level. So there is a need to study these social networks to understand more the different relations between users. Recommender systems are used now in many businesses to allow businesses to increase traffic, have greater engagement with users, customize the user experience and gain financial benefits [73]. These recommendation systems will have potential importance in the future and would be used in 1) engines that identify content on the Internet, 2) the entertainment industry where everything will move to on-demand, and 3) advertisement industry [73]. Moreover, adding recommendation systems to search engines will generate a new area in which recommendation systems would grow. In our future work we will extend the chapter to cover more issues in recommendation systems such as social tagging, scalability and privacy as these are important issues that need to be addressed and studied extensively.

7 Conclusion

Many researches have been done in the field of recommendation systems that helped in improving such systems to produce accurate recommendation results. Social networks and virtual communities with their capabilities of providing user profiles and relations between users added a new way of performing recommendations. In this chapter we presented social networks and recommendation systems. Recommendation systems are used in many applications and industrial companies such as Amazon [11] and MovieLens [12]. We discussed the different techniques used for recommendations and categorized them as follows: 1) content-based recommendations 2) collaborative recommendations and 3) Hybrid recommendations. There are limitations in content-based and collaborative recommendations. Hybrid recommendations are used to address the problems of collaborative and content-base approaches such as new user and new item problems. We also discussed the importance of integrating recommendation systems in social networks and what are the different researches done in that field. Real-life recommender systems are very complex and therefore need advanced techniques that can consider many factors during the recommendation process. This leads to the need for developing more advanced recommendation systems that can satisfy the customers by providing accurate recommendation based on the different preferences of these users.

References

1. G. Alexanderson, “Euler and Königsberg’s bridges: a historical view”, *Bulletin (New Series) of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 567–573, 2006.
2. D.B. West, *Introduction to Graph Theory*, Prentice Hall, second edition, September 2000.
3. S. Wasserman and K. Faust, *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
4. R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, “Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks”, *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 86, no. 14, pp. 3200–3203, 2001.
5. D. Boyd and N. Ellison, “Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship”, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 210–230, 2007.
6. J. Chen, W. Geyer, C. Dugan, M. Muller, and I. Guy, “Make new friends, but keep the old: Recommending people on social networking sites”, in *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2009, CHI ’09, pp. 201–210, ACM Press.
7. J.S. Armstrong, *Principles of Forecasting: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
8. G. Salton, *Automatic Text Processing: the Transformation, Analysis and Retrieval of Information by Computer*, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1989.
9. M.J.D. Powell, *Approximation Theory and Methods*, Cambridge University Press, 1981.
10. R. Thaler, “Toward a positive theory of consumer choice”, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 39–60, March 1980.
11. G. Linden, B. Smith, and J. York, “Amazon.com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering”, *IEEE Internet Computing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 76–80, 2003.
12. B.N. Miller, I. Albert, S.K. Lam, J.A. Konstan, and J. Riedl, “Movielens unplugged: Experiences with an occasionally connected recommender system”, in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Intelligent user interfaces*. 2003, IUI ’03, pp. 263–266, ACM Press.
13. S. Bellman, G.H. Lohse, and E.J. Johnson, “Predictors of online buying behavior”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 32–38, 1999.
14. E. Rich, “User modeling via stereotypes”, *Cognitive Science*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 329–354, 1979.
15. D. Goldberg, D. Nichols, B. M. Oki, and D. Terry, “Using collaborative filtering to weave an information tapestry”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 61–70, 1992.
16. K. Lewis, J. Kaufman, M. Gonzalez, A. Wimmer, and N. Christakis, “Tastes, ties, and time: A new social network dataset using facebook.com”, *Social Networks*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 330–342, October 2008.
17. S. Milgram, “The small-world problem”, *Psychology Today*, vol. 2, pp. 60–67, 1967.
18. D.J. Watts, *Small Worlds: The Dynamics of Networks between Order and Randomness*, Princeton University Press, illustrated edition, November 1999.
19. G. Adomavicius and A. Tuzhilin, “Toward the next generation of recommender systems: A survey of the state-of-the-art and possible extensions”, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 734–749, 2005.

20. W. Hill, L. Stead, M. Rosenstein, and G. Furnas, "Recommending and evaluating choices in a virtual community of use", in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. 1995, pp. 194–201, ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
21. P. Resnick, N. Iacovou, M. Suchak, P. Bergstrom, and J. Riedl, "GroupLens: an open architecture for collaborative filtering of netnews", in *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*. 1994, CSCW '94, pp. 175–186, ACM Press.
22. U. Shardanand and P. Maes, "Social information filtering: Algorithms for automating 'word of mouth'", in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1995, pp. 210–217, ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
23. M. Pazzani and D. Billsus, "Learning and revising user profiles: The identification of interesting web sites", *Machine Learning*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 313–331, June 1997.
24. R.J. Mooney and L. Roy, "Content-based book recommending using learning for text categorization", in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Conference on Digital Libraries*. 2000, DL '00, pp. 195–204, ACM Press.
25. B. Sarwar, G. Karypis, J. Konstan, and J. Reidl, "Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms", in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on World Wide Web*. 2001, WWW '01, pp. 285–295, ACM Press.
26. K. Lang, "Newsweeder: Learning to filter netnews", in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1995, pp. 331–339, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
27. M. Pazzani and D. Billsus, "Content-based recommendation systems", in *The Adaptive Web Methods and Strategies of Web Personalization*, P. Brusilovsky, A. Kobsa, and W. Nejdl, Eds., vol. 4321, pp. 325–341. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2007.
28. M. Balabanovi and Y. Shoham, "Fab: Content-based, collaborative recommendation", *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 66–72, March 1997.
29. Y. Cai, H.-F. Leung, Q. Li, J. Tang, and J. Li, "Recommendation based on object typicality", in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge management*. 2010, CIKM '10, pp. 1529–1532, ACM Press.
30. I. Cantador, A. Bellogín, and D. Vallet, "Content-based recommendation in social tagging systems", in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 2010, RecSys '10, pp. 237–240, ACM Press.
31. C. Wartena, W. Slakhorst, and M. Wibbels, "Selecting keywords for content-based recommendation", in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2010, CIKM '10, pp. 1533–1536, ACM Press.
32. J. S. Breese, D. Heckerman, and C. Kadie, "Empirical analysis of predictive algorithms for collaborative filtering", in *Proceedings of the 14th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, G. F. Cooper and S. Moral, Eds., 1998, UAI-98, pp. 43–52.
33. J.A. Konstan, B.N. Miller, D. Maltz, J.L. Herlocker, L.R. Gordon, and J. Riedl, "GroupLens: Applying collaborative filtering to usenet news", *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 77–87, 1997.

34. L. Terveen, W. Hill, B. Amento, D. McDonald, and J. Creter, “Phoaks: A system for sharing recommendations”, *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 59–62, 1997.
35. K. Goldberg, T. Roeder, D. Gupta, and C. Perkins, “Eigentaste: A constant time collaborative filtering algorithm”, *Information Retrieval Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 133–151, July 2001.
36. J. Delgado and N. Ishii, “Memory-based weighted majority prediction for recommender systems”, in *ACM SIGIR’99 Workshop on Recommender Systems: Algorithms and Evaluation*, 1999.
37. A. Nakamura and N. Abe, “Collaborative filtering using weighted majority prediction algorithms”, in *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1998, ICML ’98, pp. 395–403, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
38. D. Billsus and M.J. Pazzani, “Learning collaborative information filters”, in *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1998, ICML ’98, pp. 46–54, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
39. L. Getoor and M. Sahami, “Using probabilistic relational models for collaborative filtering”, in *Proceedings Workshop on Web Usage Analysis and User Profiling*, 1999, WEBKDD ’99.
40. T. Hofmann, “Collaborative filtering via gaussian probabilistic latent semantic analysis”, in *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Informaion Retrieval*. 2003, SIGIR ’03, pp. 259–266, ACM Press.
41. B. Marlin, “Modeling user rating profiles for collaborative filtering”, in *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2003, NIPS ’03, MIT Press.
42. D. Pavlov and D. M. Pennock, “A maximum entropy approach to collaborative filtering in dynamic, sparse, high-dimensional domains”, in *NIPS*, S. Becker, S. Thrun, and K. Obermayer, Eds. 2002, pp. 1441–1448, MIT Press.
43. L. Ungar and D. Foster, “Clustering methods for collaborative filtering”, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Recommender Systems at the 15th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. July 1998, AAAI’98, AAAI Press.
44. Y.H. Chien and E.I. George, “A bayesian model for collaborative filtering”, in *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1999.
45. D. Pennock, E. Horvitz, S. Lawrence, and L.C. Giles, “Collaborative filtering by personality diagnosis: A hybrid memory- and model-based approach”, in *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2000, UAI 2000, pp. 473–480.
46. Wee S. Lee, “Collaborative learning for recommender systems”, in *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2001, vol. 2001 of *ICML-2001*, pp. 314–321, McGraw-Hill.
47. M. Claypool, A. Gokhale, T. Miranda, P. Murnikov, D. Netes, and M. Sartin, “Combining content-based and collaborative filters in an online newspaper”, in *Proceedings of ACM SIGIR Workshop on Recommender Systems*, 1999, SIGIR ’99.
48. M. Pazzani, “A framework for collaborative, content-based and demographic filtering”, *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 13, no. 5/6, pp. 393–408, December 1999.

49. I. Soboroff and C. Nicholas, "Combining content and collaboration in text filtering", in *Proceedings of the IJCAI-99 Workshop on Machine Learning for Information Filtering*, 1999.
50. A. Popescul, L.H. Ungar, D.M. Pennock, and S. Lawrence, "Probabilistic models for unified collaborative and content-based recommendation in sparse-data environments", in *Proceedings of the 17th Conference in Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. 2001, UAI '01, pp. 437–444, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
51. A.I. Schein, A. Popescul, L.H. Ungar, and D.M. Pennock, "Methods and metrics for cold-start recommendations", in *Proceedings of the 25th Annual International ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2002, SIGIR '02, pp. 253–260, ACM Press.
52. R. Burke, "Knowledge-based recommender systems", in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Systems*. 2000, vol. 69, Marcel Dekker Inc.
53. R. Burke, "Hybrid recommender systems: Survey and experiments", *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 331–370, November 2002.
54. P. Melville, R.J. Mooney, and R. Nagarajan, "Content-boosted collaborative filtering for improved recommendations", in *Proceedings of the 18th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2002, AAAI2002, pp. 187–192.
55. J. He and W.W. Chu, "A social network-based recommender system (snrs)", *Annals of Information Systems: Special Issue on Data Mining for Social Network Data (AIS-DMSND)*, vol. 12, 2010.
56. M.R. Subramani and B. Rajagopalan, "Knowledge-sharing and influence in online social networks via viral marketing", *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 300–307, December 2003.
57. S. Yang and G.M. Allenby, "Modeling interdependent consumer preferences", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 282–294, August 2003.
58. S. Jurvetson, "What exactly is viral marketing?", *Red Herring*, vol. 78, pp. 110–112, 2000.
59. M. Bank and J. Franke, "Social networks as data source for recommendation systems in: E-commerce and web technologies", *Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing*, vol. 61, pp. 49–60, 2010.
60. N. Hu, L. Liu, and J. J. Zhang, "Do online reviews affect product sales? the role of reviewer characteristics and temporal effects", *Information Technology Management*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 201–214, 2008.
61. A. Ghose and P.G. Ipeirotis, "Designing novel review ranking systems: Predicting the usefulness and impact of reviews", in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Electronic Commerce*. 2007, ICEC '07, pp. 303–310, ACM Press.
62. S. David and T. J. Pinch, "Six degrees of reputation: The use and abuse of online review and recommendation systems", *First Monday*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2005.
63. N. Hu, P.A. Pavlou, and J. Zhang, "Can online reviews reveal a product's true quality?: Empirical findings and analytical modeling of online word-of-mouth communication", in *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*. 2006, EC '06, pp. 324–330, ACM Press.
64. P. Domingos and M. Richardson, "Mining the network value of customers", in *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2001, KDD '01, pp. 57–66, ACM Press.
65. M. Richardson and P. Domingos, "Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing", in *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2002, KDD '02, pp. 61–70, ACM.

66. D. Gambetta, “Can we trust trust?”, in *Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations*. 1988, pp. 213–237, Basil Blackwell Publishers.
67. R. Sinha and K. Swearingen, “Comparing recommendations made by online systems and friends”, in *Proceedings of the DELOS-NSF Workshop on Personalization and Recommender Systems in Digital Libraries*, 2001.
68. K. Swearingen and R. Sinha, “Beyond algorithms: An HCI perspective on recommender systems”, in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR 2001 Workshop on Recommender Systems*. 2001, ACM Press.
69. C.N. Ziegler and G. Lausen, “Analyzing correlation between trust and user similarity in online communities”, in *Proceeding of the 2nd International Conference on Trust Management*. 2004, vol. 2995, pp. 251–265, Springer Berlin / Heidelberg.
70. K. Sarda, P. Gupta, D. Mukherjee, S. Padhy, and H. Saran, “A distributed trust-based recommendation system on social networks”, in *Proceedings of the 2nd IEEE Workshop on Hot Topics in Web Systems and Technologies*, 2008.
71. J. Hannon, M. Bennett, and B. Smyth, “Recommending twitter users to follow using content and collaborative filtering approaches”, in *Proceedings of the fourth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 2010, RecSys ’10, pp. 199–206, ACM Press.
72. M. Moricz, Y. Dosbayev, and M. Berlyant, “Pymk: Friend recommendation at myspace”, in *Proceedings of the 2010 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2010, SIGMOD ’10, pp. 999–1002, ACM Press.
73. I. Guy, A. Jaimes, P. Agulló, P. Moore, P. Nandy, C. Nastar, and H. Schinzel, “Will recommenders kill search?: Recommender systems - an industry perspective”, in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM conference on Recommender Systems*. 2010, RecSys ’10, pp. 7–12, ACM Press.

Index

Collaborative Filtering, 5, 10, 15

Collaborative Recommendation, 7, 10, 13

Content-based Recommendation, 7, 8, 12, 13

Hybrid Recommendation, 11, 13

Recommender Systems, 2, 5–7, 10, 12–16

Social Networks, 3, 4, 13–15