International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology
© 2019 IJSRCSEIT | Volume 5 | Issue 1 | ISSN : 2456-3307
DOI : 10.32628/CSEIT195251

# A Review Study on Various Recommender System Techniques

**Piyush Anil Bodhankar[1], Rajesh K Nasare[2]**

[1]M. Tech Scholar, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Rajiv Gandhi College of Engineering and Research, Nagpur, Maharashtra

[2]Assistant professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Rajiv Gandhi College of Engineering and Research Nagpur

## ABSTRACT

Numerous customers like to utilize the Web to find product subtleties as online surveys. Different customers and authorities give these audits. User-given audits are winding up increasingly pervasive. Recommender systems give an essential reaction to the data over-burden issue as it presents users increasingly useful and personalized data administrations. Shared sifting methods play an indispensable part in recommender systems as they create fantastic recommendations by affecting the likings of the society of comparable users.

**Keywords:** Recommender Systems, Data Mining, Algorithms.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recommender systems give guidance about products, data or administrations users may be interested in. Recommendation systems produce a positioned rundown of things on which a user may be interested. Recommendation systems are built for films, books, networks, news, articles and so forth. They are astute applications to help users in a basic leadership process where they need to pick one thing among a conceivably overpowering arrangement of elective products or administrations. Recommender systems are personalized data filtering innovation used to either anticipate whether a specific user will like a specific thing or to recognize a lot of N things that will be of interest to a specific user. It is not important that an audit is similarly valuable to all users. The survey system enables users to assess an audit's help by giving a score that ranges from "not supportive" to "generally accommodating". On the off chance that a specific audit is perused by all users and found accommodating, at that point it tends to be accepted that new user may welcome it. Disputable surveys are the audits that have an assortment of clashing rating (positioning). Dubious survey has both energetic adherents and propelled adversary without clear lion's share in either gathering. The Recommender System utilizes data from user profile and communication to tell conceivable things of concern. It is valuable to inexact how much explicit user will like a particular product. The Recommender systems are valuable in anticipating the supportiveness of dubious surveys [1].

Recommender systems are a ground-breaking new innovation for separating extra an incentive for a business from its user databases. These systems help users to discover things they need to purchase from a business. Recommender systems advantage users by empowering them to find things they like. They help the business by producing more deals. Recommender systems are quickly turning into a vital instrument in E-trade on the Web. This paper is sorted out as pursues. Area 2 clarifies related work in recommendation systems classes. Area 3 presents regularly utilized recommendation procedures. Segment 4 finishes up the paper.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### *A. Recommender System Categories*

#### 1) Ontological-Based Recommender Systems

Decentralized architectures, like peer-to-peer (P2P) networks, have inspired the progress of ontological-based recommender systems [2]. The distributed neighbourhood-based recommender System is introduced which contains an epidemic-style protocol that preserves areas of like-minded users, and distributes information in a robust. This is done without any central involvement & in a dynamically changing large-scale environment. In [3], a multilayer semantic social network model is introduced. This model defines a system from different viewpoints. This recognizes a set of users having similar interest that correlate at different semantic levels. In [4] the concept of user contexts is used which corresponds to the different ranks of specificity to ontology. It creates a recommendation from the set of items most charged by the user and which can adjust to the level of specificity of the information presented to the user.

#### 2) Recommenders in Collaborative Tagging Systems

In [5], the construction of collaborative tagging is evaluated. The collaborative tagging allows anyone particularly consumers to freely connect keywords or tags to data or content. It has also determined consistency in user activity, tag frequencies, kinds of tags used etc. It describes dynamical model of collaborative tagging that calculate stable patterns and narrates them to replication and shared knowledge. [6] It introduces a generic model of collaborative tagging to recognize the dynamics behind it. It has observed the distribution of frequency of use of tags. The generic model uses power law distribution of tags. It combines model of tagging with feedback cycles & information value to generate stable distribution of tags. The collaborative tag suggestions algorithm uses score for each user. It actually defines a set of criteria for good tagging system. The tag suggestion uses this criterion to find high quality tags. They have eliminated noise & spam.

### *B. Recommendation Strategies*

The methods used for recommendations can be content based, collaborative filtering and trust based.

#### 1. Content Based Methods

In content based method, items similar to those that user has previously purchased or reviewed are suggested. Here the scope of this recommendation is limited to the direct region of the users' previous purchase history or score. Content-based system does not use any preference data and provides recommendation directly based on similarity of items. Similarity is computed based on item attributes using appropriate distance measures. Content-Based (CB) Recommender Systems mean that the recommendations to a specified user based on the descriptions of the items. First, domain knowledge professionals are required to examine the items. Then categories of these items are listed. Finally, the system will use these categories of items to match the characters of a specific user. Content-based filtering chooses documents based on the contents of documents & each user's preference. In content based filtering, users can obtain suitable documents that match with their interests.

#### 2. Collaborative Filtering Methods

Collaborative filtering creates personalized recommendations by combining the knowledge of similar users in the system. In collaborative Filtering (CF) technique, the recommendation process is automated by building on users' opinions of items in a community. Collaborative Filtering (CF) is based on the principle that the finest recommendations for an individual are given by people who have similar flavour. Collaborative filtering identifies users with choice similar to the target user and then computes predictions based on the score of the neighbors. Collaborative filtering considerably progresses recommendation system. The recommendation for a target item is based on other users' ranking of item instead of study contents. The job in collaborative filtering is to guess the usefulness of product to a particular user, which is based on a database of user votes.

Collaborative filtering algorithms guess ranking of a target item for target user with help of grouping of the ranking of the neighbors (similar users) that are known to item under consideration. The six algorithms of collaborative filtering are evaluated. The input to algorithms is taken as interaction matrix A of order M x N = (aij) where M is number of consumers (c1, c2, c3….cM) & N is number of products (p1,p2,p3,……..pN) . The recommendations are based on transactions. The value of aij can be either 0 or 1 where 1 means transaction between ci & pi (ci has brought pi) & 0 means absence of transaction. The output of algorithm is probable scores of product for each consumer. The recommendations consist of a ranked list of K products [7].

**3. The User-Based Algorithm**

This algorithm is used to predict target consumer's future transactions by combining the observed transactions of similar consumers. First the algorithm calculates a consumer similarity matrix WC = (wcst ) which determines the similarity score based on row vector of A. A high value of wcst shows that consumers s & t have similar liking as they have already brought many similar products. WC A will give the products' probable score for each consumer. Resulting matrix will be containing element at cth row & pth column combine s the scores of the similarities between consumer c and other consumers who have purchased product p[8].

User based algorithms compute the recommendation of item for particular user in three steps. In the first step, it searches n users in database which are similar to active user. In second step, it calculates union of the items purchased by these users and link a weight with every item based on its significance in the set. In the third step, from the union it chooses and recommends the N items which have the highest weight and which have not already been bought by the active user.

**4) The Item-Based Algorithm**

This algorithm is same as user based algorithm except it determines product similarity instead of consumer similarity. It calculates a product similarity matrix WP = (wpst) which is based on the column vectors of A. A high wpst shows that products s and t are similar as many consumers have brought both of them. A WP will give the products' probable scores for each consumer. Resulting matrix will be containing the element at the cth row and pth column combines the scores of the similarities between product p and other products that consumer c has purchased. This algorithm provides higher efficiency and comparable or better recommendation quality than the user-based algorithm for many data sets [9].

The primary motivation behind item based algorithm is the truth that the customer is more likely to buy items which are related (similar) to the items he has already bought in past. Means by analysing the historical purchasing information, we can directly find the similar items.

**5) The dimensionality-reduction algorithm**

This algorithm compresses original interaction matrix & produce recommendations, which are based on compressed, less-sparse matrix to simplify the sparsity problem. It applies standard singular-vector decomposition (SVD is a matrix factorization technique that factors an mXn matrix R into three matrices) to decompose the interaction matrix A into U·

Z · V' where U and V are two orthogonal matrices of size M x R and N x R respectively, and R is the rank of matrix A. Z is diagonal matrix of size R x R which has all singular values at its diagonal values. SVD can be used in recommender systems & has two features. Customer can use it to capture hidden association between customers & products, which indicates prediction of likeliness of specific product, SVD can be used to construct a low-dimensional image of customer-product space & calculates region in reduced Space [10]. The dimensionality-reduction algorithm requires the longest runtime because after reduction computing consumer similarity needs considerable CPU cycles.

### *C. Trust-Based Methods*

People generally like recommendations from their friends who they know & trust. Trust is bet about future dependent actions of others. In Trust Based Recommendation systems, trust network is used in which users are joined by trust scores which indicate how much faith they have in each other. The information from this trust network is used in Trust-Based Methods. In [16] the choice between recommendations from friends & recommender systems is given. If the quality and usefulness is taken into account, friends' recommendations are preferred even if the recommendations given by the recommender systems have high originality factor. Friends are treated as more experienced to create good and valuable recommendations if compared with recommender systems.

Trust-aware recommender systems take input a matrix consists of ratings about objects from users where the users are represented as rows & the objects are represented as columns & the value in the cell represents the rating given byuser to particular object [17]. Along with this, one more matrix is considered as input to system in which user can state their trust on other users which forms a matrix of trust ratings about users.

The user's trust network is constructed for generating predictions [18]. It has three steps. The first step is direct trust. The direct has two methods: explicitly or implicitly. In explicit method, the user himself or herself decides how much they trust others. In implicit method, the system decides the level of trust from particular observed user features. The second step is propagation of trust. It is possible to propagate the trust i.e. create new relations among users. The third step is predicting ratings. From the trust network, we can predict what ratings the particular user would give for items.

## III. CONCLUSION

The enormous volume of data streaming on the web has offered ascend to the requirement for data filtering methods. Recommendation systems are adequately used to sift through overabundance data and to give personalized administrations to users by utilizing refined, well-thoroughly considered expectation calculations. The Content-Based (CB) systems require express space learning and substantial information designing. The CF just needs the appraisals made by users to the things. Trust techniques take care of cold start issue, information sparsity issue. Among the six calculations of collaborative filtering talked about here, connect examination calculation works better regarding accuracy, review and F-measure however it works productively just when scanty information is accessible. This constraint can open another time of research. More research can be done on how linkanalysis will function better when the information accessible isn't inadequate information. We can consolidate at least two collaborative filtering calculations to conquer sparsity issue.

## IV.REFERENCES


[1] Patricia Victor and Chris Cornelis , Martine De Cock and Ankur M. Teredesai Trust- and Distrust-Based Recommendations for Controversial Reviews 1541 1672/11/$26.00 © 2011 IEEE INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS

[2] V. Diaz-Aviles, “Semantic peer-to-peer recommender systems,” M.S.thesis, Comput.-Based New Media Group, Inst. Comput. Sci., Albert Ludwigs Univ. Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany, 2005.

[3] I. Cantador and P. Castells, “Multilayered semantic social network modeling by ontology-based user profiles clustering: Application to collaborative filtering,” in Proc. Manag. Knowl. World Netw., 2006, pp. 334–349.

[4] S. Kim and J. Kwon, “Effective context-aware recommendation on the semantic Web,” Int. J. Comput. Sci. Netw. Security, vol. 7, no. 8, pp. 154–159, Aug. 2007.

[5] S. Golder and B. Huberman,“The structure of collaborative tagging systems” in Proc. CoRR, 2005, pp.1–8.

[6] Z. Xu, Y. Fu, J. Mao, and D. Su, “Towards the semantic Web: Collaborative tag suggestions,” in Proc. CollaborativeWeb Tagging Workshop WWW, Edinburgh, U.K., 2006

[7] Zan Huang, Daniel Zeng and Hsinchun Chen A Comparison of Collaborative-Filtering Recommendation Algorithms for E-commerce 1541-1672/07/$25.00 © 2007 IEEE

[8] J.S. Breese, D. Heckerman, and C. Kadie, “Empirical Analysis of Predictive Algorithms for Collaborative Filtering,” Proc.14th Conf. Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI 98), Morgan Kaufmann, 1998, pp. 43–52.

[9] M. Deshpande and G. Karypis, “Item-Based Top-N Recommendation Algorithms,” ACM Trans. Information Systems, vol.22, no.1, 2004, pp. 143–177.

[10] B. Sarwar et al., “Application of Dimensionality Reduction in Recommender Systems: A Case Study,” Proc. WebKDD Workshop at the ACM SIGKDD, 2000; http://glaros.dtc.umn.edu/ gkhome/node/122

[11] T. Hofmann, “Latent Semantic Models for Collaborative Filtering,” ACM Trans. Information Systems, vol. 22, no. 1,2004,pp.89–115.

[12] Z. Huang, H. Chen, and D. Zeng, “Applying Associative Retrieval Techniques to Alleviate the Sparsity Problem in Collaborative Filtering,” ACM Trans. Information Systems, vol. 22, no. 1, 2004, pp. 116–142

[13] Z. Huang, D. Zeng, and H. Chen, “A Link Analysis Approach to Recommendation under Sparse Data,” Proc. 2004 Americas Conf. Information Systems, 2004

[14] Kleinberg, J. Authoritative sources in a hyperlinked environment. in Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (1998).

[15] Brin, S., and Page, L. The anatomy of a large-scale hyper textual web search engine. in Proceedings of the 7th International World Wide Web Conference (Brisbane, Australia, 1998).

[16] Rashmi Sinha and Kirsten Swearingen. Comparing Recommendation made by Online Systems and Friends. In the Proc. of the DELOS-NSF Workshop on Personalization and Recommender Systems in Digital Libraries, Ireland.

[17] Zhili Wu, Xueli Yu and Jingyu “An Improved Trust Metric for Trust-aware Recommender Systems” 2009 IEEE.

[18] Leonardo Zanette, Claudia L.R. Motta, Flávia Maria Santoro, Marcos Elia “A Trust-based Recommender System for Collaborative Networks” 2009 IEEE.

**Cite this article as :** Piyush Anil Bodhankar, Rajesh K Nasare, "A Review Study on Various Recommender System Techniques", International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology (IJSRCSEIT), ISSN : 2456-3307, Volume 5 Issue 1, pp. 568-573, January-February 2019.

Journal URL : http://ijsrcseit.com/CSEIT195251