

Editorial: Reviews in Recommender Systems

Dominik Kowald^{1,*}, Deqing Yang² and Emanuel Lacic³

¹*Know-Center GmbH and Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria*

²*Fudan University, Shanghai, China*

³*Infobip, Zagreb, Croatia*

Correspondence*:

Dominik Kowald

dkowald@know-center.at

2 Keywords: recommender systems, review, fairness, privacy, collaborative filtering

1 INTRODUCTION

3 Nowadays, recommender systems are one of the most widely used instantiations of machine learning and artificial intelligence.
4 Thus, these systems accompany us in our daily online experience and have become an integral part of our digital life for
5 supporting us in finding relevant information in information spaces that are too big or complex for manual filtering (Ricci
6 et al., 2010; Burke et al., 2011; Jannach et al., 2016). Since the first deployments of recommendation algorithms (Resnick
7 et al., 1994; Resnick and Varian, 1997), recommender systems analyze past usage behavior (e.g., clicks or ratings) in order
8 to build user models, and to suggest items to users. Recommender systems are employed in various domains, ranging from
9 entertainment domains, such as music (Lex et al., 2020; Schedl et al., 2021) and movies (Harper and Konstan, 2015), to more
10 critical domains such as the job market Lacic et al. (2020). Apart from that, different types of algorithms have been employed to
11 develop recommender systems, ranging from collaborative filtering Ekstrand et al. (2011), content-based filtering Lops et al.
12 (2010), hybrid approaches Burke (2002), theory-driven algorithms (e.g., based on cognitive models Lacic et al. (2014); Kowald
13 et al. (2015)), to neural approaches Zhang et al. (2019); Chen et al. (2023).

14 The aim of the “Reviews in Recommender Systems” research topic is to highlight recent advances in the broad field of
15 recommender systems, including important topics such as fairness Wang et al. (2023); Kowald et al. (2020), privacy Friedman
16 et al. (2015); Muellner et al. (2021), and multi-stakeholder objectives Abdollahpouri and Burke (2019), while emphasizing novel
17 directions and possibilities for future research. In total, this research topic consists of 9 review articles surveying the literature
18 in a specific subfield of recommender systems. More concretely, the editors of this research topic have been able to accept 6
19 full-length review articles and 3 mini review articles. The following section gives a short overview of these articles.

2 RESEARCH TOPIC CONTENT

20 In a mini review article, Muellner et al. surveyed the current landscape of differential privacy in collaborative filtering-based
21 recommender systems. In total, the authors have reviewed 26 publications, and found that in most cases, differential privacy is
22 applied to the user representation (i.e., the input data of the recommender system) rather than to recommendation model updates
23 or to phases after the training. Additionally, the authors stated that most papers investigate differential privacy on datasets
24 gathered from MovieLens and Last.fm, and thus, that more research is needed for privacy-aware recommender systems in
25 sensitive domains such as the job market or finance.

26 Jannach and Abdollahpouri explore the multifaceted landscape of multi-objective recommender systems, identifying the need
27 to balance diverse and often conflicting objectives such as user satisfaction, stakeholder interests, and long-term goals of
28 stakeholders. The authors present a taxonomy categorizing these objectives into recommendation quality, multi-stakeholder
29 perspectives, temporal considerations, user experience, and system engineering challenges. The study illustrates the complexity
30 of optimizing recommender systems in real-world applications, emphasizing the importance of addressing multiple objectives to
31 enhance recommendation relevance, diversity, and overall system effectiveness.

32 Banerjee et al. delve into the challenges and potential strategies for ensuring fairness in Tourism Recommender Systems (TRS),
33 emphasizing the multi-stakeholder nature of these systems. They categorize stakeholders based on fairness criteria, review
34 state-of-the-art research from various perspectives, and highlight the complexities of balancing individual and collective interests.
35 The paper concludes that achieving fairness in TRS involves navigating trade-offs between stakeholder interests, illustrating the
36 necessity for innovative solutions that consider the environmental impact and societal concerns alongside traditional user and
37 provider objectives.

38 In this mini-review, Loepp investigates the increasingly prevalent multi-list user interfaces in recommender systems, particularly
39 focusing on carousel-based interfaces like those used by Netflix and Spotify. The review highlights the scarcity of research
40 on optimizing these carousels for user interaction and satisfaction, despite their common use. Based on 18 reviewed research
41 papers, the author identifies gaps in understanding user behavior and interface design, and proposes future research directions to
42 enhance user experience through improved design and personalization of carousel recommendations.

43 Kumar et al. provide an in-depth review of fairness in recruitment-related recommender systems (RRSs), dissecting the balance
44 between technical advancements and legal compliance. They delve into various fairness definitions (e.g., demographic parity),
45 metrics (e.g., false positive rates between different demographic groups), and debiasing strategies (e.g., post-processing to alter
46 the algorithm's output to ensure fairness) as well as compare them to existing EU and US employment laws. The survey spotlights
47 the nuanced challenges of mitigating algorithmic bias and discrimination within RRSs, advocating for a multidisciplinary
48 approach to develop more equitable and legally compliant hiring technologies.

49 Felfernig et al. explore the potential of recommender systems to support the achievement of the 17 United Nations' Sustainability
50 Development Goals (SDGs). The review addresses the utilization of AI to recommend actions and alternatives aligned with
51 sustainability objectives. The paper discusses various recommender system types, their application across all SDGs, as well as
52 identifies open research issues for future exploration. The authors show the significance of recommender systems in promoting
53 sustainability, offering both current insights and directions for ongoing research.

54 In this mini-review, Duricic et al. explore the integration of beyond-accuracy metrics (i.e., diversity, serendipity, and fairness) into
55 recommender systems based on Graph Neural Networks (GNNs). They emphasize the importance of these metrics in enhancing
56 user satisfaction, beyond mere accuracy. Furthermore, they examine recent advancements and methodologies in GNNs that
57 address these dimensions, highlighting the balance between recommendation accuracy and beyond-accuracy objectives.

58 Lubos et al. present a review of state-of-the-art video recommender systems (VRS), covering a broad range of algorithms,
59 applications, and unresolved research challenges in the field. They delve into various approaches to VRS, including content-
60 based, collaborative filtering, and hybrid systems, and discuss the importance of diverse content representations and evaluation
61 metrics. Based on the analysis of 6 different application domains, they highlight the potential for future advancements in VRS,
62 emphasizing the need for innovative solutions to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of personalized video recommendations,
63 thereby serving as a valuable resource for both researchers and practitioners in the video domain.

64 Finally, Felfernig et al. offer a comprehensive overview of knowledge-based recommender systems, distinguishing them from
65 traditional collaborative and content-based approaches by their ability to utilize semantic user preferences, item knowledge,
66 and recommendation logic. These systems are particularly beneficial for complex item types, as they can dynamically adapt to
67 user preferences through dialogue and constraint-based recommendations. The review also identifies future research directions,
68 emphasizing the integration of knowledge-based technologies in recommender systems.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

69 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be
70 construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

71 All authors listed have made a substantial, direct, and intellectual contribution to the work and approved it for publication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

72 This research was supported by the Know-Center and the FFG COMET funding program.

REFERENCES

- 73 Abdollahpouri, H. and Burke, R. (2019). Multi-stakeholder recommendation and its connection to multi-sided fairness. *arXiv*
74 *preprint arXiv:1907.13158*
- 75 Burke, R. (2002). Hybrid recommender systems: Survey and experiments. *User Modeling and User-adapted Interaction* 12,
76 331–370
- 77 Burke, R., Felfernig, A., and Göker, M. H. (2011). Recommender systems: An overview. *AI Magazine* 32, 13–18
- 78 Chen, X., Yao, L., McAuley, J., Zhou, G., and Wang, X. (2023). Deep reinforcement learning in recommender systems: A
79 survey and new perspectives. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 264, 110335
- 80 Ekstrand, M. D., Riedl, J. T., Konstan, J. A., et al. (2011). Collaborative filtering recommender systems. *Foundations and*
81 *Trends in Human-Computer Interaction* 4, 81–173
- 82 Friedman, A., Knijnenburg, B. P., Vanhecke, K., Martens, L., and Berkovsky, S. (2015). Privacy aspects of recommender
83 systems. *Recommender systems handbook* , 649–688
- 84 Harper, F. M. and Konstan, J. A. (2015). The movielens datasets: History and context. *ACM Transactions on Interactive*
85 *Intelligent Systems (TiiS)* 5, 1–19
- 86 Jannach, D., Resnick, P., Tuzhilin, A., and Zanker, M. (2016). Recommender systems — beyond matrix completion.
87 *Communications of the ACM* 59, 94–102
- 88 Kowald, D., Schedl, M., and Lex, E. (2020). The unfairness of popularity bias in music recommendation: A reproducibility
89 study. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 42nd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2020, Lisbon, Portugal, April*
90 *14–17, 2020, Proceedings, Part II* 42 (Springer), 35–42
- 91 Kowald, D., Seitlinger, P., Kopeinik, S., Ley, T., and Trattner, C. (2015). Forgetting the words but remembering the meaning:
92 Modeling forgetting in a verbal and semantic tag recommender. In *Mining, Modeling, and Recommending 'Things' in Social*
93 *Media* (Springer), 75–95
- 94 Lacic, E., Kowald, D., Seitlinger, P. C., Trattner, C., and Parra, D. (2014). Recommending items in social tagging systems
95 using tag and time information. In *In Proceedings of the 1st Social Personalization Workshop co-located with the 25th ACM*
96 *Conference on Hypertext and Social Media* (Association of Computing Machinery), 4–9
- 97 Lacic, E., Reiter-Haas, M., Kowald, D., Reddy Daredy, M., Cho, J., and Lex, E. (2020). Using autoencoders for session-based
98 job recommendations. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 30, 617–658
- 99 Lex, E., Kowald, D., and Schedl, M. (2020). Modeling popularity and temporal drift of music genre preferences. *Transactions*
100 *of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval* 3
- 101 Lops, P., De Gemmis, M., and Semeraro, G. (2010). Content-based recommender systems: State of the art and trends.
102 *Recommender Systems Handbook* , 73–105
- 103 Muellner, P., Kowald, D., and Lex, E. (2021). Robustness of meta matrix factorization against strict privacy constraints. In
104 *Advances in Information Retrieval: 43rd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2021, Virtual Event, March 28–April 1,*
105 *2021, Proceedings, Part II* 43 (Springer), 107–119
- 106 Resnick, P., Iacovou, N., Suchak, M., Bergstrom, P., and Riedl, J. (1994). Grouplens: An open architecture for collaborative
107 filtering of netnews. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*. 175–186
- 108 Resnick, P. and Varian, H. R. (1997). Recommender systems. *Communications of the ACM* 40, 56–58
- 109 Ricci, F., Rokach, L., and Shapira, B. (2010). Introduction to recommender systems handbook. In *Recommender Systems*
110 *Handbook* (Springer). 1–35
- 111 Schedl, M., Bauer, C., Reisinger, W., Kowald, D., and Lex, E. (2021). Listener modeling and context-aware music
112 recommendation based on country archetypes. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 3
- 113 Wang, Y., Ma, W., Zhang, M., Liu, Y., and Ma, S. (2023). A survey on the fairness of recommender systems. *ACM Transactions*
114 *on Information Systems* 41, 1–43
- 115 Zhang, S., Yao, L., Sun, A., and Tay, Y. (2019). Deep learning based recommender system: A survey and new perspectives.
116 *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 52, 1–38