ONLINE REPUTATION SYSTEMS

YUYE WANG

CPSC 557: Sensitive Information in a Wired World Professor: Joan Feigenbaum Date: 12 Nov, 2013



TRUST SYSTEM

• Trust system, guide people's decision on who to transact with.



ONLINE TRUST SYSTEM





C2C: FEEDBACK BASED



What does the star next to a Feedback score mean?

Feedback stars are located to the right of a member's user ID. Stars are awarded based on a member's Feedback score.

In most cases, members receive:

- +1 point for each positive rating
- 0 points for each neutral rating
- -1 point for each negative rating

The more points you get, the higher the "star" level will go.

Here's what the different stars mean:

Yellow star	☆	10 to 49 ratings
Blue star	☆	50 to 99 ratings
Turquoise star	☆	100 to 499 ratings
Purple star	☆	500 to 999 ratings
Red star	★	1,000 to 4,999 ratings
Green star	숬	5,000 to 9,999 ratings
Yellow shooting star	>>	10,000 to 24,999 ratings
Turquoise shooting star	*	25,000 to 49,999 ratings

EBAY FEEDBACK FORUM

Top Rated: Coller with highest huver retings 2 buildinc (22672 🔊 🧃 nber The positive Feedback percentage is calculated based on the total Positive Feedback (last 12 months): 99.5% for sa number of positive and negative Feedback ratings for transactions [How is Feedback percentage calculated?] that ended in the last 12 months, excluding repeat Feedback from Sto Member since: Nov-28-11 in United States the same member for purchases done within the same calendar ory week (eBay time). Vly V Note: This could mean that the number of ratings used for this s & (calculation is different from the same number shown in the recent ratings table on the left. ack ratings (last 12 months) Det /er Positives on 1 month 6 months 12 months Positives + negatives Cri rice + 1188 6697 15392 This member's 12 month Feedback ratings Ite oping Positives: 13513 Negatives: 66 Cd 10 30 66 Sł This member's positive Feedback percentage 5 25 75 Sł 13513 - = 99.5%a seller Feedback as a buyer All Feedback reedback left for others

EBAY FEEDBACK FORUM



EFFECTS



ISSUES

- Effective but not sufficient for make decision
- Still take too many human effort
- Gaming the reputation system

CNET > News > News Blogs > Study: eBay sellers gaming the reputation system?

Study: eBay sellers gaming the reputation system?

	by Elinor Mills January 11, 2007 12:24 PM PST	
f O	1 1 8+1 0 More +	Comments 🗸 🔍

A new study concludes that some eBay users are artificially boosting their reputations on the Internet auction Web site by selling items for practically pothing in exchange for positive



Reputation based

PEER-TO-PEER (P2P)

common uses: file sharing, distributed computing, instant messaging

- Centralized (Napster)
- Decentralized (Gnutella)
- Hybrid (KaZaA)



P2P NETWORK

• Highly dynamic



Distributed System

reliable

ADVERSARIES

- Selfish peers
- Malicious peers
- Techniques:
 - Traitors
 - Collusion
 - Front peers
 - Whitewashers
 - Denial of Service (DoS)

5 BASIC TRUST STRATEGIES











REPUTATION SYSTEM



PROBLEM OF INFORMATION INTEGRITY

- impossible to enforce honest, accurate reporting
- assume the majority of users are honest



INPUTS



OUTPUT

- binary value (trusted or untrusted)
- scaled integer (1 to 10)
- continuous scale ([0,1])



MULTIPLE COMPONENT

Reliability

 If transacting with P is worth the risk of defection

Credibility

 Estimate how likely they are to provide accurate report



PEER SELECTION



TAKE ACTION

Incentives

- Speed
- Quality
- Quantity
- Money

Punishment

- Kick out
- Fine





BASIC TRUST MODEL

MOST IMPORTANT PART



STEP 1 BROADCAST REQUEST



STEP 2 RECEIVE REQUEST



STEP 3 COMPUTE REPUTATION

Trust score

Previous info on j

 $\implies T(i,j) = \alpha * Info(i,j) + \beta * R(i,j)$ $R(i,j) = \frac{\sum_{k \in K} Info(k,j) * C(i,k)}{|K|}, \alpha + \beta$

Reputation score of j to i

Information collected from k about j

Credibility of k to i

STEP 4: UPDATE AND MODIFY

- After transaction with j
- Peer I update Info(i, j)
- Modify C(i, k)
- Save latest T(i, j) to the system

$$T(i,j) = \alpha * Info(i,j) + \beta * R(i,j)$$
$$R(i,j) = \frac{\sum_{k \in K} Info(k,j) * C(i,k)}{|K|}, \alpha + \beta = 1.$$

ALGORITHMS FOR REPUTATION SCORE

- EigenTrust
- PeerTrust
- Beth's model
- Josang's model
- Yao Wang's model (Bayesian)
- PowerTrust

CONCLUSION

Feedback

- Structure:
- Input:

- Centralized
- [-1, 0, 1]

- Output:
- Selection:
- Adversary:
- Credibility of reporter:
- 1 scale value Human
- Some
 - None

Reputation

- Distributed
- Combination of 5 factors
- Multiple values
- System
- Many
- Yes

CONCLUSION

Feedback

- Cooperate Yes
- Defect
- Quality
- Quantity
- Time

- Yes
- No
- Yes
 - No

Reputation

- Yes
- Not as good
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

DISCUSSION

- Compare feedback based and reputation based trust system. Can either of the model being improved by the idea of the other one?
- If to build an automatic seller selection for buyers in online shopping system, what factors do you think need to take into account?
- What other application you can think of that a trust system can be used?

THANKS

REFERENCE:

- Piatek, M., Isdal, T., Krishnamurthy, A., & Anderson, T. E. (2008, April). One Hop Reputations for Peer to Peer File Sharing Workloads. In *NSDI* (Vol. 8, pp. 1-14).
- Marti, S., & Garcia-Molina, H. (2006). Taxonomy of trust: Categorizing P2P reputation systems. Computer Networks, 50(4), 472-484.
- Sarjaz, B. S., & Abbaspour, M. (2013). Securing BitTorrent using a new reputation-based trust management system. Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications, 6(1), 86-100.
- Kamvar, S. D., Schlosser, M. T., & Garcia-Molina, H. (2003, May). The eigentrust algorithm for reputation management in p2p networks. InProceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web (pp. 640-651). ACM.
- Molavi Kakhki, A., Kliman-Silver, C., & Mislove, A. (2013, May). Iolaus: securing online content rating systems. In Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web (pp. 919-930). International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Li, Y., & Gruenbacher, D. (2010, April). Analysis of P2P file sharing network's credit system for fairness management. In Network Operations and Management Symposium (NOMS), 2010 IEEE (pp. 88-95). IEEE.
- Jian-li, H. U., & Bin, W. Q. Y. Z. (2009). Research on Reputation Based Trust Model for P2P Environment. *Computer Science*, 9, 003.
- Lakshmi, B. V. S. N., & Rao, C. P. (2012). Managing P2P Reputation System Using Decentralized Approach.

- Xiong, L., & Liu, L. (2003, June). A reputation-based trust model for peer-to-peer e-commerce communities. In E-Commerce, 2003. CEC 2003. IEEE International Conference on (pp. 275-284). IEEE.
- Kamvar, S. D., Schlosser, M. T., & Garcia-Molina, H. (2003, May). The eigentrust algorithm for reputation management in p2p networks. InProceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web (pp. 640-651). ACM.
- Gupta, M., Judge, P., & Ammar, M. (2003, June). A reputation system for peer-to-peer networks. In Proceedings of the 13th international workshop on Network and operating systems support for digital audio and video (pp. 144-152). ACM.
- Selcuk, A. A., Uzun, E., & Pariente, M. R. (2004, April). A reputation-based trust management system for P2P networks. In Cluster Computing and the Grid, 2004. CCGrid 2004. IEEE International Symposium on (pp. 251-258). IEEE.
- Buchegger, S., & Le Boudec, J. Y. (2004, June). A robust reputation system for peer-to-peer and mobile ad-hoc networks. In *Proceedings of P2PEcon* (Vol. 2004).
- Robinson, S. D. (1976). Recent Antitrust Developments: 1975. Columbia Law Review, 76(2), 191-235.
- Dewan, P., & Dasgupta, P. (2010). P2p reputation management using distributed identities and decentralized recommendation chains. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 22(7), 1000-1013.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

- Reputation / Trust
- Transactions
- Cooperate / Defect
- Strangers
- Adversary