

Leave No One Behind: Enhancing Diversity While Maintaining Accuracy in Social Recommendation

Lei Li and Xiao Zhou (✉)

Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China
{leil, xiaozhou}@ruc.edu.cn

Abstract. Social recommendation, a branch of algorithms that utilizes social connection information to construct recommender systems, has demonstrated its effectiveness in enhancing recommendation accuracy. However, apart from accuracy, the diversity of recommendations also plays a critical role in user engagement. Unfortunately, the impact of social recommendation models on recommendation diversity remains largely unexplored. In this study, we investigate the dual performance of existing social recommendation algorithms in terms of accuracy and diversity. Our empirical findings highlight a concerning trend: social recommendation models tend to decrease diversity, despite their accuracy improvements. To address this issue, we propose a novel approach called Diversified Social Recommendation (DivSR), which leverages relational knowledge distillation techniques to transfer high-diversity structured knowledge from non-social recommendation models to social recommendation models. DivSR is designed as a simple, model-agnostic framework that integrates seamlessly with existing social recommendation architectures. Experimental results on three benchmark datasets demonstrate that DivSR significantly increases diversity without markedly compromising accuracy across various social recommendation backbones, achieving a better accuracy-diversity trade-off. Our code and data are publicly available at: <https://github.com/l10ruc/DivSR>.

Keywords: Recommender Systems · Social Recommendation · Diversified Recommendation

1 Introduction

In this era of information explosion, recommender systems play a vital role in alleviating the problem of information overload for users [7,42]. Recommender systems have been successfully implemented across various domains including e-commerce [29], online news [37], and multimedia contents [23]. With the advancement of recommendation algorithms, accuracy serves as the dominant target or even the only target to maximize the utility of recommendation systems [1,12]. As one of its typical representatives, social recommendation [18,31] utilizes social resources such as interpersonal relations and influence, as extra information to enhance performance. This approach typically incorporates social connections

either as a regularization term [11] or through feature embeddings from neighboring nodes using a graph attention network framework [8].

However, an accurate recommendation is not necessarily a satisfactory one [2]. Users on e-commerce platforms seek more than just precisely accurate products; they also devote significant time to exploring news-feed products for diverse options. Thus, an ideal recommendation system should fulfill both accuracy and diversity requirements [22]. Unfortunately, existing social recommendation systems primarily focus on enhancing accuracy, often overlooking diversity. This oversight is problematic considering that social recommendation systems are fundamentally influenced by social influence theory [21], which posits that users influenced by their social connections tend to adopt similar preferences. This can lead to homogeneity in the recommendations over time due to the over-reliance on preferences within a user’s immediate social circle [28], underlining the necessity of fostering diversity in social recommendations.

In this work, we revisit the current social recommendation algorithms, probing their performance in terms of diversity. We conducted extensive experiments to evaluate the performance of several existing social recommendation methods on three benchmark datasets in terms of both accuracy and diversity. For each algorithm, we removed socially-relevant modules, enabling it to make item recommendations without utilizing social information. Such a comparison between social recommendation methods and their variant (non-social methods) allows us to discern performance discrepancies attributable to the integration of social relationships. Our empirical findings reveal that *existing social recommendation models tend to decrease diversity while improving accuracy compared to non-social recommendation methods*.

To achieve a better accuracy-diversity trade-off on social recommendation, we propose the DivSR (**D**iversified **S**ocial **R**ecommendation) framework, which leverages knowledge distillation to achieve system-level overall diversity in recommendations. Fundamentally, DivSR maintains a model-agnostic design, allowing seamless integration with various social recommendation backbone models. In DivSR, we train a social recommendation model as the student model to combine high accuracy and high diversity. The high diversity is derived from a pre-trained teacher model, which is a non-social recommendation counterpart. We design a knowledge transfer module using relational distillation learning technology [24], which distills structured similarity knowledge between users and friends from the teacher model to the student model. To achieve a balanced trade-off between accuracy and diversity, DivSR optimizes both the recommendation task and the knowledge distillation task simultaneously within a primary and auxiliary learning framework.

We perform experiments on three widely used public datasets, incorporating five robust social recommenders as backbone models. Comprehensive results demonstrate that DivSR enhances diversity without excessively sacrificing accuracy across various social recommendation backbones. DivSR demonstrates a superior accuracy-diversity trade-off compared to several diversified models. The key contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We empirically assess the accuracy-diversity performance of social recommendation systems, finding that they typically reduce diversity compared to their non-social counterparts.
- We propose DivSR, a model-agnostic framework utilizing knowledge distillation techniques designed to foster diversity in social recommendations. This approach includes a diversity-knowledge transfer module capable of distilling structured similarity information.
- Through experiments on three datasets, we demonstrate the effectiveness of DivSR, highlighting its ability to significantly enhance diversity without excessively sacrificing accuracy across various social recommendation systems.

2 Related Work

2.1 Social Recommendation

To improve the accuracy of recommendation results, numerous social recommendation methods have been developed, incorporating online social relationships between users as side information [9,16]. Early models like SoReg [19] and SocialMF [11] integrated social connections as regularization terms or utilized trust relationships to project users into latent representations, exemplified by TrustMF [36] and TrustSVD [9]. In recent years, graph neural networks (GNNs) [15] have achieved great success in deep learning, owing to their strong capability on modeling graph data. DiffNet [35] and its extension DiffNet++ [34] modeled the information diffusion process in social graph to enlarge the users’ influence scope. Multi-channel hypergraph convolutional network was employed on MHCN [41] to enhance social recommendation by leveraging high-order user relations. SEPT [40] proposed a socially-aware self-supervised learning(SSL) framework that discovers supervisory signals from two complementary views of raw data. DESIGN [31] introduced knowledge distillation between models that rely on different data sources to leverage social information effectively. Wang *et al.* [32] proposed a universal denoised self-augmented learning framework that incorporates social influence to decipher user preferences while mitigating noisy effects. Nevertheless, these methods mostly aim to improve accuracy while neglecting diversity. Our work contributes to achieving a balance between accuracy and diversity in social recommendation.

2.2 Diversified Recommendation

Diversified recommendation aims to provide users with a more varied set of items, enabling users to discover new and unexplored interests [6,17]. The accuracy-diversity dilemma, pointing higher accuracy often means losing diversity to some extent and vice versa. A classical re-ranking work to enhance diversity is maximal marginal relevance (MMR) [4], which used the notion of marginal relevance to combine relevance and diversity with a trade-off parameter. Determinantal point process (DPP) [5] re-ranked items to achieve the largest determinant on

the item’s similarity matrix. Zheng *et al.* [43] introduced an end-to-end diversified recommendation model named DGCN, which selects node neighbors based on the inverse category frequency for diverse aggregation and further utilizes category-boosted negative sampling and adversarial learning to diversify items in the embedding space. DGRec [38] targeted diversifying GNN-based recommender systems with diversified embedding generation. Different from these methods, our work facilitates seamless integration with various social recommendation systems, effectively enhancing accuracy while maintaining high diversity when integrating social relationships.

3 PRELIMINARIES

3.1 Problem Statement

In the task of social recommendation, we denote $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_M\}$ ($|U| = M$) as the user set and $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$ ($|V| = N$) as the item set. We use a, b to index users, and i, j to index items. Let $G_s = \langle U, S \rangle$ denote a directed social graph, where $S \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ is a matrix representing social relations between users. For each user-user pair (a, b) , $s_{ab} = 1$ if user a trusts user b and 0 otherwise. Let $G_r = \langle U \cup V, R \rangle$ denote an undirected bipartite graph, where $R \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ is a user-item interaction matrix. For each user-item pair (a, i) , $r_{ai} = 1$ indicates that user a consumes item i and 0 otherwise. The core objective of a social recommendation system leveraging G_r and G_s is to predict and recommend top k interested items that a user is likely to be interested in, based on their past interactions and social influences. The diversified social recommendation task aims to recommend items that users prefer while ensuring high system-level overall diversity.

3.2 Accuracy-Diversity Dilemma in Social Recommendation

In this paper, we revisit the current social recommendation algorithms, probing their performance in terms of diversity. Nevertheless, the model performance comparison between different social recommendation models is not our primary interest. Instead, we are particularly concerned with evaluating how accuracy and diversity are influenced by the introduction of social relationships. We conduct preliminary experiments to analyze the two-fold performance *w.r.t.* accuracy (Recall@100) and diversity (Coverage@100) on three widely-used public datasets (Yelp [35], Ciao [30], and Flickr [33]) between Social Recommender System (**Social RS**) and Non-social Recommender System (**Non-social RS**).

For Social RS, we choose several typical social recommendation models, including TrustMF [36], SocialMF [11], DiffNet [35], DESIGN [31], and MHCN [41]. In contrast, we just remove the socially relevant modules from each Social RS while keeping all other components unchanged to get a non-social recommendation counterpart. For example, DiffNet utilizes a layer-wise GNN structure to simulate the recursive social diffusion process. The final user embedding p_a

Table 1: Accuracy-Diversity results on Yelp, Ciao, and Flickr datasets.

	Yelp		Ciao		Flickr	
	Recall	Coverage	Recall	Coverage	Recall	Coverage
w/o social	12.513	31.610	12.301	33.478	2.219	40.723
TrustMF	13.773 ↑	23.276 ↓	12.778 ↑	21.524 ↓	3.242 ↑	21.547 ↓
w/o social	12.513	31.610	12.301	33.478	2.219	40.723
SocialMF	14.077 ↑	21.335 ↓	12.899 ↑	22.215 ↓	3.339 ↑	27.125 ↓
w/o social	12.543	39.974	12.519	39.655	2.135	43.654
DiffNet	14.136 ↑	16.738 ↓	12.658 ↑	27.560 ↓	3.539 ↑	32.663 ↓
w/o social	14.518	59.502	15.803	19.746	3.152	22.905
MHCN	15.365 ↑	53.273 ↓	16.338 ↑	22.173 ↑	4.574 ↑	40.205 ↑
w/o social	13.553	51.277	14.102	56.267	3.427	32.761
DESIGN	14.984 ↑	42.228 ↓	15.367 ↑	24.262 ↓	4.127 ↑	35.290 ↑

is composed of two parts: the embedding from social diffusion layers and the preferences from historical behaviors:

$$p_a = h_a^K + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_r(a)} \frac{q_i}{|\mathcal{N}_r(a)|}, \tag{1}$$

$$h_a^K = GNN(h_a^0; G_s), \tag{2}$$

where h_a^0 and q_i represent the initial free embedding of user a and item i , respectively. $\mathcal{N}_r(a)$ is the itemset that user a consumed, $GNN(\cdot)$ is a layer-wise graph neural network and K indicates the number of GCN layers. When the social module is removed, h_a^K simply defaults to h_a^0 , as the social diffusion layers that would normally utilize the explicit user-user social graph (G_s) are omitted. Thus, DiffNet (w/o social) relies solely on the user-item interaction graph (G_r) for generating recommendations.

From Table 1, we observe that social recommendation models can significantly improve the accuracy compared to their non-social variants. For example, SocialMF shows an improvement of approximately 12% on Yelp and 5% on Ciao when compared to SocialMF (w/o social). In terms of diversity, most social recommendation methods severely reduce system aggregate-level diversity. For instance, the diversity of DiffNet drops from 40% to 17% on Yelp and from 39% to 28% on Ciao when compared to its non-social variant. From these findings, it can be concluded that: **Social recommendation methods usually reduce recommendation diversity while improving recommendation accuracy compared to their non-social variants.**

3.3 Embedding Similarity in Social Recommendation

To gain more insights into the findings obtained in Table 1 and understand why SocialRS reduces diversity, we analyze embedding similarities between users and their friends as training progresses. Following [28], we calculate the cosine similarity between the feature vectors of two users, normalized to 0–1. A higher value indicates greater similarity.




Fig. 1: The trends of the user-friend embedding similarity during training.

Figure 1 illustrates changes in embedding similarity, accuracy, and diversity during training DiffNet on Yelp dataset. Initially, with random vector initialization, similarity is low and diversity is high. As training advances, vector similarities increase, boosting accuracy but lowering diversity. In advanced training stages, vector similarities peak and then decline, whereas diversity decreases to a minimum before starting to increase again. Accuracy, meanwhile, converges towards a stable value. Extended training post-convergence may lead to decreased accuracy, with embedding similarities falling and diversity rising. This pattern suggests a negative correlation between embedding similarity and diversity. Furthermore, we also observe that social recommendation methods always generate more similar representations (higher embedding similarity) between users and their friends compared to their non-social variants.

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Overall Framework

In this paper, we propose a **Diversified Social Recommendation** framework based on knowledge distillation, (named **DivSR**), which achieves a more balanced trade-off between accuracy and diversity. The overall architecture is shown in Figure 2. DivSR is motivated by two advantages: i) Social RS typically exhibits satisfactory recommendation accuracy, and ii) Non-social RS tends to offer higher recommendation diversity. To capitalize on these strengths, DivSR adopts a novel approach wherein a social recommendation model serves as the student model, amalgamating the strengths of both high accuracy and high diversity. The high diversity is derived from a pre-trained teacher model, which is a non-social recommendation counterpart. We design a knowledge transfer module based on relational distillation learning technology, which facilitates the transfer of structured diversity knowledge from the teacher model to the student model. Specifically, the structured vector similarity between users and friends is utilized to characterize diversity knowledge, as revealed in Section 3.3, where a lower vector similarity corresponds to an increase in diversity. DivSR optimizes both the

Enhancing Diversity While Maintaining Accuracy in Social Recommendation




Fig. 2: The left is an overview of the proposed DivSR framework. The right is the Diversity-Knowledge Transfer module.

recommendation task and the knowledge distillation task simultaneously within a primary and auxiliary learning framework.

4.2 Teacher Model & Student Model

DivSR is a simple and model-agnostic solution that can be easily deployed on existing social recommendation models. Given a social recommendation method, we first pre-train its corresponding non-social variant as the teacher network under the recommendation loss. Then we jointly train the social recommendation method as the student model using both recommendation loss and distillation loss. During the training phase of the student network, the teacher network has already been fully trained and frozen.

Specifically, we formalize $f_t(\theta_t)$ as a Non-social RS, where θ_t is the model parameters of the teacher network. Since the teacher model does not consider social relationships, we provide it with a user-item bipartite graph. The teacher model is trained under the Bayesian Personalized Ranking (BPR) [26] loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_R(\theta_t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_r(a), j \notin \mathcal{N}_r(a)} -\ln \sigma(\tilde{r}_{a,i}(\theta_t) - \tilde{r}_{a,j}(\theta_t)) + \lambda \|\theta_t\|^2, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_r(a)$ denotes the itemsets user a consumed, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a sigmoid function and λ is a regularization parameter that prevents overfitting. The rating score $\tilde{r}_{a,i}(\theta_t) = (q_i^t)^T p_a^t$ is determined by the final user/item embedding (p_a^t, q_i^t) produced by the teacher model.

Now, considering a student model $f_s(\theta_s)$, which incorporates both the user-item bipartite graph (G_r) and the user-user social graph (G_s), we proceed with joint training on both the recommendation task and the knowledge distillation task. The knowledge distillation task will be introduced later and the objective function for the recommendation task is same as Equation 3. The final user/item embedding generated by student model for user a , item i are p_a^s, q_i^s , whose dot product forms the rating scoring, $\tilde{r}_{a,i}(\theta_s) = (q_i^s)^T p_a^s$.

4.3 Diversity-Knowledge Transfer

Knowledge distillation has been actively studied for model compression in various fields [27,10,39]. It transfers the knowledge captured by a teacher model through a large capacity into a student model, maintaining comparable performance. Different from general methods which transfer individual outputs from a teacher model to a student model point-wise, relational knowledge distillation (RKD) [24] was introduced to transfer relations of the outputs structure-wise.

To enhance recommendation diversity, we employ the embedding similarity between users and their friends as a diversity indicator. Notably, this similarity operates at a structure-to-structure level, as depicted in the right panel of Figure 2. Therefore, we adopt relational knowledge distillation to transfer knowledge from the teacher model to the student model:

$$\mathcal{L}_D = \sum_{(a,b) \in G_s} l_\delta(\psi_T(a,b), \psi_S(a,b)), \quad (4)$$

where l_δ is L2 loss, $\psi(a,b)$ is the angle-wise potentials:

$$\psi(a,b) = \cos \theta = \frac{p_a^T p_b}{\|p_a\| \|p_b\|}. \quad (5)$$

The angle-wise distillation loss \mathcal{L}_D transfers the relationship of training example embeddings by penalizing angular differences. As angles encapsulate higher-order properties compared to distances, they offer greater efficacy in transferring relational information, affording the student model increased flexibility.

Given the complexity and noise inherent in real-world social relationships, we adopt a pragmatic approach by refraining from computing the similarity between individual user-friend pairs (a,b) in G_s . Instead, we compute the average vector of all his social neighbors $p_{af} = \text{mean}(p_{\{b\}}), b \in \mathcal{N}_s(a)$, thereby smoothing out feature representations and mitigating noise in the social network.

4.4 Model Training

The learning of the student model consists of two tasks: recommendation and knowledge distillation task. The overall objective is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_R(\theta_s) + \beta \mathcal{L}_D(\theta_s | \theta_t), \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{L}_R is the recommendation task loss function, \mathcal{L}_D is the knowledge distillation loss function, and β is a hyperparameter that governs the trade-off between the two objectives. A larger β prioritizes the acquisition of diversity knowledge, whereas a lower value emphasizes accuracy. Upon acquiring the combined representations for all users and items within the student model, we can subsequently predict user a 's preference for item i : $\tilde{r}_{a,i}(\theta_s) = (q_i^s)^T p_a^s$.

Table 2: Statistics of the datasets.

Dataset	#Users	#Items	#Feedback	#Relations	Feedback Dens.	Relation Dens.
Yelp	17,220	35,351	205,529	143,609	0.034%	0.048%
Ciao	6,788	77,248	206,143	110,383	0.039%	0.239%
Flickr	8,137	76,190	320,775	182,078	0.050%	0.275%

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 Experimental Settings

Datasets In order to be consistent with previous research [35,41], we conduct experiments on three benchmark datasets. Yelp¹ is a popular online location-based social network that allows users to share their experiences. Ciao² is a popular social networking website where users can rate items, write reviews, and add friends. Flickr³ is an online image-based social sharing platform. The statistics of these datasets are shown in Table 2.

Metrics In this work, we adopt four widely used metrics to measure accuracy and diversity. For accuracy, we use Recall@K and NDCG@K [41]. Recall denotes computing the fraction of relevant items out of all relevant items. NDCG is the normalized discounted cumulative gain, which gives more weight to highly ranked resources and incorporates different relevance levels through different gain values. To measure diversity, we utilize Coverage@K and Entropy@K, commonly applied in diversified recommendation [25,43]. Coverage measures the extent to which a recommendation result encompasses diverse items from the entire item pool. Entropy assesses the uniformity of item probabilities within the recommendation results. Higher Coverage@K and Entropy@K mean higher diversity. To save space, we only report top-100 recommendation results, noting that similar conclusions hold for other top- N recommendations.

Implementation Details Our experiments are conducted on NVIDIA V100 GPUs with 32GB memory. For all the methods, we refer to the hyperparameter ranges provided in their original papers and use grid search to find the optimal set of hyperparameters. We employ the Adam optimizer [14] with a gradient descent-based approach, initializing the learning rate at 0.001. The batch size is set as 2000. The embedding size is fixed as 64 and the L_2 regularization parameter λ is 0.001. The coefficient β for knowledge distillation is searched among $\{2.0, 1.0, 0.5, \dots, 1e-4\}$. The experiments were conducted five times, and results reported as averages, reflect the model’s performance. Additionally, early stopping is utilized to alleviate the over-fitting problem.

¹ <https://www.yelp.com/>

² <http://www.cse.msu.edu/~tangjili/trust.html>

³ <https://www.flickr.com/>

Table 3: Overall performances of five backbone models and DivSR on three datasets. The improvements are calculated between Base and DivSR. All the metrics (except E@100) are percentage numbers with '%' omitted.

Backbone	Dataset	Yelp				Ciao				Flickr			
		Method	R@100	N@100	C@100	E@100	R@100	N@100	C@100	E@100	R@100	N@100	C@100
TrustMF	w/o social	12.513	3.452	31.610	10.792	12.301	4.932	33.478	10.420	2.219	0.797	40.723	11.943
	Base	13.773	3.823	23.276	10.152	12.778	5.081	21.524	8.963	3.242	1.185	21.547	10.230
	DivSR	13.721	3.816	28.015	10.329	12.634	5.080	27.245	9.536	3.299	1.186	25.329	10.619
	Improve.	-0.38%	-0.18%	20.36%	1.75%	-1.13%	-0.02%	26.58%	6.40%	1.76%	0.08%	17.55%	3.80%
SocialMF	w/o social	12.513	3.452	31.610	10.792	12.301	4.932	33.478	10.420	2.219	0.797	40.723	11.943
	Base	14.077	3.858	21.335	10.391	12.899	5.170	22.215	9.694	3.339	1.211	27.125	11.069
	DivSR	14.139	3.897	35.938	10.925	12.942	5.171	31.684	10.201	3.330	1.210	32.424	11.515
	Improve.	0.44%	1.01%	68.45%	5.14%	0.33%	0.02%	42.62%	5.23%	-0.27%	-0.08%	19.54%	4.03%
DiffNet	w/o social	12.543	3.395	39.974	11.279	12.519	4.710	39.655	11.385	2.135	0.765	43.654	12.289
	Base	14.136	3.843	16.738	10.225	12.658	5.184	27.560	10.272	3.539	1.263	32.663	11.719
	DivSR	14.278	3.868	26.770	10.647	13.133	5.146	31.822	10.784	3.517	1.258	37.160	11.958
	Improve.	1.00%	0.65%	59.94%	4.13%	3.75%	-0.73%	15.46%	4.98%	-0.62%	-0.40%	13.77%	2.04%
DESIGN	w/o social	13.553	3.742	51.277	11.898	14.102	5.308	56.267	12.878	3.427	1.213	32.761	11.779
	Base	14.984	4.187	42.228	11.852	15.367	6.001	24.262	11.130	4.127	1.422	35.290	12.828
	DivSR	15.008	4.200	43.371	11.926	15.424	6.007	26.661	11.150	4.172	1.462	37.298	12.979
	Improve.	0.16%	0.31%	2.71%	0.62%	0.37%	0.10%	9.89%	0.18%	1.09%	2.81%	5.69%	1.18%
MHCN	w/o social	14.518	4.001	59.502	11.813	15.803	6.016	19.746	10.464	3.152	1.174	22.905	11.021
	Base	15.365	4.317	53.273	11.654	16.338	6.504	22.173	10.529	4.574	1.645	40.205	12.173
	DivSR	15.323	4.306	55.903	11.674	16.336	6.441	25.572	10.536	4.579	1.633	43.757	12.268
	Improve.	-0.27%	-0.25%	4.94%	0.17%	-0.01%	-0.97%	15.33%	0.07%	0.11%	-0.73%	8.83%	0.78%

5.2 Main Results with Various Backbone Models

Backbones. As DivSR is model-agnostic, we evaluate its performance with representative social recommenders. TrustMF [36] employs matrix factorization (MF) to embed users into low-dimensional spaces. SocialMF [11] is a regularization-based social recommendation model that constrains users' latent vectors to be close to those of their social neighbors. DiffNet [35] utilizes graph convolutional networks to capture dynamic social diffusion in social graphs. MHCN [41] enhances social recommendation through self-supervised learning (SSL) on motif-induced hypergraphs. DESIGN [31] performs statistical data analyses to obtain a deeper understanding of the social influence theory.

Results. We train the base social models and their DivSR counterparts on three datasets. The overall recommendation results are shown in Table 3.

Here, we observe that social recommendation methods usually reduce recommendation diversity while improving recommendation accuracy compared to their non-social variants (except DESIGN and MHCN on Flickr). For DESIGN and MHCN on Flickr, we guess that the tendency that socially connected users to have similar preferences is not obvious. They just utilize social relations as supplemental information for self-supervised learning. For accuracy, GNNs-based methods outperform MF-based methods (*i.e.* DiffNet *vs.* TrustMF), which can be attributed to GNNs' strong capability in modeling graph data. SSL-enhanced methods prove to be more effective than methods without SSL (*i.e.* MHCN *vs.* DiffNet), highlighting the effectiveness of self-supervised learning. Regarding diversity, GNN-based methods tend to generate more diverse recommendations




Fig. 3: Accuracy-Diversity trade-off comparison on Yelp dataset.

than MF-based methods (*i.e.* DESIGN *vs.* SocialMF), which could be credited to their ability to equip users/items with more neighbors.

DivSR promotes diversity without excessively sacrificing accuracy, and in some cases, even improving it compared to these social recommendation backbones. For example, DivSR boosts diversity from 23% to 33% on average across the three datasets towards SocialMF, with accuracy fluctuating by less than 1%. Compared to GCN-based backbones, DivSR achieves a more substantial improvement in diversity over MF-based backbones. Meanwhile, DivSR generally exhibits a higher coverage while maintaining recall score compared to social recommendation backbones, indicating a better accuracy-diversity trade-off. It’s noteworthy that DivSR may occasionally demonstrate a slightly lower diversity than Social RS (w/o social), but the accuracy of the latter is markedly lower. These findings underscore the effectiveness of the knowledge distillation module in enhancing recommendation diversity while preserving high accuracy.

5.3 Comparison with Diversified Models

Baselines. We conduct experiments for comparison with several diversified methods. MMR [4] leverages marginal relevance to balance relevance and diversity. DPP [5] is an elegant probabilistic model that is widely used for diversified recommendation. DivMF [13] regularizes a score matrix of an MF model to maximize coverage of top- k recommendation lists. DGRec [38] designs the sub-modular function to select a diversified subset of neighbors to enhance diversity.

Results. In Figure 3, two re-ranking methods (MMR, DPP), promote more diverse recommendations with higher diversity. However, their recommendation accuracy declines significantly, indicating their failure to handle the accuracy-diversity dilemma. In contrast, DivSR occupies the most favorable position in the

Table 4: Performance comparison between different teacher strategies.

Dataset	Yelp		Ciao		Flickr	
Method	R@100	C@100	R@100	C@100	R@100	C@100
SocialMF	14.077	21.335	12.899	22.215	3.339	27.125
Uns.	13.802	24.469	12.824	29.078	<u>3.299</u>	<u>32.458</u>
DivSR(M)	<u>14.059</u>	<u>34.698</u>	13.151	31.975	3.307	31.890
DivSR	14.139	35.938	<u>12.942</u>	<u>31.684</u>	3.330	32.424
DiffNet	14.136	16.738	12.658	27.560	3.539	32.663
Uns.	13.685	22.936	12.828	31.254	2.298	33.053
DivSR(M)	<u>13.829</u>	<u>25.270</u>	13.245	32.013	3.517	37.160
DivSR	14.278	26.770	<u>13.133</u>	<u>31.822</u>	3.517	37.160

upper-right quadrant, demonstrating that DivSR achieves the optimal accuracy-diversity trade-off. When compared to DGRec, DivSR exhibits a substantial increase in diversity while making only a minor sacrifice in accuracy.

5.4 Teacher Model Choice Analysis

We design two different sources for the supervised signal to train the student model. **Uns.:** It removes the teacher model and directly minimizes the user-friend similarity in the student model, $\mathcal{L}_D = \sum_{(a,b) \in G_s} \|\psi_S(a,b)\|_2$, akin to an unsupervised training approach. **DivSR(M):** It selects the model with the highest diversity from five non-social models as the teacher model. Specifically, we utilize MHCN (w/o social) as the sole teacher model for Yelp, DESIGN (w/o social) for Ciao, and DiffNet (w/o social) for Flickr.

The results in Table 4 illustrate the comparison of different teacher choices. Firstly, the unsupervised method demonstrates that optimizing user features for diversity through similarity yields effectiveness. Despite potentially resulting in decreased accuracy, the unsupervised method often enhances diversity. Secondly, utilizing the supervised signal provided by the teacher model to guide diversity knowledge transfer proves beneficial for overall performance. DivSR and DivSR (M) consistently achieve superior trade-off results compared to the unsupervised method in most cases. Thirdly, DivSR typically outperforms DivSR (M) as it consistently ranks within the top-2 in comparisons. These results of variations underscore that meticulously optimizing user-friend similarity can lead to improved accuracy-diversity performance. Moreover, selecting different teacher models can yield significant performance gains.

5.5 Effect of Knowledge Distillation

To gain deeper insights into the effect of the knowledge distillation mechanism in DivSR, we present a visualization of user embeddings in Figure 4. Using the Louvain algorithm [3], we detect communities within the Flickr dataset. Subsequently, we randomly sample 2,000 users from the top five communities and apply t-SNE [20] to visualize their embeddings.




Fig. 4: User embeddings visualization.




Fig. 5: Parameter sensitivity.

We can observe that TrustMF (w/o social) generates relatively messy user representation distributions, lacking clear community aggregation behavior. Conversely, TrustMF (with social) exhibits pronounced community segregation, with users within the same community clustering closely while remaining isolated from users in other communities. This segregation can impede user development and content diversity. However, our model exhibits a certain degree of community aggregation while reducing the extent of community segregation, thereby making the communities less isolated from each other. This result demonstrates that the distillation mechanism has successfully learned low user similarity in non-social recommendation systems, showcasing the effectiveness of DivSR.

5.6 Parameter Sensitivity

In this part, we investigate the impacts of different values of β on trade-off performance between accuracy and diversity. As illustrated in Figure 5, as β decreases, the recall gradually increases, reaching its peak at a value of 0.1, and then declines until convergence. Conversely, diversity gradually decreases until convergence. When β decreases, the model assigns less weight to diversity learning, resulting in a decrease in diversity and an increase in accuracy. When β falls within an appropriate range (*i.e.* 0.05-0.1), the model achieves a good balance between accuracy and diversity, exhibiting high accuracy and high diversity simultaneously. Finally, as β approaches very small values, the constraint

on diversity learning almost disappears, causing the model to degrade into a social recommendation model, with both accuracy and diversity converging to the performance of the backbone model. The coefficient β plays a pivotal role in balancing the main task and the additional knowledge distillation task.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we study the trade-off between recommendation accuracy and diversity in social recommendation models. We empirically observe that several existing social recommendation methods tend to reduce diversity while improving accuracy compared to their non-social variants. In response to this challenge, we propose DivSR, a simple and model-agnostic solution that can be easily deployed on existing social recommendation models. DivSR operates by employing relational knowledge distillation techniques, facilitating the transfer of high-diversity structured knowledge from their non-social counterparts to the social recommendation models. Our findings demonstrate that, when prioritizing diversity, DivSR outperforms existing social recommender systems. Notably, DivSR achieves a superior accuracy-diversity trade-off compared to several diversified models, showcasing its efficacy in addressing the inherent tensions between accuracy and diversity in social recommendation systems.

References

1. Amatriain, X., Pujol, J.M., Tintarev, N., Oliver, N.: Rate it again: increasing recommendation accuracy by user re-rating. In: Proceedings of the third ACM conference on Recommender systems. pp. 173–180 (2009)
2. Avazpour, I., Pitakrat, T., Grunske, L., Grundy, J.: Dimensions and metrics for evaluating recommendation systems. Recommendation systems in software engineering pp. 245–273 (2014)
3. Blondel, V.D., Guillaume, J.L., Lambiotte, R., Lefebvre, E.: Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment* **2008**(10), P10008 (2008)
4. Carbonell, J., Goldstein, J.: The use of mmr, diversity-based reranking for re-ordering documents and producing summaries. In: Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval. pp. 335–336 (1998)
5. Chen, L., Zhang, G., Zhou, E.: Fast greedy map inference for determinantal point process to improve recommendation diversity. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31** (2018)
6. Chen, W., Ren, P., Cai, F., Sun, F., de Rijke, M.: Improving end-to-end sequential recommendations with intent-aware diversification. In: Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management. pp. 175–184 (2020)
7. Davidson, J., Liebald, B., Liu, J., Nandy, P., Van Vleet, T., Gargi, U., Gupta, S., He, Y., Lambert, M., Livingston, B., et al.: The youtube video recommendation system. In: Proceedings of the fourth ACM conference on Recommender systems. pp. 293–296 (2010)

8. Fan, W., Ma, Y., Li, Q., He, Y., Zhao, E., Tang, J., Yin, D.: Graph neural networks for social recommendation. In: The world wide web conference. pp. 417–426 (2019)
9. Guo, G., Zhang, J., Yorke-Smith, N.: Trustsvd: Collaborative filtering with both the explicit and implicit influence of user trust and of item ratings. In: Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence. vol. 29 (2015)
10. Hinton, G., Vinyals, O., Dean, J.: Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531 (2015)
11. Jamali, M., Ester, M.: A matrix factorization technique with trust propagation for recommendation in social networks. In: Proceedings of the fourth ACM conference on Recommender systems. pp. 135–142 (2010)
12. Kang, W.C., McAuley, J.: Self-attentive sequential recommendation. In: 2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM). pp. 197–206. IEEE (2018)
13. Kim, J., Jeon, H., Lee, J., Kang, U.: Diversely regularized matrix factorization for accurate and aggregately diversified recommendation. In: Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. pp. 361–373. Springer (2023)
14. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 (2014)
15. Kipf, T.N., Welling, M.: Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907 (2016)
16. Li, H., Li, L., Xu, G., Lin, C., Li, K., Jiang, B.: Spex: A generic framework for enhancing neural social recommendation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* **40**(2), 1–33 (2021)
17. Liang, Y., Qian, T., Li, Q., Yin, H.: Enhancing domain-level and user-level adaptivity in diversified recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. pp. 747–756 (2021)
18. Ma, H., Yang, H., Lyu, M.R., King, I.: Sorec: social recommendation using probabilistic matrix factorization. In: Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Information and knowledge management. pp. 931–940 (2008)
19. Ma, H., Zhou, D., Liu, C., Lyu, M.R., King, I.: Recommender systems with social regularization. In: Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining. pp. 287–296 (2011)
20. Van der Maaten, L., Hinton, G.: Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research* **9**(11) (2008)
21. Marsden, P.V., Friedkin, N.E.: Network studies of social influence. *Sociological Methods & Research* **22**(1), 127–151 (1993)
22. Parapar, J., Radlinski, F.: Towards unified metrics for accuracy and diversity for recommender systems. In: Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems. pp. 75–84 (2021)
23. Park, W.I., Kang, S., Kim, Y.K.: A personalized multimedia contents recommendation using a psychological model. *Computer Science and Information Systems* **9**(1), 1–21 (2012)
24. Park, W., Kim, D., Lu, Y., Cho, M.: Relational knowledge distillation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 3967–3976 (2019)
25. Puthiya Parambath, S.A., Usunier, N., Grandvalet, Y.: A coverage-based approach to recommendation diversity on similarity graph. In: Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems. pp. 15–22 (2016)
26. Rendle, S., Freudenthaler, C., Gantner, Z., Schmidt-Thieme, L.: Bpr: Bayesian personalized ranking from implicit feedback. arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.2618 (2012)

27. Romero, A., Ballas, N., Kahou, S.E., Chassang, A., Gatta, C., Bengio, Y.: Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550 (2014)
28. Sacharidis, D., Mukamakuza, C.P., Werthner, H.: Fairness and diversity in social-based recommender systems. In: Adjunct Publication of the 28th ACM Conference on User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization. pp. 83–88 (2020)
29. Schafer, J.B., Konstan, J.A., Riedl, J.: E-commerce recommendation applications. *Data mining and knowledge discovery* **5**, 115–153 (2001)
30. Tang, J., Gao, H., Liu, H.: mtrust: Discerning multi-faceted trust in a connected world. In: Proceedings of the fifth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining. pp. 93–102 (2012)
31. Tao, Y., Li, Y., Zhang, S., Hou, Z., Wu, Z.: Revisiting graph based social recommendation: A distillation enhanced social graph network. In: Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022. pp. 2830–2838 (2022)
32. Wang, T., Xia, L., Huang, C.: Denoised self-augmented learning for social recommendation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12685 (2023)
33. Wu, L., Chen, L., Hong, R., Fu, Y., Xie, X., Wang, M.: A hierarchical attention model for social contextual image recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **32**(10), 1854–1867 (2019)
34. Wu, L., Li, J., Sun, P., Hong, R., Ge, Y., Wang, M.: Diffnet++: A neural influence and interest diffusion network for social recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **34**(10), 4753–4766 (2020)
35. Wu, L., Sun, P., Fu, Y., Hong, R., Wang, X., Wang, M.: A neural influence diffusion model for social recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval. pp. 235–244 (2019)
36. Yang, B., Lei, Y., Liu, J., Li, W.: Social collaborative filtering by trust. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* **39**(8), 1633–1647 (2016)
37. Yang, J.: Effects of popularity-based news recommendations (“most-viewed”) on users’ exposure to online news. *Media Psychology* **19**(2), 243–271 (2016)
38. Yang, L., Wang, S., Tao, Y., Sun, J., Liu, X., Yu, P.S., Wang, T.: Dgrec: Graph neural network for recommendation with diversified embedding generation. In: Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining. pp. 661–669 (2023)
39. You, S., Xu, C., Xu, C., Tao, D.: Learning from multiple teacher networks. In: Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. pp. 1285–1294 (2017)
40. Yu, J., Yin, H., Gao, M., Xia, X., Zhang, X., Viet Hung, N.Q.: Socially-aware self-supervised tri-training for recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining. pp. 2084–2092 (2021)
41. Yu, J., Yin, H., Li, J., Wang, Q., Hung, N.Q.V., Zhang, X.: Self-supervised multi-channel hypergraph convolutional network for social recommendation. In: Proceedings of the web conference 2021. pp. 413–424 (2021)
42. Zheng, B., Hou, Y., Zhao, W.X., Song, Y., Zhu, H.: Reciprocal sequential recommendation. In: Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems. pp. 89–100 (2023)
43. Zheng, Y., Gao, C., Chen, L., Jin, D., Li, Y.: Dgcn: Diversified recommendation with graph convolutional networks. In: Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021. pp. 401–412 (2021)