

# Generalized Reputation Computation Ontology and Temporal Graph Architecture

Anton Kolonin<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Stichting SingularityNET, Barbara Strozilaan 362 (Eurocenter II), 1083, HN, Amsterdam.*

<sup>2</sup>*Novosibirsk State University, 1 Pyrogova str., Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia.*

akolonin@gmail.com

**Annotation.** *The problem of reliable democratic governance is important for survival of any community, and it will be more and critical over time communities with levels of social connectivity in society rapidly increasing with speeds and scales of electronic communication. In order to face this challenge, different sorts of rating and reputation systems are being develop, however reputation gaming and manipulation in such systems appears to be serious problem. We are considering use of advanced reputation system supporting “liquid democracy” principle with generalized design and underlying ontology fitting different sorts of environments such as social networks, financial ecosystems and marketplaces. The suggested system is based on “weighted liquid rank” algorithm employing different sorts of explicit and implicit ratings being exchanged by members of the society. For the purpose, we suggest “incremental reputation” design and graph database used for implementation of the system. Finally, we present evaluation of the system against real social network and financial blockchain data.*

**Keywords:** graph database, liquid democracy, multi-agent environment, reputation system, social system ontology

## 1 Introduction

The entire history of human communities shows that no reliable solution for reaching truly long-term democratic consensus in society has been invented so far [1]. Different sorts of social organizations and governance policy have been tried, starting with completely centralized governance in from of “monarchy” and ending with completely distributed “anarchy”. In any case, the crucial part of social organization design remains principles of reaching social consensus recognized and accepted by entire society.

One form of consensus is known to be based on brute force in animal groups and ancient societies, serving the minority having the access to the force. The same solution is reproduced in nowadays distributed computing systems such as blockchains and called Proof-of-Work (PoW). More advanced form of consensus employed by human race now is based of financial capabilities of members of society. It is known to lead to the situation when “reacher become richer” and gain more and more power. This is is also replicated with the same phenomena observed in latest developments of blockchain systems relying on Proof-of-Stake (PoS). Further, in some of the latest blockchain systems, the employed solution is so-called Delegated Proof-of-Stake (DPoS). The latter solution still implies the rule on basis of financial capabilities being implemented indirectly, by means of manually controlled voting process to selected delegates who conduct the governance of the system.

The limited list of the options above leads to the situation that consensus in any community or a distributed computing system may be easily taken over by a group which concentrates substantial amount of power (be it physical, military or computational one) of financial resources. Obviously, the latter group may be minority organized towards the goals hostile to the majority of the community. So,


the better and more reliable and fair forms of consensus are in demand. The one of them is so-called Proof-of-Reputation (PoR) [2] consensus being discussed further.

## 2 Reputation System Concept

The suggested Reputation Consensus [2] implementing Proof-of-Reputation (PoR) principle, opposing power of brute force (PoW), power of money (PoS or DPoS), as shown on Fig. 1. We anticipate that the Proof-of-Reputation can make it possible to implement system of Liquid Democracy to cure known issues of representative democracy, influenced by power of money. In this case the governing power of member of a human or artificial society depends on Reputation of the member earned on basis of the following principles.

- Reputation may be computed by means of different measures, called “ratings”, performed explicitly or implicitly by all members of community, called “raters”, in respect to ones who Reputation is being computed for, called “ratees”, with account to Reputations of the “raters” themselves.
- Reputation computation is time-scoped, so that measures collected by a ratee in the past are less contributing to its current Reputation than the latest ones, which have more impact.
- Data used to compute the Reputations of all raters and ratees with the ratings that they issue or receive is open so that audit of Reputations and the historical measures over the history can be performed in order to prevent Reputation manipulation and gaming.

Consensus – technology to govern distributed multi-agent systems such as blockchains or societies, resistant to takeover and scam.



**Fig. 1.** Types of consensus in distributed systems such as Proof-of-Work, Proof-of-Stake and Proof-of-Reputation.

There may be many kinds of explicit and implicit measures contributing to evaluation of Reputation considered, depending on a kind of practical use case and implementation of a given Reputation system [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. For instance, it could be system serving social network [8] or a marketplace [9].


Applicability of the measures or ratings may depend on accuracy and reliability that they may provide as well as resistance to attack vectors targeting takeover of the consensus by means of reputation cheating and gaming for specific case. In the current work we are trying to come up with generic purpose architecture so are going to enumerate all possible options. Respectively, following the work [2] we consider such measures as: a) members explicitly staking financial values on other members; b) members explicitly providing ratings in respect to transactions committed with other

members; c) implicit ratings computed from the financial values of transactions between the members; d) evaluation of textual, audial and video reviews or mentions made by members in respect to other members or transactions between them.

### 3 Reputation System Ontology

Generic purpose ontology for a Reputation System serving an online community may be depicted on Fig. 2 with the following entities identified (some of them show on the Fig.2 and some omitted).

- Account – primary entity of a Reputation System to play a “rater” or “ratee” role or both, can be impersonating a physical person, business or governmental entity, robotic system etc.;
- Smart Contract – secondary entity specific to blockchain environments which may belong to some of the Accounts;
- Product/Service – secondary entity specific to marketplace environments identifying products or services provided by some of the Accounts;
- Post/Comment – secondary entity specific to social networks or messaging environments representing any sort of textual, audial or any other sensible non-financial communication;
- Word – tertiary entity specific to social networks or messaging environments identifying a word used in a post/comment and carrying positive or negative sentiment which can be purposed to assess its impact on reputation;
- Tag/Category – any classification of any of the entities identified above.



**Fig. 2.** Simplified ontology of the generic-purpose Reputation System for online environments.

Besides the entities above, there are relationship connecting them, such as the following.

- Votes – any “Vote”, “Like” or “Rate” event providing assessment of any communication on behalf of a “rater” Account;
- Authors – authorship of a communication;
- Mentions – mentioning of an Account in a communication;
- Uses – use of a Word in a communication;
- Relates – relevance of a Post/Comment or a Product/Service (not shown on Fig.1) to specific Tag/Category;

- Provides – provision of a Product/Service (not shown on Fig.1) on behalf of an Account;
- Follows – following of one Account by another in a social network;
- Creates – creation of a Smart Contract by an Account;
- Calls – call of a Smart Contract by an Account;
- Pays (Transfers) – transfer of a funds for a Service/Product (not shown on Fig.1), which may be involving Smart contract or not, assuming that each Pay or Transfer may also have multiple properties such as amount of the payment and currency, inventory of services or products being ordered and paid and the optional rating “Rate” event, if applies.

## 4 Incremental Implementation and Temporal Graph Database

Given the high volumes of data being involved in real-world financial networks and requirements for low response time on behalf of production systems, we focus on “incremental” design option for Reputation System described in the earlier work [2].

The implementation employs in-memory graph database of Aigents project available in Java as open source <https://github.com/aigents/aigents-java>.

The first key feature of the Aigents graph database is its ability to store labeled temporal graphs with possibility to attach any value to an edge between two vertices, so the value can be either numeric value indicating weight or strength of the relationship in a weighted graph or a compound truth value in probabilistic logic network [10]. In case of the Reputation System implementation, it may keep either single rating assessment or a financial transaction value and currency, or the combination of them all so the ratings may be weighted by financial values as presented in the earlier work [9]. Notably, the edge may contain entire probabilistic distribution or the list of associated transactions along with ratings and financial values.

The second feature of the Aigents graph database is its ability to slice graphs on temporal basis so that each time period is stored in separate subgraph while the subgraphs can be arbitrary merged, or the subgraphs of multiple temporal subgraphs can be extracted and merged over time. In the case of Reputation System implementation, it has appeared logical to keep all transactions segmented in temporal subgraphs specific to what is called recalculation period [2] or observation period [9], which is 1 day by default in the current implementation.

The indexing of the data is primarily temporal and secondary based on vertices and types of the relationships. During the run-time, temporal ranges of subgraphs being processed on time scale are bound to memory resources available as well, so that amount of storage space limits time range that can be processed simultaneously. However, the incremental nature of the reputation recalculation given the “incremental” design option needs only few subgraphs to be present in memory at one time.


Specifically, the two types of graphs are purposed for the Reputation System implementation. First, there is “reputation evidence data” with historical data accumulated for each of the observation period such as single day by default. Second, there is “reputation state” graph keeping current “reputation balance” for each of the periods. That is, for each of the reputation update process per observation period accordingly to the algorithm specification [9], the only three subgraphs should be present in physical memory – one “reputation evidence data” for the current period and two “reputation state” subgraphs for current and previous periods.

## 5 Application to real Social Network and Blockchain Data

The illustration of how the Reputation System can work has been evaluated with use of real world data extracted from public blockchain Steemit as discussed in the earlier work [8]. We have tried to evaluate how the level of reputation computed by the Reputation System for participants of Steemit social network corresponds to the evaluations of trust and credibility given to them manually. For the purpose, we were computing reputations for entire network for long period of time based on both social and financial data involving voting for posts, commenting on posts and sending financial payments as well. Further, the computed reputation ranks were compared against the “black lists” maintained by network administrators and volunteers as well as against the lists of “whales”, called so for listing well-known publicly available participants. The extra study has been performed to see how

the reputation changes over time for accounts of different kinds (“black-listed” or “whales”), assuming every account starts with default reputation of  $0.5$  which may get changed to higher or lower over time, as it is shown on Fig. 3.

The observation made given the reputation dynamics is that “expectedly highly reputable” (from the “whales” list) accounts are given longer “tails” spanning over time so reputation either does not decay or decays slowly. On the opposite, the “expectedly low reputable accounts” (from the “black lists”) are present with fast decay of the reputation values.



**Fig. 3.** Temporal dynamics of reputation values for randomly selected 5 accounts from “black-lists” and 5 accounts from “whales” list. Horizontal axis corresponds to time period of 3 months from left to right, vertical axis indicates reputation value in range from  $0.0$  to  $1.0$ , labeled on scale from  $0$  to  $100$  on the chart.

## 6 Conclusion

We have come up with generalized ontology capable to describe possible interactions in a wide range of online environments such as social networks, marketplaces and financial ecosystems including blockchains.

We have designed and implemented Reputation System available as part of the open source Aigents project at <https://github.com/aigents/aigents-java>. As a part of the implementation, the temporal Aigents graph database has been successfully evaluated for the purpose of storage and processing of the reputation data.

We were able to extract data described by the ontology from the real world social network and financial ecosystem based on public blockchain and have successfully evaluated the performance of the computations against known reference data.

## References

- [1] Hazin M., Shheglov S. Stairway to Heaven. Dialogues about power, careers and the world elite. *Book on Demand Ltd.* February 24, 2018. <https://www.amazon.com/Stairway-Heaven-Dialogues-careers-Russian/dp/5519547254>
- [2] Kolonin A., Goertzel D., Duong D., Ikle M. A Reputation System for Artificial Societies. *arXiv:1806.07342 [cs.AI]*, 2018. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.07342>

- [3] Swamynathan G., Almeroth K., Zhao B. The design of a reliable reputation system. *Electron Commer Res* 10: 239–270, pp.239-270, 2010. DOI 10.1007/s10660-010-9064-y, 31 August 2010 <http://people.cs.uchicago.edu/~ravenben/publications/pdf/reputation-ecrj10.pdf>
- [4] Sanger, J. & Pernul G. Interactive Reputation Systems. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, August 2018, Volume 60, Issue 4, pp 273–287, 2018 60: 273, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-017-0493-1>
- [5] Androulaki E., Choi S.G., Bellovin S.M., Malkin T. Reputation Systems for Anonymous Networks. In: Borisov N., Goldberg I. (eds) *Privacy Enhancing Technologies*. PETS 2008. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 5134. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-70630-4\\_13](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-70630-4_13)
- [6] Gupta M., Judge P., Ammar M. A Reputation System for Peer-to-Peer Networks. *NOSSDAV'03*, June 1–3, 2003, Monterey, California, USA, ACM 1-58113-694-3/03/0006, 2003). <https://www.cs.indiana.edu/~minaxi/pubs/reputation.pdf>
- [7] Blomer J., Juhnke J. & Kolb C. Anonymous and Publicly Linkable Reputation Systems. *Financial Cryptography and Data Security 2015*, Cryptology ePrint Archive: Report 2014/546, 2015. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2014/546>
- [8] Kolonin A. Reputation Systems for Human-Computer Environments" In: *Complexity, Informatics and Cybernetics*: IMCIC 2019, conference materials, Orlando, Florida, USA, 2019. <https://aigents.com/papers/2019/ReputationSystemsForHumanComputerEnvironmentsIMCIC2019.pdf>
- [9] Kolonin A., Goertzel D., Pennachin C., Duong D., Argentieri M., Znidar N. *A Reputation System for Marketplaces - Viability Assessment*. arXiv: 1902.03857 [cs.SI], 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.03857>
- [10] Goertzel B., Ikle M., Goertzel I., Heljakka A. Probabilistic Logic Networks: A Comprehensive Framework for Uncertain Inference, *Springer Publishing Company*, Incorporated ©2008 ISBN:0387768718 9780387768717. <https://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1468044>