Influence Maximization in Networks

Thanks to Jure Leskovec, Stanford and Panayiotis Tsaparas, Univ. of Ioannina for slides

Agenda

- The **Influence Maximization Problem** (**IMP**)
  - (Or, how to create big cascades)
  - (Or, finding the most influential set of nodes)
- **IMP** Hardness
- **IMP** Approximation
  - Submodularity
  - Hill Climbing Approximation Algorithm
- **IMP** Experiments and Remarks

Viral Marketing?

- **We are more influenced by our friends than strangers**



- 68% of consumers consult friends and family before purchasing home electronics
- 50% do research online before purchasing electronics

Viral Marketing

Identify influential customers



These customers endorse the product among their friends

Convince them to adopt the product – Offer discount/free samples

How to Create Big Cascades?

- **Information epidemics:**
  - Which are the influential users?
  - Which news sites create big cascades?
  - Where should we advertise?



Which node shall we target?

● vs. ●

Probabilistic Contagion

- **Independent Cascade Model**
  - Directed finite $G = (V, E)$
  - Set S starts out with new behavior
    - Say nodes with this behavior are "**active**"
  - Each edge (v, w) has a probability p_{vw}
  - If node v is active, it gets **one** chance to make w active, with probability p_{vw}
    - Each edge fires at most once
- **Does scheduling matter? No**
  - u, v both active, doesn't matter which fires first
  - **But the time moves in discrete steps**

Independent Cascade Model

- **Initially some nodes *S* are active**
- Each edge (v, w) has probability (weight) p_{vw}



- **When node *v* becomes active:**
  - It activates each out-neighbor w with prob. p_{vw}
- **Activations spread through the network**

Most Influential Set of Nodes

- ***S***: is initial active set
- ***f(S)***: The expected size of final active set



- **Set *S* is more influential if *f(S)* is larger**

$$f(\{a,b\}) < f(\{a,c\}) < f(\{a,d\})$$

Most Influential Set

Problem: (*k* is user-specified parameter)

- **Most influential set of size *k*:** set ***S*** of ***k*** nodes producing largest **expected** cascade size ***f(S)*** if activated
  [Domingos-Richardson '01]
- **Optimization problem:** $\max_{S \text{ of size } k} f(S)$



*Influence set X_a of **a***

*Influence set X_d of **d***

Why "expected cascade size"? X_a is a result of a random process. So in practice we would want to compute X_a for many realizations and then maximize the "average" value $f(S)$. For now let's ignore this nuisance and simply assume that each node a influences *a* set of nodes X_a

$$f(S) = \sum_{\text{Random realizations } i} f_i(S)$$

How hard is influence maximization?

Most Influential Subset of Nodes

- **Problem: Most influential set of *k* nodes:**
  set ***S*** on ***k*** nodes producing largest expected cascade size ***f(S)*** if activated
- **The optimization problem:**

$$\max_{\text{S of size k}} f(S)$$

- **How hard is this problem?**
  - **NP-COMPLETE!**
    - Show that finding most influential set is at least as hard as a **vertex cover**

Background: Vertex Cover

- **Vertex cover problem**
  (a known NP-complete problem):
  - Given universe of elements $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$ and sets $X_1, \ldots, X_m \subseteq U$



  - **Are there *k* sets among $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ such that their union is *U*?**
- **Goal:**
  Encode vertex cover as an instance of $\max_{S \text{ of size } k} f(S)$

Influence Maximization is NP-hard

- Let a vertex cover instance with sets $X_1, \ldots, X_m$
- Build a bipartite "X-to-U" graph:



e.g.:
$X_1 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$

Construction:
- Create edge (X_i, u) $\forall X_i$ $\forall u \in X_i$ -- directed edge from sets to their elements
- Put weight 1 on each edge (the activation is deterministic)

- **Vertex Cover as Influence Maximization in X-to-U graph: There exists a set *S* of size *k* with *f(S)=k+n* iff there exists a size *k* set cover**

Note: Optimal solution is always a set of nodes X_i (we never influence nodes "*u*") This problem is hard in general, could be special cases that are easier.

Summary so Far

- **Extremely bad news:**
  - **Influence maximization is NP-complete**
- **Next, good news:**
  - **There exists an approximation algorithm!**
    - For some inputs the algorithm won't find globally optimal solution/set ***OPT***
    - But we will also prove that the algorithm will never do too badly either. More precisely, the algorithm will find a set ***S*** where ***f(S) > 0.63*f(OPT)***, where *OPT* is the globally optimal set.

The Approximation Algorithm

- **Consider a Greedy Hill Climbing algorithm to find *S*:**
  - **Input:**
    Influence set $\boldsymbol{X_u}$ of each node $\boldsymbol{u}$: $\boldsymbol{X_u} = \{\boldsymbol{v_1}, \boldsymbol{v_2}, \dots\}$
    - If we activate $\boldsymbol{u}$, nodes $\{\boldsymbol{v_1}, \boldsymbol{v_2}, \dots\}$ will eventually get active
  - **Algorithm:** At each iteration $\boldsymbol{i}$ take the node $\boldsymbol{u}$ that gives best marginal gain:
    $\max_{\boldsymbol{u}} \boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{S_{i-1}} \cup \{\boldsymbol{u}\})$

S_i … Initially active set
$f(S_i)$ … Size of the union of X_u, $u \in S_i$

(Greedy) Hill Climbing

Algorithm:

- Start with $\boldsymbol{S_0 = \{\,\}}$
- For $\boldsymbol{i = 1 \ldots k}$
  - Take node $\boldsymbol{u}$ that max $\boldsymbol{f(S_{i-1} \cup \{u\})}$
  - Let $\boldsymbol{S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{u\}}$



- **Example:**
  - Eval. $f(\{a\}), \ldots, f(\{e\})$, pick max of them
  - Eval. $f(\{\boldsymbol{d}, a\}), \ldots, f(\{\boldsymbol{d}, e\})$, pick max
  - Eval. $f(\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{b}, a\}), \ldots, f(\{\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{b}, e\})$, pick max



Approximation Guarantee

- **Claim: Hill climbing produces a solution S where: $f(S) \geq (1-1/e)*f(OPT)$** $(f(S)>0.63*f(OPT))$
  [Nemhauser, Fisher, Wolsey '78, Kempe, Kleinberg, Tardos '03]
- **Claim holds for functions $f(\cdot)$ with 2 properties:**
  - **f is monotone:** (activating more nodes doesn't hurt)
    if $S \subseteq T$ then $f(S) \leq f(T)$ and $f(\{\})=0$
  - **f is submodular:** (activating each additional node helps less)
    adding an element to a set gives less improvement than adding it to one of its subsets: $\forall S \subseteq T$

$$\underbrace{f(S \cup \{u\}) - f(S)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a small set}} \geq \underbrace{f(T \cup \{u\}) - f(T)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a large set}}$$

Submodularity– Diminishing returns

- **Diminishing returns:**



$\forall S \subseteq T$

Adding ***u*** to ***T*** helps less than adding it to **S**!

$$\underbrace{f(S \cup \{u\}) - f(S)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a small set}} \geq \underbrace{f(T \cup \{u\}) - f(T)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a large set}}$$

Plan: Prove 2 things

(1) Our f(S) is submodular

(2) Hill Climbing gives near-optimal solutions

(for monotone submodular functions)

Background: Submodular Functions

- **We must show our $f(\cdot)$ is submodular:**
- $\forall S \subseteq T$

$$\underbrace{f(S \cup \{u\}) - f(S)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a small set}} \geq \underbrace{f(T \cup \{u\}) - f(T)}_{\text{Gain of adding a node to a large set}}$$

- **Basic fact 1:**
  - If $f_1(x), \ldots, f_k(x)$ are **submodular**, and $c_1, \ldots, c_k \geq 0$ then $F(x) = \sum_i c_i \cdot f_i(x)$ is also **submodular**

    (Linear combination of submodular functions is a submodular function)

Background: Submodular Functions

- $\forall S \subseteq T: \underbrace{f(S \cup \{u\}) - f(S)}_{\text{Gain of adding } u \text{ to a small set}} \geq \underbrace{f(T \cup \{u\}) - f(T)}_{\text{Gain of adding } u \text{ to a large set}}$
- **Basic fact 2: A simple submodular function**
  - Sets $X_1, \ldots, X_m$
  - $f(S) = \left|\cup_{k \in S} X_k\right|$ (size of the union of sets X_k, $k \in S$)
  - **Claim: $f(S)$ is submodular!**



The more sets you already have the less new area a given set will cover

Our *f(S)* is Submodular!

$$f(S) = \sum_{\text{Random realizations } i} f_i(S)$$

- **Proof strategy:**
  - We will argue that influence maximization is an instance of the **set cover problem**:
    - ***f(S)*** is the size of the union of nodes influenced by set **S**
    - Note ***f(S)*** is "random" (a result of a random process) so we need to be careful
    - **Principle of deferred decision to the rescue!**



Our $f(S)$ is Submodular!

$$f(S) = \sum_{\text{Random realizations } i} f_i(S)$$

- **Principle of deferred decision:**
  - Flip all the coins at the beginning and record which edges fire successfully
  - **Now we have a deterministic graph!**
  - **Def:** Edge is **live** if it fired successfully
    - That is, we remove edges that did not fire



Influence sets for realization i:

$X_a^i = \{a,f,c,g\}$

$X_b^i = \{b,c\}$,

$X_c^i = \{c\}$

$X_d^i = \{d,e,h\}$

…

- **What is influence set X_u of node u?**
  - **The set reachable by live-edge paths from u**

Our *f(S)* is Submodular!

$$f(S) = \sum_{\text{Random realizations } i} f_i(S)$$

- What is an influence set X_u?
  - The set reachable by live-edge paths from u
- What is now ***f(S)?***
  - ***$f_i(S)$*** = size of the set reachable by live-edge paths from nodes in ***S***



Influence sets for realization *i*:

X_a^i = {a,f,c,g}

X_b^i = {b,c},

X_c^i = {c}

X_d^i = {d,e,h}

- **For the i-th realization of coin flips**
  - $f_i(S = \{a, b\}) = |\{a, f, c, g\} \cup \{b, c\}| = 5$
  - $f_i(S = \{a, d\}) = |\{a, f, c, g\} \cup \{d, e, h\}| = 7$

Our $f(S)$ is Submodular!

$$f(S) = \sum_{\text{Random realizations } i} f_i(S)$$



Activate edges by coin flipping







- **Fix outcome $i \in I$ of coin flips**
- X_v^i = set of nodes reachable from v on live-edge paths
- $f_i(S)$ = size of cascades from S given coin flips i
- $f_i(S) = \left|\bigcup_{v \in S} X_v^i\right| \Rightarrow f_i(S)$ is **submodular!**
  - X_v^i are sets, $f_i(S)$ is the size of their union
- **Expected influence set size:** $f(S) = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(S) \Rightarrow f(S)$ is **submodular!**
  - $f(S)$ is a linear combination of submodular functions

RECAP: Influence Maximization

- **Find most influential set *S* of size *k*:** largest expected cascade size ***f(S)*** if set ***S*** is activated



Network, each edge activates with prob. p_{uv}

Activate edges by coin flipping

Multiple realizations *i*:



- **Want to solve:**

$$\max_{|S|=k} f(S) = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(S)$$

Consider ***S={a,d}*** then:
$f_1(S)=5$, $f_2(S)=4$, $f_3(S)=3$
and **f(S) = 12**

… influence set of node *a*
… influence set of node *d*

Plan: Prove 2 things

(1) Our f(S) is submodular

(2) Hill Climbing gives near-optimal solutions

(for monotone submodular functions)

Proof for Hill Climbing

Claim:

If f(S) is monotone and submodular.
Hill climbing produces a solution S

where: $\boldsymbol{f(S) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) \cdot f(OPT)}$

- In other words: $f(S) > 0.63 \cdot f(OPT)$

- **The setting:**
  - Keep adding nodes that give the largest gain
  - Start with $\boldsymbol{S_0 = \{\}}$, produce sets $\boldsymbol{S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_k}$
  - **Add elements one by one**
  - Let $\boldsymbol{OPT = \{t_1 \ldots t_k\}}$ be **the optimal set (OPT)** of size $\boldsymbol{k}$
- **We need to show:** $\boldsymbol{f(S) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e})\, f(OPT)}$

Proof Overview

- **Define: Marginal gain:** $\delta_i = f(S_i) - f(S_{i-1})$
- **Proof: 3 steps:**
  - **0)** Lemma: $f(A \cup B) - f(A) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} [f(A \cup \{b_j\}) - f(A)]$
    - **where:** $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$ and $f(\cdot)$ is submodular



  - **1)** $\delta_{i+1} \geq \frac{1}{k}[f(OPT) - f(S_i)]$
  - **2)** $f(S_{i+1}) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) f(S_i) + \frac{1}{k} f(OPT)$
  - **3)** $f(S_k) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) f(OPT)$

Step zero: Basic Hill Climbing Fact

- $f(A \cup B) - f(A) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} [f(A \cup \{b_j\}) - f(A)]$
  - **where:** $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$ and $f(\cdot)$ is submodular
- **Proof:**
  - Let $\boldsymbol{B_i} = \{\boldsymbol{b_1}, \ldots \boldsymbol{b_i}\}$, so we have $\boldsymbol{B_1}, \boldsymbol{B_2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{B_k}(= \boldsymbol{B})$
  - $f(A \cup \mathrm{B}) - f(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} [f(A \cup B_i) - f(A \cup B_{i-1})]$
  - $= \sum_{i=1}^{k} [f(A \cup B_{i-1} \cup \{b_i\}) - f(A \cup B_{i-1})]$
  - $\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} [f(A \cup \{b_i\}) - f(A)]$

By submodularity since A∪X ∪{b} ⊇ A∪{b}

Work out the sum. Everything but 1st and last term cancel out:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\cancel{f(A \cup B_1)} - f(A \cup B_0) \\
&+ \cancel{f(A \cup B_2)} - \cancel{f(A \cup B_1)} \\
&+ \cancel{f(A \cup B_3)} - \cancel{f(A \cup B_2)} \ldots \\
&+ f(A \cup B_k) - \cancel{f(A \cup B_{k-1})}
\end{aligned}
$$

Step one: What is δ_i gain at step *i*?

Remember: $\boldsymbol{\delta_i = f(S_i) - f(S_{i-1})}$

- $f(OPT) \leq f(S_i \cup OPT)$ (by monotonicity)
- $= f(S_i \cup OPT) - f(S_i) + f(S_i)$
- $\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} [f(S_i \cup \{t_j\}) - f(S_i)] + f(S_i)$ (by prev. slide)
- $\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} [\delta_{i+1}] + f(S_i)$
- $= f(S_i) + k\ \delta_{i+1}$
- **Thus:** $f(OPT) \leq f(S_i) + k\ \delta_{i+1}$
- $\Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\delta_{i+1} \geq \frac{1}{k}[f(OPT) - f(S_i)]}$

OPT = { t_1, … t_k }
t_j is j-th element of the optimal solution.

Rather than choosing t_j let's greedily choose **the best element q_i**, which gives a gain of δ_{i+1}.
So, $\boldsymbol{f(S_i \cup \{t_j\}) \leq \delta_{i+1}}$.
This is the "hill-climbing" assumption.

Step two: What is $f(S_{i+1})$?

- **We just showed:** $\delta_{i+1} \geq \frac{1}{k}[f(OPT) - f(S_i)]$
- **What is $f(S_{i+1})$?**
  - $f(S_{i+1}) = f(S_i) + \delta_{i+1}$
  - $\geq f(S_i) + \frac{1}{k}[f(OPT) - f(S_i)]$
  - $= \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) f(S_i) + \frac{1}{k} f(OPT)$
- **What is $f(S_k)$?**

Step three: What is $f(S_k)$?

- **Claim:** $f(S_i) \geq \left[1-\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)^i\right] f(OPT)$

Proof by induction:

- $\boldsymbol{i = 0}$:
  - $f(S_0) = f(\{\}) = 0$
  - $\left[1-\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)^0\right] f(OPT) = 0$

Step three: What is $f(S_k)$?

- **Given that this is true for S_i:** $f(S_i) \geq \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^i\right] f(OPT)$

Proof by induction:

- **At $i + 1$:**
  - $f(S_{i+1}) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) f(S_i) + \frac{1}{k} f(OPT)$
  - $\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^i\right] f(OPT) + \frac{1}{k} f(OPT)$

    the claim
  - $= \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{i+1}\right] f(OPT)$

Two slides ago we showed:

$$f(S_{i+1}) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right) f(S_i) + \frac{1}{k} f(OPT)$$

What is $f(S_k)$?

- **Thus:**

$$f(S) = f(S_k) \geq \left[1 - \underbrace{\left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^k}_{\leq \frac{1}{e}}\right] f(OPT)$$

- **So:**

$$f(S_k) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{e}\right) f(OPT)$$

qed.

Solution Quality

We just proved:

- Hill climbing finds solution *S* which
  f(S) ≥ (1-1/e)*f(OPT) i.e., $f(S) \geq 0.63 * f(OPT)$

- This is a **data <u>independent</u> bound**
  - This is a worst case bound
  - No matter what is the input data, we know that the Hill-Climbing **will never do worse** than *0.63*f(OPT)*

Evaluating *f(S)*?

- **How to evaluate *f(S)*?**
  - Still an open question of how to compute it efficiently
- **But: Very good estimates by simulation**
  - Repeating the diffusion process often enough (polynomial in ***n***; 1/ε)
  - Achieve ***(1*± *ε)*-approximation** to ***f(S)***
  - Generalization of Nemhauser-Wolsey proof: Greedy algorithm is now a ***(1-1/e- ε')*-approximation**

Experiments and Concluding Thoughts

Experiment Data

- **A collaboration network**: co-authorships in papers of the arXiv high-energy physics theory:
  - 10,748 nodes, 53,000 edges
  - **Example cascade process:** Spread of new scientific terminology/method or new research area
- **Independent Cascade Model:**
  - **Case 1:** Uniform probability ***p*** on each edge
  - **Case 2:** Edge from **v** to **w** has probability **1/deg(w)** of activating **w**.

Experiment Settings

- **Simulate the process 10,000 times for each targeted set**
  - Every time re-choosing edge outcomes randomly
- **Compare with other 3 common heuristics**
  - **Degree centrality:** Pick nodes with highest degree
  - **Distance centrality:** Pick nodes in the “center” of the network
  - **Random nodes:** Pick a random set of nodes

Independent Cascade Model



$p_{uv} = 0.01$



$p_{uv} = 0.10$

Uniform edge firing probability p_{uv}

Independent Cascade Model



$p_{uv}=1/\deg(v)$

Non-uniform edge firing probability p_{uv}

Discussion

- **Notice:** Greedy approach is slow!
  - For a given network ***G***, repeat 10,000s of times:
    - Flip coin for each edge and determine influence sets under coin-flip realization *i*
    - Each node *u* is associated with 10,000s influence sets X_u^i
  - **Greedy's complexity is $O(k \cdot n \cdot R \cdot M)$**
    - n … number of nodes in *G*
    - k … number of nodes be selected/influenced
    - R … number of simulation rounds
    - m … number of edges in *G*

Cottage Industry of Heuristics

- Many researchers have since proposed heuristics that work well in practice and run faster than the greedy algorithm

[Chen, Wang, Yang, KDD '09]



Figure 2: Influence spreads of different algorithms on the collaboration graph NetPHY under the independent cascade model ($n = 37,154$, $m = 231,584$, and $p = 0.01$).



Figure 4: Running times of different algorithms on the collaboration graph NetPHY under the independent cascade model ($n = 37,154$, $m = 231,584$, $p = 0.01$, and $k = 50$).

Open Questions

- **More realistic marketing:**
  - Different marketing actions increase **likelihood** of initial activation, for **several** nodes at once
- **Study more general influence models**
  - Find trade-offs between generality and feasibility
- **Deal with negative influences**
  - Model competing ideas
- Obtain more data (better models) about how activations occur in real social networks