

On the Non-Progressive Spread of Influence through Social Networks

MohammadAmin Fazli, Jafar Habibi, Pooya Jalaly Khalilabadi, Sina Sadeghian Sadeghabad
Computer Engineering Dept., Sharif University of Technology
fazli, jalaly, s_sadeghian@ce.sharif.edu, habibi@sharif.edu

July 17, 2022

Abstract

In the seminal work of D. Kempe et al. in [20], two models were proposed for the spread of influence in social networks, the progressive model and the non-progressive model. While many works regarding the progressive model have been done, few ones have studied the spread of influence in the non-progressive model. Given a graph G , a *0/1 initial assignment* is a function $f_0 : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which demonstrates whether each vertex is influenced at time zero or not. A function of thresholds $t : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is given. In the *non-progressive spread of influence* model, at time τ ($\tau > 0$), every vertex v for which at least $t(v)$ of its neighbors have been influenced becomes infected and is not infected otherwise. The problem of finding a minimum *perfect target set* (PTS) for a graph with a given threshold function, is equal to finding a 0/1 initial assignment with minimum number of initially influenced vertices where the influence eventually spread to all other vertices.

In this paper, we study the spread of influence in the non-progressive model under the strict majority threshold. First we prove the lower and upper bound in terms of maximum and minimum degree of vertices in general graphs. We prove that this problem is NP-Hard and then a greedy algorithm is introduced which leads us to an approximation algorithm. Then, we investigate the spread of influence in power-law graphs. We provide a new approach to find the lower and upper bound for the minimum perfect target set and then we prove that the algorithm is a constant factor approximation algorithm on power-law graphs. At the final part of this paper, we will evaluate the performance of our algorithm experimentally on realistic datasets and random power-law graphs.

1 Introduction

The problem of *Maximizing the Spread of Social Influence* over a graph under a *Propagation Model* has extensively been studied in different contexts. This problem has long been at the epicenter of scientific research done in many fields [16, 12, 23, 29]. In many real-world applications, this problem play an important role. For example, in viral marketing, the diffusion of influence in social networks has been exploited to market new products. By promoting a new product to a small number of

people, we can trigger a cascade of influence by which friends will recommend the product to other friends. As a result, a large number of individuals will ultimately adopt the product [5, 13, 26].

The problem is known as *Dynamic Monopolies* in the view of researchers in the area of combinatorics. Many combinatorial works have been done on this problem in the previous three decades [14, 15, 21, 24, 25, 7, 1, 6]. The problem was considered by Kempe et al. [20] in 2003 and brought to the attention of the community of computer scientists (See, e.g. [20, 27, 18, 4, 8, 9, 10]). In their work they categorize spread of influence models into two different types: In the *Progressive models*, infected vertices of the graph can not change their states, but in the *Non-progressive models*, under some conditions, infected vertices can be uninfected again. The majority of the existing works on this subject are related to the progressive models while not much work has been done on the non-progressive ones.

In this paper, we focus on one of the basic propagation models which is called the *Strict Majority Model* and consider its non-progressive behavior on complex graphs. We first define this model formally in both progressive and non-progressive models.

Strict Majority Model. Consider a graph G . The set of vertices and edges of G are denoted by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. $N(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors of vertex v , and $d(v) = |N(v)|$ is the degree of this vertex. $\Delta(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ denote the maximum and minimum degree of vertices respectively. The induced subgraph of G with vertex set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is called the subgraph of G induced by S and is denoted by $G[S]$. $d_S(v)$ is the number of v 's neighbors in S .

A *0/1 initial assignment* is a function $f_0 : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. For any 0/1 initial assignment f_0 , $f_\tau : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ($\tau \geq 1$) demonstrates the state of vertices at time τ and $t(v)$ demonstrates threshold associated with vertex v .

Define a threshold $t(v) = \lceil \frac{d(v)+1}{2} \rceil$ for each vertex.

In *non-progressive strict majority* model:

$$f_\tau(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{u \in N(v)} f_{\tau-1}(u) < t(v) \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{u \in N(v)} f_{\tau-1}(u) \geq t(v) . \end{cases}$$

In *progressive strict majority* model:

$$f_\tau(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f_{\tau-1}(v) = 0 \text{ and } \sum_{u \in N(v)} f_{\tau-1}(u) < t(v) \\ 1 & \text{if } f_{\tau-1}(v) = 1 \text{ or } \sum_{u \in N(v)} f_{\tau-1}(u) \geq t(v) . \end{cases}$$

Strict majority model is a special case of a more general model which is called the *Linear Threshold model*. The above formalism defines this model except that it is not necessarily needed for the model to have $t(v) = \lceil \frac{d(v)+1}{2} \rceil$ and the threshold can be any other locally computable function.

A 0/1 initial assignment f_0 is called a *perfect target set* (PTS), if for a finite τ , $f_\tau(v) = 1$ for all $v \in V(G)$. The cost of a target set f_0 , denoted by $cost(f_0)$, is total number of vertices v , for which $f_0(v) = 1$. The task of finding a minimum *perfect target set* is to find a perfect target set with minimum cost. The cost of this minimum PTS is denoted by $PPTS(G)$ and $NPPTS(G)$ respectively, in progressive and non-progressive models. In related literature this optimization

problem is called *Target Set Selection* [1]. Other variants of this problem include the problem of finding a f_0 with $\text{cost}(f_0) = k$ which for a given input $k > 0$ influences maximum number of vertices eventually. This problem is called *Maximum Active Set* in the literature [1].

Tight or nearly tight bounds on the $PPTS(G)$ are known for special types of graphs such as torus, hypercube, butterfly and chordal rings [14, 15, 21, 24, 25]. The best bounds for progressive strict majority model in general graphs are due to Chang and Lyuu. In [8], they showed that for a directed graph G , $PPTS(G) \leq \frac{23}{27}|V(G)|$. In [7] they improved their upper bound to $\frac{2}{3}|V(G)|$ for directed graphs and $\frac{|V(G)|}{2}$ for undirected graphs. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no known bound for $NPPTS(G)$ for any type of graphs. In this paper, we will combinatorially prove that $\frac{2n}{\Delta(G)+1} \leq NPPTS(G) \leq \frac{n\Delta(G)(\delta(G)+2)}{4\Delta(G)+(\Delta(G)+1)(\delta(G)-2)}$.

From the algorithmic perspective, we know that Target Set Selection problem and Maximum Active Set problem are both NP-Hard in linear threshold model [20], so one would like to obtain approximation algorithms for these problems. Under several randomized mechanisms for coloring the vertices, Kempe et al. [20] and Mossel and Roch [22] give a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithms for Maximum Active Set problem by showing that the number of influenced vertices is submodular. In Target Set Selection Problem we do not have such a good submodular behavior. Most of the results on this problem are inapproximabilities or tractable algorithms in different propagation models [18, 4, 7, 9]. The inapproximability result of Chang and Lyuu in [7] on progressive strict majority threshold model is the most relevant result of this kind to our paper. They show that unless $NP \subseteq TIME(n^{O(\ln \ln n)})$, no polynomial time $((1/2 - \epsilon) \ln |V|)$ -approximation algorithms exists for computing $PPTS(G)$. In this paper, we will show that computing $NPPTS(G)$ is NP-Hard for general graphs under strict majority threshold. Then, we will focus on finding approximation algorithms for this problem on power-law graphs, based on the combinatorial method we used for deriving bounds.

The most practical result of this paper is a constant-factor approximation algorithm for power-law graphs. It is known that social networks' communication graphs are power-law [11]. A graph is power-law if and only if its degree distribution follows a power-law distribution, at least asymptotically. That is, the fraction $P(x)$ of nodes in the network having degree x goes for large number of nodes as $P(x) = \alpha x^{-\gamma}$ where α is a constant and $\gamma > 1$ is called power-law coefficient. In the very recent work of C.Chang [6] these graphs are verified. He has proved that $NPPTS(G) = O(\lceil \frac{|V|}{2^{\gamma-1}} \rceil)$ under non-progressive majority models in a power-law graph. But his results do not practically provide any bound for the strict majority model. We will show that our upper bound is better and practically applicable for different amounts of γ under strict majority threshold.

2 Non-Progressive Spread of Influence in General Graphs

In this section we investigate non-progressive strict majority model and prove a lower bound and an upper bound for minimum PTS in graphs. In the final part of this section, we show that finding the minimum PTS in general graphs is NP-Hard.

2.1 Lower bound

The following theorem shows that if we have some lower bound and upper bound for minimum Perfect Target Set in bipartite graphs then these bounds could be generalized to all graphs (Theorem 2.4).

Theorem 2.1 *If $\alpha|V(H)| \leq NPPTS(H) \leq \beta|V(H)|$ for every bipartite graph H under strict majority threshold, then $\alpha|V(G)| \leq NPPTS(G) \leq \beta|V(G)|$ under strict majority threshold for every graph G .*

Proof. Consider a graph G with n vertices and vertex set $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. Assume that there is a Perfect Target Set f_0 for G such that $cost(f_0) < \alpha|V(G)|$. Let $H = (X, Y)$ be a bipartite graph such that $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ and $E(H) = \{x_i y_j | v_i v_j \in E(G)\}$. Let g_0 be a PTS for H such that $g_0(x_i) = g_0(y_i) = f_0(v_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. We claim that g_0 is a PTS for H . By induction on τ , we prove that $g_\tau(x_i) = g_\tau(y_i) = f_\tau(v_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. By the definition, the assertion is true for $\tau = 0$. Now let the assertion be true for time τ . Consider a vertex $x_i \in X$. We have $\sum_{y \in N(x_i)} g_\tau(y) = \sum_{v \in N(v_i)} f_\tau(v)$ and also $t(x_i) = t(v_i)$, thus x_i is influenced at time $\tau + 1$ by g_0 iff v_i is influenced at time $\tau + 1$ by f_0 . By similar justification we can show that $g_{\tau+1}(y_i) = f_{\tau+1}(v_i)$ too. So g_0 is a PTS for H iff f_0 is a PTS for G , which is a contradiction since by assumption $NPPTS(H) \geq \alpha|V(H)|$.

Now we prove that $NPPTS(G) \leq \beta|V(G)|$. Consider the bipartite graph H with the aforementioned definition. By assumption there is a Perfect Target Set g'_0 with weight at most $\beta|V(H)|$ for H . With no loss of generality assume that the number of vertices in X for which g'_0 is one (initially infected vertices) is less than the number of initially infected vertices of Y . Let f'_0 be a PTS for G such that $f'_0(v_i) = g'_0(x_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. We have $cost(g'_0) \leq \beta|V(G)|$ since $|V(H)| = 2|V(G)|$. By induction on τ we show that $f'_{2\tau}(v_i) = g'_{2\tau}(x_i)$ and $f'_{2\tau+1}(v_i) = g'_{2\tau+1}(y_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and every $\tau \geq 0$. The assertion is clearly true for $\tau = 0$. Now let the assertion be true for time 2τ . Consider a vertex $v_i \in V(G)$. We have $\sum_{v \in N(v_i)} f'_{2\tau}(v) = \sum_{x \in N(x_i)} g'_{2\tau}(x)$ and also $t(v_i) = t(x_i)$, thus v_i is influenced at time $2\tau + 1$ by f'_0 iff x_i is influenced at time $2\tau + 1$ by g'_0 . By similar justification we can show that $f'_{2\tau+2}(v_i) = g'_{2\tau+2}(y_i)$ too. So g'_0 is a PTS for H iff f'_0 is a PTS for G and so $NPPTS(G) \leq \beta|V(G)|$.

The following lemma shows characteristics of PTSs in some special cases. These will be used in proof of our theorems.

Lemma 2.2 *Consider the non-progressive model and let $G = (X, Y)$ be a bipartite graph and f_0 be a perfect target set under strict majority threshold. For every $S \subseteq V(G)$ if $\sum_{v \in S \cap X} f_0(v) = 0$ or $\sum_{v \in S \cap Y} f_0(v) = 0$, then there exists at least one vertex u in S such that $d_S(u) \leq d(u) - t(u)$.*

Proof. Consider a set $S \subseteq V(G)$. With no loss of generality, suppose that $f_0(v) = 0$ for every $v \in S \cap X$. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Assume that for every $u \in S$, $d_S(u) > d(u) - t(u)$. For every $y \in S \cap Y$, $f_1(y) = 0$ since y has at least $d(y) - t(y) + 1$ adjacent vertices in $S \cap X$ for which f_0 is zero. Similarly, for every $x \in S \cap X$, $f_2(x) = 0$ since x has at least $d(x) - t(x) + 1$ adjacent vertices in f_1 for which f_1 is zero, and so on. Thus f_0 is not a Perfect Target Set, a contradiction.

If the conditions of previous lemma holds, we can obtain an upper bound for number of edges of the graph. Following lemma provides this upper bound. This will help us finding a lower bound for NPPTS of graphs. The function $t : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ may be any arbitrary function but here it is interpreted as the threshold function.

Lemma 2.3 *Consider a graph G with n vertices. If for every $S \subseteq V(G)$ there exists at least one vertex v for which $d_S(v) \leq d(v) - t(v)$, then $|E(G)| \leq \sum_{u \in V(G)} (d(u) - t(u))$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on n . For $n = 1$ the assertion is trivial. Consider a graph G with n vertices. Let $S = V(G)$. By assumption, there is at least one vertex v , such that $d(v) \leq d(v) - t(v)$. Remove the vertex v from G . By induction hypothesis $G - v$ has at most $\sum_{u \in V(G-v)} (d(u) - t(u))$ edges, so G has at most $\sum_{u \in V(G)} (d(u) - t(u))$ edges.

The following theorem shows that for every bipartite graph G , $NPPTS(G) \geq \frac{2|V(G)|}{\Delta(G)+1}$. Theorem 2.1 generalizes this theorem to all graphs. Also, Theorem 2.5 shows that this bound is tight.

Theorem 2.4 *For every bipartite graph $G = (X, Y)$ of order n , $NPPTS(G) \geq \frac{2n}{\Delta(G)+1}$.*

Proof. Let f_0 be an arbitrary PTS for G . Partition the vertices of graph G into three subsets B_X , B_Y and W as follow.

$$\begin{aligned} B_X &= \{v \in X \mid f_0(v) = 1\} \\ B_Y &= \{v \in Y \mid f_0(v) = 1\} \\ W &= \{v \in V(G) \mid f_0(v) = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Consider the induced subgraph of G with vertex set $B_X \cup W$ and suppose that $S \subseteq B_X \cup W$. For every vertex $v \in Y \cap S$, we have $f_0(v) = 0$. So By Lemma 2.2, for every $S \subseteq B_X \cup W$ there is at least one vertex u such that $d_S(u) \leq d(u) - t(u)$. By Lemma 2.3, this implies that $G[B_X \cup W]$ has at most $\sum_{u \in B_X \cup W} (d(u) - t(u))$ edges. Similarly we can prove that $G[B_Y \cup W]$ has at most $\sum_{u \in B_Y \cup W} (d(u) - t(u))$ edges. Let e_W be the number of edges in $G[W]$, e_{WX} be the number of edges with one end point in B_X and the other end point in W and e_{WY} be the number of edges with one end point in B_Y and the other end point in W . we have:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{WX} + e_W &\leq \sum_{v \in B_X \cup W} (d(v) - t(v)) \\ e_{WY} + e_W &\leq \sum_{v \in B_Y \cup W} (d(v) - t(v)) \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$e_{WX} + e_{WY} + 2e_W \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} (d(v) - t(v)) + \sum_{v \in W} (d(v) - t(v))$$

The total degree of vertices in W is $\sum_{v \in W} d(v) = e_{WX} + e_{WY} + 2e_W$. Thus

$$\sum_{v \in W} d(v) \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} (d(v) - t(v)) + \sum_{v \in W} (d(v) - t(v))$$




Figure 1: A tight example for $NPPTS(G)$'s lower bound

If we denote the set of vertices for which f_0 is equal to 1 by B , we have

$$\sum_{v \in W} (2t(v) - d(v)) \leq \sum_{v \in B} (d(v) - t(v)) \quad (1)$$

For every vertex v , $t(v) \geq \frac{d(v)+1}{2}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} |W| &\leq \sum_{v \in B} \frac{d(v) - 1}{2} \Rightarrow |W| \leq \frac{\Delta - 1}{2} (|B|) \\ \Rightarrow |B| &\geq \frac{2n}{\Delta + 1} \end{aligned}$$

And the proof is complete.

The Theorem 2.5 is a tight example which shows that this lower bound can be achieved.

Theorem 2.5 *For infinite number of n , there exists a $2d + 1$ -regular graph with n vertices such that $NPPTS(G) = \frac{n}{d+1}$ under strict majority threshold.*

Proof. Consider a m_1 -vertices $(d+1)$ -regular graph G_1 . In step i ($1 \leq i \leq \infty$), Add $m_{i+1} = \frac{d}{d+1}m_i$ vertices to the graph and connect each of them to G_i by $d+1$ edges. Each vertex of G_i must receive exactly d newly edges. Name the subgraph formed by these vertices G_{i+1} . This process is shown in Figure 1. The final graph has $n = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m_i = m_1(d+1)$ vertices. It is easy to see that $V(G_1)$ is a PTS, so $NPPTS(G) \leq |V(G_1)| = m_1 = \frac{2n}{2d+2} = \frac{2n}{\Delta+1}$

2.2 Upper bound

Theorem 2.6 is the main result of this subsection which gives an upper bound for $NPPTS(G)$. To prove this theorem, we first propose a greedy algorithm to find a PTS and then we will show that its output has at most $\frac{|V(G)|\Delta(\delta+2)}{4\Delta+(\Delta+1)(\delta-2)}$ vertices.

Theorem 2.6 *For every graph G of order n , $NPPTS(G) \leq \frac{n\Delta(\delta+2)}{4\Delta+(\Delta+1)(\delta-2)}$ under strict majority threshold.*

Algorithm 1 guarantees this upper bound. This algorithm gets a graph G of order n and the values of thresholds t as input and determines the values of f_0 of each vertex.

Algorithm 1 Greedy NPPTS

```

sort the vertices in  $G$  in ascending order of their degrees
for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
  whiteadj[ $v_i$ ] = 0
  blocked[ $v_i$ ] = 0
end for
for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
  for each  $u \in N(v_i)$  do
    if whiteadj[ $u$ ] =  $d(u) - t(u)$  then
      blocked[ $v_i$ ] = 1
    end if
  end for
  if blocked[ $v_i$ ] = 1 then
     $f_0(v) = 1$ 
  else
     $f_0(v) = 0$ 
    for each  $u \in N(v_i)$  do
      whiteadj[ $u$ ] += 1
    end for
  end if
end for

```

Claim 2.7 *The algorithm Greedy NPPTS finds a Perfect Target Set for non-progressive spread of influence.*

Proof. By induction on the number of vertices for which f_0 is determined, we prove that f_0 remains a PTS after each step of algorithm if we assume that f_0 is 1 for undetermined values. It is clear that the claim is true at the beginning. Consider a set of values of f_0 which forms a PTS and let v be a vertex for which value of $f_0(v)$ is set to 0 by algorithm in next step. By induction hypothesis, f_0 is a PTS if $f_0(v)$ is assumed to be 1. According to algorithm, $f_0(v)$ is set to 0 iff the value of

$\text{blocked}[v]$ is zero i.e. no adjacent vertex of v , say u , has exactly $d(u) - t(u)$ adjacent initially uninfected vertices. So by setting $f_0(v)$ to 0, each initially infected vertex w still has at least $t(w)$ infected vertices and also v has at least $t(v)$ initially infected neighbors itself. Thus, after one step of propagation, all initially infected vertices plus v are infected and by induction hypothesis, all vertices will be infected eventually and so f_0 remains a PTS.

Claim 2.8 *For every graph G of order n , Greedy NPPTS guarantees the upper bound of $\frac{n\Delta(\delta+2)}{4\Delta+(\Delta+1)(\delta-2)}$ for NPPTS(G) under strict majority threshold where Δ and δ are maximum and minimum degree of vertices respectively.*

Proof. According to the algorithm, the value of $f_0(v)$ is set to 1 iff $\text{whiteadj}[u] = d(u) - t(u)$ for some $u \in N(v)$. Let S be the set of vertices u for which $\text{whiteadj}[u] = d(u) - t(u)$. B and W denote the set of infected and uninfected vertices respectively. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in S} (d(v) - t(v)) &\leq \sum_{v \in W} d(v) \Rightarrow \sum_{v \in S} \left(\frac{d(v)}{2} - 1\right) \leq \sum_{v \in W} d(v) \\ &\Rightarrow \left(\frac{\delta}{2} - 1\right)|S| \leq \Delta|W|. \Rightarrow |S| \leq \frac{2\Delta}{\delta - 2}|W| \end{aligned}$$

Also:

$$\begin{aligned} |B| &\leq \sum_{v \in S} (t(v)) \leq \sum_{v \in S} \left(\frac{d(v)}{2} + 1\right) \leq 2|S| + \sum_{v \in W} d(v) \\ &\leq 2|S| + \Delta|W| \leq \left(2\frac{2\Delta}{\delta - 2} + \Delta\right)|W| \leq \frac{4\Delta + \Delta(\delta - 2)}{\delta - 2}|W| \\ &\Rightarrow |B| \leq \frac{\Delta(\delta + 2)}{4\Delta + (\Delta + 1)(\delta - 2)}n \end{aligned}$$

The approximation factor of the algorithm can be concluded directly from previous claim and the lower bound provided by Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.9 *Greedy NPPTS is a $\frac{\Delta(\Delta+1)(\delta+2)}{8\Delta+2(\Delta+1)(\delta-2)}$ approximation algorithm for NPPTS problem.*

2.3 NP-Hardness

In this section, we will prove the NP-Hardness of the problem. We will use the reduction of Minimum Dominating Set problem (MDS) [3] to prove this.

Theorem 2.10 *If there is a polynomial algorithm for computing NPPTS(G) for a given graph G , then $P = NP$.*




Figure 2: The graph H

Proof. Suppose that we are given an undirected graph G , where $V(G) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ and $|E(G)| = e$. we define an undirected graph H as follows (See Figure 2). First, define

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= \{g_1, g_2\} & X_1 &= \{a_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e + 1\} \\ X_2 &= \{b_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e + 1\} & X_3 &= \{c_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e\} \\ X_4 &= \{w_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\} & X_5 &= \{v_i | 1 \leq i \leq n\} \\ X_6 &= \{d_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e\} \end{aligned}$$

Then define H by

$$\begin{aligned} V(H) &= \cup_{i=0}^6 X_i \\ E(H) &= \{g_1 a_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e + 1\} \\ &\cup \{g_2 b_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e + 1\} \\ &\cup \{g_1 c_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e\} \\ &\cup \{g_2 c_i | 1 \leq i \leq 2e\} \\ &\cup \{w_i c_j | 1 \leq i \leq n, \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} d(u_k) \leq j \leq \sum_{k=1}^i d(u_k)\} \\ &\cup \{v_i w_j | u_i u_j \in E(G) \vee i = j\} \\ &\cup \{v_i d_j | 1 \leq i \leq n, \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} d(u_k) \leq j \leq \sum_{k=1}^i d(u_k)\} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that D is the $MDS(G)$. Define $D^H = \{v_i | u_i \in D\}$. We prove that $NPPTS(G) = 2e + n + 4 + |D|$. It is easily verifiable to see that vertices in $X_0 \cup X_3 \cup X_4 \cup D^H$ plus one vertex from each of X_1 and X_2 is a perfect target set for the graph H . So, we have $NPPTS(H) \leq |X_0| + |X_3| + |X_4| + |D^H| + 2 = 2e + n + 4 + |D|$.

It remains to prove that $NPPTS(H) \geq 2e + n + 4 + |D|$. Suppose that $S \subseteq V(H)$ is a PTS for H with minimum cardinality. Consider vertex g_1 in time t . If $f_t(g_1) = 0$, in time $t + 1$ for every vertex $a_i \in X_1$ we will have $f_{t+1}(a_i) = 0$ and then $f_{t+2}(g_1) = 0$. So we have, $g_1 \in S$. With a same justification we have $g_2 \in S$. More than that, at least $2e + 1$ vertices from each of g_1 or g_2 's neighbors must be in S , so w.l.o.g suppose that X_3 's members plus at least one vertex from each of X_1 and X_2 are in S . By this setting, the vertices of $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$ become infected and keep this infection for every $t > 0$.

Consider vertex $w_k \in X_4$. Define $B(w_k) = \{d_i \in X_6 | d_i \text{ is reachable from } w_k \text{ by a path of length } 2\}$. Suppose that $w_k \notin S$. If there is a $d_i \in B(w_k)$ in S , we can remove it from S and then insert w_k instead. It does not prevent S from being a PTS and also does not increase $|S|$. So, all the vertices in $B(w_k)$ are not in S . Now, consider one of w_k 's neighbors in X_5 such as v_p . Non of v_p 's neighbors

in X_6 are infected initially. So v_p has at most $d(u_p)$ initially infected neighbors. So $f_1(v_p) = 0$ and it is true for all other w_k 's neighbors in X_5 . So $f_2(w_k) = 0$ and $f_2(d_j) = 0$ for all $d_j \in B(w_k)$. We can generalize previous justifications and deduce that for every $t > 0$ $f_{2t}(w_k) = 0$ and $f_{2t}(d_j) = 0$ for all $d_j \in B(w_k)$. So, for every $w_k \in X_4$, at least one of its neighbors in X_5 must be in S . This means that $S \cap X_5$ must have at least $|D|$ vertices and the proof is complete.

3 Non-Progressive Spread of Influence in Power-law graphs

In this section we investigate the non-progressive spread of influence through networks in which the degree of nodes follow a power-law distribution. For each natural number x , we assume that the number of vertices with degree x is proportional to $x^{-\gamma}$ and we use α as the normalization coefficient. The value of γ , known as power-law coefficient is always between 2 and 3 in known networks. We denote the number of vertices of degree x by $P(x) = \alpha x^{-\gamma}$. Let n be the number of vertices of graph, so we have:

$$n = \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \alpha x^{-\gamma} = \alpha \zeta(\gamma) \Rightarrow \alpha = \frac{n}{\zeta(\gamma)}.$$

Where the ζ is the Riemann Zeta function [19].

3.1 lower bound

From the Equation 1, we know:

$$\sum_{v \in W} (2t(v) - d(v)) \leq \sum_{v \in B} (d(v) - t(v)).$$

The maximum cardinality of W is achieved when the degree of all vertices in B is greater than the degree of all vertices in W . In this case, assume that the minimum degree of vertices in B is k and $0 \leq p \leq 1$ is the proportion of the vertices of degree k in B , so under strict majority threshold we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x=1}^{k-1} \alpha x^{-\gamma} + (1-p)\alpha k^{-\gamma} &\leq |W| \leq \sum_{v \in W} (2t(v) - d(v)) \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in B} (d(v) - t(v)) \leq \sum_{x=k+1}^{\infty} \alpha x^{-\gamma} \left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right) + p\alpha k^{-\gamma} \frac{k-1}{2} \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{x=1}^{k-1} x^{-\gamma} + (1-p)k^{-\gamma} &\leq \frac{\sum_{x=k+1}^{\infty} (x^{1-\gamma} - x^{-\gamma}) + pk^{-\gamma}(k-1)}{2} \\ \Rightarrow \zeta(\gamma) - \zeta(\gamma, k-1) + (1-p)k^{-\gamma} \\ &\leq \frac{\zeta(\gamma-1, k) - \zeta(\gamma, k) + pk^{-\gamma}(k-1)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

By estimating the value of Riemann Zeta function, we can estimate the upper bound of k and lower bound of p for that k to provide a lower bound for $|B|$. Suppose that we have the maximum possible value of k and minimum value of p for that k , then:

$$|B| \geq \sum_{x=k+1}^{\infty} \alpha x^{-\gamma} + \alpha p k^{-\gamma} = \frac{\zeta(\gamma, k) + p k^{-\gamma}}{\zeta(\gamma)} n.$$

The estimated values of lower bound is shown in Figure 3 for $2 \leq \gamma \leq 2.8$.

3.2 upper bound

Suppose that one has run Greedy NPPTS algorithm under strict majority threshold on a graph with power-law degree distribution. The following theorem shows that unlike general graphs, the Greedy NPPTS algorithm guarantees a constant factor upper bound on power-law graphs.

Lemma 3.1 *Algorithm Greedy NPPTS initially influences at most $(1 + \frac{1}{2^{\gamma+1}} - \frac{1}{2\zeta(\gamma)})n$ vertices under strict majority threshold on a power-law graphs of order n .*

Proof. We may assume that the input graph is connected. We prove that the number of uninfected vertices of degree 1 are sufficient for this upper bound. Let v be a vertex of degree more than 1 with k adjacent vertices of degree 1 say $u_1, u_2 \dots u_k$. If $d(v)$ is odd, it is clear that at least $\frac{k}{2}$ of the vertices $u_1, u_2 \dots u_k$ will be uninfected since $k \leq d(v)$. Note that according to algorithm, the value of f_0 for degree 1 vertices are determined before any other vertex. If $d(v)$ is even, at least $\frac{k}{2} - 1$ of vertices $u_1, u_2 \dots u_k$ will be uninfected. So we have:

$$\begin{aligned} NPPTS(G) &\leq n - \frac{1}{2}(P(1) - \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} P(2x)) \\ &\leq n - \frac{1}{2}(\alpha \frac{1}{1^{\gamma}} - \alpha \sum_{x=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2x)^{\gamma}}) \\ &= n - \frac{\alpha}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{2^{\gamma}}\zeta(\gamma)) = n(1 + \frac{1}{2^{\gamma+1}} - \frac{1}{2\zeta(\gamma)}) \end{aligned}$$

By previous lemma, we conclude that the Greedy NPPTS algorithm is a constant factor algorithm on power-law graphs under strict majority threshold. The lower bound and upper bound for different values of γ are shown in Figure 3. As you can see our algorithm acts optimally on social networks with large value of power-law coefficient.

4 Experimental Evaluations

In addition to obtaining worst-case guaranties (lower-bound and upper-bound) on the performance of our algorithm, we are interested in understanding its behavior in practice on realistic network




Figure 3: Values of upper bound and lower bound in power-law graphs

Table 1: **Results on the real networks**

Network	No. of nodes	γ	No. of nodes selected by algorithm			
			Greedy	High Degree	Central	Random
Who-trusts-whom network of Epinions.com	75888	1.50	27131	75878	75879	75888
Slashdot social network	77360	1.68	49978	77327	77360	77360
Collaboration network of Arxiv Astro Physics	18772	1.84	8287	18771	18772	18763
Arxiv High Energy Physics paper citation network	34546	2.05	14647	34539	34546	34505
Amazon product co-purchasing network	262111	2.54	155085	262111	262005	262026

data. First we run our algorithm on random power-law graphs with wide range of power-law coefficients. Then following the method used in [20], we compare the performance of our algorithm to other heuristics for identifying influential individuals. In the next step we use the same method to examine our algorithm on real network data.

Random Power-Law Graph. Among all structural features of social networks, our algorithm needs only power-law degree distribution. So it's a good practice to test our algorithm on graphs with different amount of power-law coefficient to see our algorithm's behavior in practice. The idea of generating such graphs is given in [2] by Aiello et al. The model in [2] has two parameters α and γ . α is the logarithm of the graph size and γ is the log-log growth rate (power-law coefficient). The number of vertices with degree x , y satisfies

$$\log y = \alpha - \gamma \log x$$

The random power-law graphs model is defined as follows: given n weighted vertices with weights $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$, a pair (i, j) of vertices appears as an edge with probability $w_i w_j p$ independently. These parameters p and $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ must satisfy

- $\#\{i | w_i = 1\} = \lfloor e^\alpha \rfloor - r$ and $\#\{i | w_i = k\} = \lfloor \frac{e^\alpha}{k^\gamma} \rfloor$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, \lfloor e^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}} \rfloor$. Here α is a value minimizing $|n - \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor e^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}} \rfloor} \lfloor \frac{e^\alpha}{k^\gamma} \rfloor|$ and $r = n - \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor e^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}} \rfloor} \lfloor \frac{e^\alpha}{k^\gamma} \rfloor$.
- $p = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}$

One can easily see the expected degree of i 'th vertex would be w_i and also vertices' weights follow power-law.

Real Network Data. For evaluation, it is desirable to use network dataset that exhibit many of the structural features of large-scale social network especially power-law degree distribution. Thus, for our testbed, we employ four social networks' data: Who-trusts-whom network of Epinions.com, Slashdot social network, collaboration network of Arxiv Astro Physics, Arxiv High Energy Physics paper citation network, Amazon product co-purchasing network. By removing edge directions, we changed directed graphs to undirected ones. In cases where graph is not connected we select graphs' giant component.

Implementation and Evaluation Scenario. We compare our greedy algorithm with heuristics based on nodes' degrees and centrality within the network, as well as the crude baseline of choosing random nodes to target. The degree and centrality-based heuristics are commonly used in the sociology literature as estimates of a node's influence [28, 20].

High-Degree heuristic chooses vertices in order of decreasing degrees until the selected vertices form a perfect target set. In Distance-Centrality, we select nodes in order of increasing average distance to other nodes in the network. Finally, we consider, as a baseline, the result of choosing nodes uniformly at random.

In each of these cases, in each step, we check whether the selected vertices are perfect target set or not. This can be easily verified by simulating spread of influence process until vertices' states become stable. In [17], it is shown that, for a function Δ from $\{0, 1\}^n$ to $\{0, 1\}^n$ whose components from




Figure 4: Results on the random power-law graphs

a symmetric set of threshold functions (such as the function f_τ defined in Section 1) the repeated application of Δ , leads either to a fixed point or to a cycle of length two. So the simulation process ends at time τ when for each $v \in V(G)$ we have $f_\tau(v) = f_{\tau-2}(v)$.

Notice that because the optimization problem is NP-hard (Theorem 2.10), and the testbed graphs are prohibitively large, we cannot compute the optimum value to verify the actual quality of approximations.

Experimental Results. Figure 4 shows the performance of our algorithm in comparison to introduced heuristics on random power-law graphs. For any value of γ (power-law coefficient) all heuristics pick almost entire vertices of the graph while our algorithm pick a number of them between proved lower-bound and upper-bound.

The same thing happens when we run our algorithm and other heuristics on real networks data. The results are depicted in Figure 5. The exact amount of their output can be found in Table 1.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we take non-progressive strict majority model in minimum target set selection problem and verify it theoretically. Even though this model is very famous, few works have studied it. Our results include upper bound, lower bound, hardness and approximation algorithm for this problem. We also apply our techniques on power-law graphs (which is one of the most important




Figure 5: Results on the real network data

features of social networks) and derive constant-factor approximation algorithm for this kind of graphs.

An interesting research direction for this problem is to design approximation (or maybe exact) algorithm for other special kinds of complex graphs such as small-world graphs. Another interesting research is to solve maximum active set problem for non-progressive models.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Dr. Vahab Mirrokni for his many good advices throughout the preparation of this paper. They are also thankful to Soroush Hosseini, Morteza Saghafian and Moslem Habibi for their ideas and their helps.

References

- [1] E. Ackerman, O. Ben-Zwi, and G. Wolfvitz. Combinatorial Model and Bounds for Target Set Selection. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2010.
- [2] W. Aiello, F. Chung, and L. Lu. A random graph model for massive graphs. In *Proceedings of the thirty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 171–180. Acm, 2000.

2000.

- [3] R. Allan and R. Laskar. On domination and independent domination numbers of a graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 23(2):73–76, 1978.
- [4] O. Ben-Zwi, D. Hermelin, D. Lokshtanov, and I. Newman. An exact almost optimal algorithm for target set selection in social networks. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 355–362. ACM, 2009.
- [5] J. Brown and P. Reingen. Social ties and word-of-mouth referral behavior. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 14(3):350–362, 1987.
- [6] C. Chang. On reversible cascades in scale-free and Erdos Renyi random graphs. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1011.0653*, 2010.
- [7] C. Chang and Y. Lyuu. On irreversible dynamic monopolies in general graphs. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0904.2306*, 2009.
- [8] C. Chang and Y. Lyuu. Spreading messages. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(27-29):2714–2724, 2009.
- [9] N. Chen. On the approximability of influence in social networks. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1029–1037. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.
- [10] W. Chen, Y. Wang, and S. Yang. Efficient influence maximization in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 199–208. ACM, 2009.
- [11] A. Clauset, C. Shalizi, and M. Newman. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM review*, 51(4):661–703, 2009.
- [12] Z. Dezső and A. Barabási. Halting viruses in scale-free networks. *Physical Review E*, 65(5):55103, 2002.
- [13] P. Domingos and M. Richardson. Mining the network value of customers. In *KDD-2001: proceedings of the Seventh ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, August 26-29, 2001, San Francisco, CA, USA*, page 57. Assn for Computing Machinery, 2001.
- [14] P. Flocchini, F. Geurts, and N. Santoro. Optimal irreversible dynamos in chordal rings. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 113(1):23–42, 2001.
- [15] P. Flocchini, R. Královi, P. Ruika, A. Roncato, and N. Santoro. On time versus size for monotone dynamic monopolies in regular topologies. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 1(2):129–150, 2003.

- [16] L. Freeman. *The development of social network analysis*. Empirical Press Vancouver, British Columbia, 2004.
- [17] J. Goles et al. Periodic behaviour of generalized threshold functions. *Discrete Mathematics*, 30(2):187–189, 1980.
- [18] A. Goyal, F. Bonchi, L. Lakshmanan, M. Balcan, N. Harvey, R. Lapus, F. Simon, P. Tittmann, S. Ben-Shimon, A. Ferber, et al. Approximation Analysis of Influence Spread in Social Networks. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1008.2005*, 2010.
- [19] A. Ivic. Riemann zeta-function. *JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC., ONE WILEY DRIVE, SOMERSET, NJ 08873(USA)*, 1985, 340, 1985.
- [20] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 137–146. ACM, 2003.
- [21] F. Luccio, L. Pagli, and H. Sanossian. Irreversible dynamos in butterflies. In *Proc. of 6th Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity*, pages 204–218. Citeseer, 1999.
- [22] E. Mossel and S. Roch. On the submodularity of influence in social networks. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 128–134. ACM, 2007.
- [23] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani. Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks. *Physical review letters*, 86(14):3200–3203, 2001.
- [24] D. Peleg. Local majorities, coalitions and monopolies in graphs: a review. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 282(2):231–257, 2002.
- [25] D. Pike and Y. Zou. Decycling Cartesian products of two cycles. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 19:651, 2005.
- [26] M. Richardson and P. Domingos. Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 61–70. ACM, 2002.
- [27] J. Tang, J. Sun, C. Wang, and Z. Yang. Social influence analysis in large-scale networks. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 807–816. ACM, 2009.
- [28] S. Wasserman. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge university press, 1994.

- [29] D. Wilson. Levels of selection: An alternative to individualism in biology and the human sciences. *Social Networks*, 11(3):257–272, 1989.