

Maximizing Influence in Social Networks: A Two-Stage Stochastic Programming Approach That Exploits Submodularity

Hao-Hsiang Wu, Simge Küçükyavuz

Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

wu.2294@osu.edu, kucukyavuz.2@osu.edu

July 23, 2018

ABSTRACT: We consider the influence maximization problem arising in social networks. In contrast to existing studies that involve greedy approximation algorithms with a 63% performance guarantee, our work focuses on solving the problem optimally. We propose a Benders decomposition algorithm to find the optimal solution to the problem with a finite number of samples. We show that the submodularity of the influence function can be exploited to develop optimality cuts that are more effective than the standard optimality cuts available in the literature. We prove that the submodular cuts are facet-defining for the influence maximization problem under certain conditions. Furthermore, we give an extension of this algorithm to solve general two-stage stochastic programs where the second-stage value function is submodular. Finally, we report our computational experiments, which show that our proposed algorithm outperforms the greedy algorithm for problems with a moderate number of scenarios.

Keywords: social networks; independent cascade; influence maximization; stochastic programming; submodularity

1. Introduction The prevalence of social networking services, such as Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter has led to increasing interest in viral or word-of-mouth marketing of new products or services to customers. A few individuals, seen as influencers, are targeted with free samples or relevant information on a new product or service. Marketers hope that these early adopters promote the product to others in their social network through status updates, blog posts or online reviews and that this information propagates throughout the social network from peers to peers of peers until the product “goes viral.” Therefore, a key question for marketers of new products is to identify a small number of individuals whom to target so as to instigate a cascade of peer influence taking into account the network effects.

In the past decade, there has been a flurry of research on social networks in the computer science community. Domingos and Richardson (2001) introduce the problem of finding which customers to target to maximize the spread of their influence in the social network. The authors propose a Markov random-field-model of the social network, where the probability that a customer is influenced takes into account whether her connections are influenced. After building this network, the authors propose several heuristics to identify which k individuals to target in a viral marketing campaign. Kempe et al. (2003) formalize the optimization problem, referred to as the *independent cascade* model. The authors show that the independent cascade problem is NP-hard, assuming that there is an efficient oracle to compute the influence spread function. Furthermore, Wang et al. (2012) show that calculating the influence spread function is #P-hard under the probabilistic assumptions of Kempe et al. (2003). Therefore, the independent cascade problem is #P-hard, and there are two sources of difficulty. First, the calculation of the influence spread function is hard, because there is an exponential number of scenarios. This difficulty is overcome by using sampling. Second, the seed

selection is combinatorial in nature, and requires evaluating an exponential number of choices. This difficulty is overcome by seeking heuristic solutions in the literature. We will describe the results of the seminal paper by [Kempe et al. \(2003\)](#) and the subsequent developments in Section 2.

Despite their ubiquity, social networks have not attracted much attention in the optimization community. The algorithms studied to date are approximation algorithms with a worst-case guarantee within 63% optimal ([Kempe et al., 2015](#)). The proposed heuristics are tested on real social networks and compared to other simple heuristics. However, their practical performance has not been tested against the optimal solution due to the hardness of the problem and the unavailability of an algorithm that can find the optimal solution for large scale instances of the problem. In this paper, we fill this gap and give a two-stage stochastic programming formulation of the classical *independent cascade* problem ([Kempe et al., 2003](#)). We propose a Benders decomposition algorithm that utilizes the special structure (submodularity) of the second-stage value function. We show that our algorithm scales well with respect to the number of scenarios representing the uncertainty. We provide the first test on the quality of the greedy solution when compared to the optimal solution obtained by our algorithm. Further, the proposed algorithm reaches the optimal solution faster than greedy in most of the tested instances.

We note that while we focus on the independent cascade model, our approach is more generally applicable to many other variants of the influence maximization problem previously studied in the literature. Furthermore, beyond social networks, there are other applications of identifying a few key nodes in complex networks for which our models are applicable. For example, [Ostfeld and Salomons \(2004\)](#) consider the problem of locating costly sensors on the crucial junctures of the water distribution network to ensure water quality and safety by the early detection and prevention of outbreaks. The models could also be useful in the development of immunization strategies in epidemic models (see, e.g. [Madar et al., 2004](#)), and prevention of cascading failures in power systems (see, e.g., [Hines et al., 2009](#)).

Two-stage stochastic programming is a versatile modeling tool for decision-making under uncertainty. In the first stage, a set of decision needs to be made when some parameters are random. In the second stage, after the uncertain parameters are revealed, a second set of (recourse) decisions are made so that the expected total cost is minimized. We refer the reader to [Birge and Louveaux \(1997\)](#) and [Shapiro et al. \(2009\)](#) for an overview of stochastic (linear) programming. In this paper, we consider a two-stage stochastic programming model for the influence maximization problem in social networks. We show that the second-stage problem can be formulated as a linear program. Furthermore, by utilizing the submodularity of the second stage value (objective) function, we develop effective decomposition algorithms.

2. Greedy Algorithm of [Kempe et al. \(2003\)](#) In this section, we describe the modeling assumptions of [Kempe et al. \(2003\)](#), and overview the greedy hill-climbing algorithm proposed by these authors. Suppose that we are given a social network $G = (V, A)$, where $|V| = n, |A| = m$. The vertices represent the

individuals, and an arc $(i, j) \in A$ represents a potential influence relationship between individuals i and j . In the independent cascade model, it is assumed that each arc $(i, j) \in A$ has an associated probability of success, π_{ij} . In other words, with probability π_{ij} individual i will be successful at influencing individual j . We say that an arc (i, j) is *active* or *live* in this case. Our goal is to select a subset of *seed* nodes, $X \subset V$, with $|X| \leq k < n$ to activate initially, so that the expected number of people influenced by X (denoted by $\sigma(X)$) is maximized, where k is a given integer. (Note that the original problem statement is to select exactly k nodes to activate. However, for the relaxation that seeks $|X| \leq k$ seed nodes that maximize influence, there exists a solution for which the inequality holds at equality.) The cascade is assumed to be *progressive*, in other words, once a node is activated it remains active.

Kempe et al. (2003) show that the influence function $\sigma(X)$ is nonnegative, monotone and submodular. Therefore, the influence cascade problem is that of maximizing a submodular function, which is NP-hard. However, using the results of Cornuéjols et al. (1977) and Nemhauser et al. (1978) that the greedy method gives a $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithm for maximizing a nonnegative monotone submodular function, where e is the base of the natural logarithm, Kempe et al. (2003) establish that the greedy hill-climbing algorithm solves the independent cascade problem with a constant (0.63) guarantee, assuming that the function $\sigma(X)$ can be calculated efficiently. The authors observe that even though the stochastic diffusion process of influence spread is dynamic, because the decisions of whom to activate do not influence the probability of an individual influencing another, we may envision the process to be static. In other words, we can generate sample paths (scenarios) of likely events for each arc, a priori. This is referred to as the “triggering model” or the “triggering set technique” by Kempe et al. (2015). This technique generates a sample path (scenario) by tossing biased coins (with probability of π_{ij} for each arc $(i, j) \in A$) to determine whether the arc is active/live. Based on this scenario, a graph consisting of live arcs is constructed (referred to as a *live-arc graph*), to calculate the influence spread under this scenario. The authors show the equivalence of the stochastic diffusion process to the live-arc graph model with respect to the final active set.

Recognizing the computational difficulty of calculating $\sigma(X)$ exactly, which involves taking the expectation of the influence function with respect to a finite (but exponential) number of scenarios, Kempe et al. (2003) propose Monte-Carlo sampling, which provides a subset of scenarios, Λ , of equal probability. Letting σ_ω denote the influence function for scenario $\omega \in \Lambda$, we get $\sigma(X) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda} \sigma_\omega(X)$. The basic greedy approximation algorithm of Kempe et al. (2003) is given in Algorithm 1.

Subsequently, Wang et al. (2012) formally show that calculating $\sigma(X)$ is #P-hard under the assumption of independent arc probabilities $\pi_{ij}, (i, j) \in A$. Therefore, Kempe et al. (2015) propose a modification where an arbitrarily good approximation of $\sigma(X)$ is obtained in polynomial time by sampling from the true distribution. In particular, Kempe et al. (2015) show that for a sample size of $\Omega\left(\frac{n^2}{\varepsilon^2} \ln(1/\alpha)\right)$, the average number of activated nodes over the sample is a $(1 \pm \varepsilon)$ -approximation to $\sigma(X)$, with probability at least $1 - \alpha$.

Algorithm 1: Greedy Approximation Algorithm of Kempe et al. (2003)

-
- 1 Start with $X = \emptyset$ and a sample set of scenarios Λ ;
 - 2 **while** $|X| \leq k$ **do**
 - 3 For each node $i \in V \setminus X$, use the sample Λ to approximate $\sigma(X \cup \{i\})$;
 - 4 Add the node with the largest estimate for $\sigma(X \cup \{i\})$ to X ;
 - 5 **end**
 - 6 Output the set X of seed nodes.
-

Further algorithmic improvements to this heuristic are given in the literature (see Kempe et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2013, for an overview). Most notably, Borgs et al. (2014) give a randomized algorithm for finding a $(1 - 1/e - \epsilon)$ -approximate seed sets in $O((m+n)\epsilon^{-3} \log n)$ time for any precision parameter $\epsilon > 0$. Note that this run time is independent of the number of seeds k . The authors show that the run time is close to the lower bound of $\Omega(m+n)$ on the time required to obtain a constant factor randomized approximation algorithm. The proposed randomized algorithm has a success probability of 0.6, and failure is detectable. Therefore, the authors suggest repeated runs if failure is detected to improve the probability of success.

3. A Two-Stage Stochastic Programming Model As described in Kempe et al. (2003), in the live-arc graph model, the time aspect is not essential in the final active set determination. This observation is crucial in the formulation of our two-stage stochastic programming model, which we describe next.

The decision-making process considered by Kempe et al. (2003) may be viewed as a two-stage stochastic program. In the first stage, the nodes to be activated are determined. Then the uncertainty is revealed with respect to which influence arcs are active. Based on this, the spread of the influence is determined. Let Λ be a finite collection of scenarios. Each *scenario* $\omega \in \Lambda$, with a probability of occurrence p_ω , represents a *live-arc graph* graph $G_\omega = (V, A_\omega)$, where $A_\omega \subseteq A$ is the set of active arcs under that scenario. Let $\sigma_\omega(X)$ be the number of vertices reachable from X in G_ω . Then $\sigma(X) = \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda} p_\omega \sigma_\omega(X)$. Let $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be the characteristic vector of $X \subset V$. Where appropriate, we use $\sigma(x)$ interchangeably with $\sigma(X)$.

We are now ready to give the two-stage stochastic programming formulation of the independent cascade model:

$$\max \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda} p_\omega \sigma_\omega(x) \tag{1}$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{j \in V} x_j \leq k \tag{2}$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n. \tag{3}$$

Next, we give a linear programming (LP) formulation for $\sigma_\omega(x)$. Observe that the maximum number of nodes reachable from nodes X (corresponding to the decision vector x) in graph G_ω can be formulated as a

maximum flow problem on a modified graph $G'_\omega = (V \cup \{s, t\}, A'_\omega)$, where s is the source node, t is the sink node, and A'_ω includes the arcs A_ω and arcs (s, i) and (i, t) for all $i \in V$. Let the capacity of the arcs (i, t) , $i \in V$ be one, and the capacity of arcs $(i, j) \in A_\omega$ be n (the maximum flow possible on any arc). In addition, we would like the arcs (s, i) , $i \in V$ to have a capacity of n if $x_i = 1$ and 0 otherwise. Therefore, we let the capacity of arc (s, i) be nx_i . The reader might wonder why we create an arc (s, i) if a node i is not activated. To see why, note that in a two-stage stochastic programming framework, we need to build a second-stage model that is correct for any first-stage decision x . It is easy to see that the maximum flow on this graph is equal to the maximum number of vertices reachable from the seeded nodes X . The LP formulation of the second-stage problem for scenario $\omega \in \Lambda$ is

$$\sigma_\omega(x) = \max \sum_{i \in V} y_{si} \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j:(j,i) \in A'_\omega} y_{ji} - \sum_{j:(i,j) \in A'_\omega} y_{ij} = 0, \quad i \in V \quad (u_i^\omega) \quad (4b)$$

$$y_{si} \leq nx_i, \quad i \in V \quad (v_{si}^\omega) \quad (4c)$$

$$y_{ij} \leq n, \quad (i, j) \in A_\omega \quad (v_{ij}^\omega) \quad (4d)$$

$$y_{it} \leq 1, \quad i \in V \quad (v_{it}^\omega) \quad (4e)$$

$$y_{ij} \geq 0, \quad (i, j) \in A'_\omega, \quad (4f)$$

where y_{ij} represents the flow on arc $(i, j) \in A'_\omega$, and the dual variables associated with each constraint is defined in parentheses. Note that the subproblems are feasible for any $\omega \in \Lambda$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ (we can always send zero flows), therefore this problem is said to have *complete recourse*. The dual variables associated with the constraints are given in the parentheses. The dual of the second-stage problem (4) is

$$\sigma_\omega(x) = \min \sum_{i \in V} (nx_i v_{si}^\omega + v_{it}^\omega) + \sum_{(i,j) \in A_\omega} n v_{ij}^\omega \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j:(j,i) \in A'_\omega} y_{ji} - \sum_{j:(i,j) \in A'_\omega} y_{ij} = 0, \quad i \in V \quad (5b)$$

$$u_i^\omega + v_{si}^\omega \geq 1, \quad i \in V \quad (5c)$$

$$u_j^\omega - u_i^\omega + v_{ij}^\omega \geq 0, \quad (i, j) \in A_\omega \quad (5d)$$

$$-u_i^\omega + v_{it}^\omega \geq 0, \quad i \in V \quad (5e)$$

$$v_{ij}^\omega \geq 0, \quad (i, j) \in A'_\omega. \quad (5f)$$

Note that we can write a large-scale mixed-integer program, known as the deterministic equivalent program (DEP), to solve the independent cascade problem. To do this, we create copies of the second-stage variables y_{ij}^ω for all $\omega \in \Lambda$, where y_{ij}^ω represents the flow on arc $(i, j) \in A'_\omega$ under scenario $\omega \in \Lambda$. The DEP is formulated as

$$\max \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda} p_\omega \sum_{i \in V} y_{si}^\omega \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{j \in V} x_j \leq k \quad (6b)$$

$$y_{si}^\omega \leq nx_i, \quad \omega \in \Lambda, i \in V \quad (6c)$$

$$y_{ij}^\omega \leq n, \quad \omega \in \Lambda, (i, j) \in A_\omega \quad (6d)$$

$$y_{it}^\omega \leq 1, \quad \omega \in \Lambda, i \in V \quad (6e)$$

$$x \in \{0, 1\}^n, y_{ij}^\omega \geq 0, \omega \in \Lambda, (i, j) \in A'_\omega. \quad (6f)$$

It is well-established in the stochastic programming field that due to its large size, it is not practical to solve DEP directly. Instead, as is commonly done, we propose the use of Benders decomposition method (Benders, 1962; Van Slyke and Wets, 1969) utilizing the structure of this large-scale MIP.

The generic master problem at an iteration is formulated as

$$\max \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda} p_\omega \theta_\omega \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x \in \mathcal{X} \quad (7b)$$

$$(x, \theta) \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (7c)$$

where, θ_ω is a variable representing the second-stage objective function approximation for scenario ω , constraints (7c) represents the optimality cuts generated until this iteration, and the set \mathcal{X} represents restrictions on the first-stage variables x (e.g., $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^n : \sum_{j \in V} x_j \leq k\}$ for the independent cascade model). The set of inequalities in \mathcal{C} provide a piecewise linear approximation of the second stage value function, which is iteratively refined through the so-called *optimality cuts*. (We will describe different forms of these inequalities in the following discussion.) Let $(\bar{x}, \bar{\theta})$ be the optimal solution to the master problem at the current iteration. Then for all $\omega \in \Lambda$ we solve the subproblems (4) to obtain $\sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$. We add valid optimality cuts to \mathcal{C} if $\bar{\theta}_\omega > \sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$ for any $\omega \in \Lambda$, otherwise we deduce that the current solution \bar{x} is optimal. The generic version of the Benders decomposition algorithm is given in Algorithm 2. The particular implementation will depend on the method with which subproblems are solved (in line 4 of Algorithm 2), and the optimality cuts (in line 6 of Algorithm 2) are obtained.

A naive way of generating the optimality cuts is to solve the subproblem (4) for each $\omega \in \Lambda$ as an LP to obtain $\sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$, and the corresponding dual vector $(\bar{u}^\omega, \bar{v}^\omega)$. Then the optimality cut is

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sum_{i \in V} (nx_i \bar{v}_{si}^\omega + \bar{v}_{it}^\omega) + \sum_{(i,j) \in A_\omega} n \bar{v}_{ij}^\omega. \quad (8)$$

We refer to the optimality cuts (8) obtained by solving the subproblems as an LP as the *LP-based optimality cuts*.

Next, we discuss a more efficient way of obtaining the optimality cuts. Note that because the subproblems are maximum flow problems, they can be solved more efficiently using specialized algorithms. In particular, for our problem, one only needs to solve a reachability problem to obtain the corresponding maximum flow.

Algorithm 2: Benders Decomposition Algorithm

```

1 Start with  $\mathcal{C} = \{0 \leq \theta_\omega \leq n, \omega \in \Lambda\}$ . Solve the initial master problem (7) and obtain  $(\bar{x}, \bar{\theta})$ ,
   OptCheck=1 ;
2 while OptCheck=1 do
3   for  $\omega \in \Lambda$  do
4     Solve Subproblem (4) to obtain  $\sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$ ;
5     if  $\bar{\theta}_\omega > \sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$  then
6       Add an optimality cut to  $\mathcal{C}$ ;
7     end
8   end
9   if  $\bar{\theta}_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$  for all  $\omega \in \Lambda$  then
10    Let OptCheck=0;
11  end
12 end
13 Output the set  $X = \{i \in V : \bar{x}_i = 1\}$  of seed nodes.
```

Reachability problem in a graph can be solved in linear time in the number of arcs using breadth- or depth-first search. For a given first-stage solution \bar{x} and the corresponding seed set \bar{X} , let $\hat{R}(\bar{X}) \subseteq V$ be the set of nodes in V reachable from s , $R(\bar{X}) = \hat{R}(\bar{X}) \setminus \bar{X}$ be the set of nodes reachable from s not including the seed nodes \bar{X} , and $\bar{R}(\bar{X}) = V \setminus \hat{R}(\bar{X})$ be the set of nodes in V not reachable from s in G'_ω . From maximum flow minimum cut theorem (see, e.g., Ahuja et al., 1993)) we can show that a minimum cut is given by $(\hat{R}(\bar{X}) \cup \{s\}, \bar{R}(\bar{X}) \cup \{t\})$. (See the maximum flow formulation of this problem for a given \bar{X} and scenario $\omega \in \Lambda$ in Figure 1.) Let $u_i^\omega = 1$ if $i \in \hat{R}(\bar{X})$, and $u_i^\omega = 0$, if $i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})$. In addition, for $(i, j) \in A'_\omega$, let $v_{ij}^\omega = 1$ if $i \in \hat{R}(\bar{X}) \cup \{s\}$ and $j \in \bar{R}(\bar{X}) \cup \{t\}$, otherwise let $v_{ij}^\omega = 0$. It is easy to check that this choice of the dual variables is feasible. Furthermore, this choice is optimal. To see this, note that the objective value of the dual is

$$\sum_{i \in V} (nx_i \bar{v}_{si}^\omega + \bar{v}_{it}^\omega) + \sum_{(i,j) \in A_\omega} n \bar{v}_{ij}^\omega = \sum_{i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})} nx_i + \sum_{i \in \hat{R}(\bar{X})} 1 + \sum_{(i,j) \in (\hat{R}(\bar{X}), \bar{R}(\bar{X}))} n = |\hat{R}(\bar{X})|,$$

because $x_i = 0$ for $i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})$ and there can be no arc $(i, j) \in A_\omega$ with $i \in \hat{R}(\bar{X})$, $j \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})$ (otherwise j would be reachable from s and hence it will be in $\hat{R}(\bar{X})$). Because the optimal objective value of the primal subproblem is $\sigma_\omega(\bar{x}) = |\hat{R}(\bar{X})|$, this dual solution must be optimal. With this choice of the optimal dual vector, we obtain the Benders optimality cut

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})} nx_i. \quad (9)$$

We refer to the optimality cuts (9) obtained by solving the subproblems as reachability problems as *combinatorial optimality cuts*. Note that inequality (9) can also be seen as a big-M type inequality. For $x = \bar{x}$,

with the associated seed set \bar{X} , we get a correct upper bound on θ_ω as $\sigma_\omega(x)$. For any other $x \neq \bar{x}$, if $x_i = 1$ for some $i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})$, then the upper bound on θ_ω given by inequality (9) is trivially valid, because $\sigma_\omega(x) \leq n$ for any $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Finally, for any $x \neq \bar{x}$, if $x_i = 0$ for all $i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})$, then we must have $x_j = 0$ for some $j \in \bar{X}$ and $x_\ell = 1$ from some $\ell \in R(\bar{X})$. However, because ℓ is reachable from \bar{X} , replacing j with ℓ will not increase the number of reachable nodes, i.e., $\sigma_\omega(x) \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$. Therefore, inequality (9) is valid.




Figure 1: Maximum flow formulation of the influence function

Finally, note that because the first-stage problem is a pure binary optimization problem, one can also consider the optimality cuts proposed in the integer L-shaped method of [Laporte and Louveaux \(1993\)](#). The resulting inequality, for $\omega \in \Lambda$ and a given \bar{x} , with an associated seed set \bar{X} , is

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i \in V \setminus \bar{X}} (n - \sigma_\omega(\bar{x}))x_i. \quad (10)$$

This inequality can be strengthened by the same observation that replacing a node $j \in \bar{X}$ with a node $\ell \in R(\bar{X})$ does not increase the number of reachable nodes. Therefore, we can reduce the coefficient of x_ℓ in inequality (10) to obtain a strengthened version of the integer L-shaped optimality cut (10):

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i \in \bar{R}(\bar{X})} (n - \sigma_\omega(\bar{x}))x_i, \quad (11)$$

which is clearly valid. We refer to inequalities (11) as the *strengthened integer L-shaped optimality cuts*.

4. Exploiting the Submodularity of the Second-Stage Value Function In Section 3, we presented the best possible optimality cut that can be obtained from the existing approaches in stochastic programming (inequality (11)). In this section, we explore the possibility of utilizing the submodularity of the second-stage value function.

As observed by [Kempe et al. \(2003\)](#), the set function $\sigma_\omega(X)$ is submodular and monotone (nondecreasing). [Nemhauser and Wolsey \(1981\)](#) give submodular inequalities to describe the maximum of a submodular set function (see also [Nemhauser and Wolsey, 1988](#)), which we summarize next.

Consider the polyhedron given by $\mathcal{S}_\omega = \{(\theta_\omega, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}^n : \theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(S) + \sum_{j \in V \setminus S} \rho_j^\omega(S) x_j, \forall S \subseteq V\}$ for $\omega \in \Lambda$, where $\rho_j^\omega(S) = \sigma_\omega(S \cup \{j\}) - \sigma_\omega(S)$ is the marginal contribution of adding $j \in V \setminus S$ to the set S .

THEOREM 4.1 (*Nemhauser and Wolsey, 1981*) *For a submodular and nondecreasing set function $\sigma_\omega : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, X is an optimal solution to $\max_{S \subseteq V: |S| \leq k} \{\sigma_\omega(S)\}$, if and only if (θ_ω, x) is an optimal solution to $\{\max \theta_\omega : \sum_{j \in V} x_j \leq k, (\theta_\omega, x) \in \mathcal{S}_\omega\}$.*

Utilizing Theorem 4.1, we give an explicit description of the submodular inequalities for the independent cascade problem.

PROPOSITION 4.1 *For $S \subseteq V$ and $\omega \in \Lambda$ the inequality*

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(S) + \sum_{j \in \bar{R}(S)} r_j^\omega(S) x_j, \quad (12)$$

is a valid optimality cut for the master problem (7), where $\bar{R}(S)$ is the set of nodes not reachable from the nodes in S in the graph $G_\omega = (V, A_\omega)$, and $r_j^\omega(S)$ is the number of nodes reachable from $j \in \bar{R}(S)$ (including j) that are not reachable from any node in S .

PROOF. From Theorem 4.1, we know that $\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(S) + \sum_{j \in V \setminus S} \rho_j^\omega(S) x_j$ is a valid inequality. Note that $\bar{R}(S) \subseteq V \setminus S$ and for $j \in \bar{R}(S)$, we have $\rho_j^\omega(S) = r_j^\omega(S)$, in other words, the marginal contribution of adding $j \in \bar{R}(S)$ to S is precisely $r_j^\omega(S)$. Furthermore, for any node $j \in R(S)$, the marginal contribution of adding j to S is zero, because j is already reachable from at least one node in S . This completes the proof. \square

PROPOSITION 4.2 *The submodular optimality cuts (12) dominate the combinatorial optimality cuts (11).*

PROOF. This follows because $r_j^\omega(S) \leq n - \sigma_\omega(\bar{x})$ for any $j \in \bar{R}(S)$. \square

Next we give conditions under which inequalities (12) are facet defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_\omega)$. For $i \in V$, let $\text{indeg}(i)$ and $\text{outdeg}(i)$ denote the in-degree and out-degree of node i , respectively. Let $T := \{i \in V : \text{indeg}(i) = 0\}$, we refer to nodes in T as *root nodes*. For $i \in V \setminus T$, let P_i be the set of root nodes such that i is reachable from the nodes in this set, i.e., $P_i := \{j \in T : i \in R(\{j\})\}$. Finally, let $L := \{i \in V : \text{indeg}(i) > 0, \text{outdeg}(i) = 0\}$ denote the set of *leaf nodes* that have no outgoing arcs.

PROPOSITION 4.3 *For $S \subseteq V$ and $\omega \in \Lambda$ the submodular inequality (12) is facet defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_\omega)$ only if the following conditions hold*

- (i) *if $i \in S$, then $i \notin T$,*
- (ii) *there exists $T' \subseteq T$ with $|T'| < k$ such that $S \subseteq R(T')$.*

PROOF. First, note that the submodular inequality (12) for a set S is equivalent to that for the set $S \cup R(S) =: \hat{R}(S)$, because $\sigma_\omega(S) = \sigma_\omega(\hat{R}(S))$, $\bar{R}(S) = \bar{R}(\hat{R}(S))$, $r_j^\omega(S) = r_j^\omega(\hat{R}(S))$ for all $j \in \bar{R}(S)$ and $\rho_j^\omega(S) = 0$ for $j \in R(S)$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we assume that for all non-leaf nodes $i \in S \setminus L$, we have $R(\{i\}) \subseteq S$.

- (i) Suppose, for contradiction, that there exists $i \in S \cap T$. Now consider the submodular inequality (12) for the set $S' = S \setminus \{i\}$ given by

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(S') + \sum_{j \in \bar{R}(S')} r_j^\omega(S') x_j = \sigma_\omega(S) - 1 + x_i + \sum_{j \in \bar{R}(S)} r_j^\omega(S) x_j, \quad (13)$$

which follows because the set of all descendants of i , $R(\{i\})$ is contained in S by assumption, so removing i reduces the influence function by exactly 1, and the set of nodes not reachable from S' is given by $\bar{R}(S') = \bar{R}(S) \cup \{i\}$, and hence the coefficients $r_j^\omega(S') = r_j^\omega(S)$ for $j \in \bar{R}(S)$, and $r_i^\omega(S') = 1$. Because $x_i \leq 1$, inequality (13) dominates the submodular inequality (12) for this choice of S . Hence, the submodular inequality for a set S such that there exists $i \in S \cap T$ is not facet defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_\omega)$.

- (ii) Suppose, for contradiction, that there does not exist $T' \subseteq T$ with $|T'| < k$ such that $S \subseteq R(T')$. In this case, consider the set $\hat{S} := \{i \in S : \nexists j \in S \text{ with } i \in R(\{j\})\}$, in other words, \hat{S} is the set of nodes in the graph induced by S that have no incoming arcs from other nodes in S . Note that from condition (i), we know that $\hat{S} \cap T = \emptyset$. Then, by assumption there exist at least k nodes, say nodes $1, \dots, k \in \hat{S}$ such that $P_i \cap P_j = \emptyset$ for all pairs $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, i \neq j$. Now consider the submodular inequality (12) for the set $S' = S \setminus \{1, \dots, k\}$ given by

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(S') + \sum_{j \in \bar{R}(S')} r_j^\omega(S') x_j = \sigma_\omega(S) - k + \sum_{j \in \bar{R}(S)} r_j^\omega(S) x_j + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \hat{R}(P_i) \setminus R(\{i\})} x_j, \quad (14)$$

which follows because the set of all descendants of $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $R(\{i\})$, is contained in S by assumption, so removing nodes $i = 1, \dots, k$ reduces the influence function by exactly k , and the set of nodes not reachable from S' is given by $\bar{R}(S') = \bar{R}(S) \cup \{1, \dots, k\}$. In addition, the coefficients $r_j^\omega(S') = r_j^\omega(S)$ for $j \in \bar{R}(S)$ such that $j \notin \cup_{i=1}^k (\hat{R}(P_i) \setminus R(\{i\}))$, $r_j^\omega(S') = r_j^\omega(S) + 1$ for $j \in \bar{R}(S)$ such that $j \in \cup_{i=1}^k (\hat{R}(P_i) \setminus R(\{i\}))$, and $r_i^\omega(S') = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Because $\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \hat{R}(P_i) \setminus R(\{i\})} x_j \leq \sum_{j \in V} x_j \leq k$, inequality (14) dominates the submodular inequality (12) for this choice of S . Hence, there must exist $T' \subseteq T$ with $|T'| < k$ such that $S \subseteq R(T')$ for the submodular inequality (12) to be facet defining for $\text{conv}(\mathcal{S}_\omega)$.

□

For a given solution \bar{x} to the current master problem, we propose the use of the submodular inequalities (12) in the Benders decomposition algorithm, where we let $S = \{i \in V : \bar{x}_i = 1\} =: \bar{X}$. We refer to the cuts in the form of (12) as *submodular optimality cuts*.

PROPOSITION 4.4 *Algorithm 2 with optimality cuts (12) with $S = \bar{X}$ converges to an optimal solution in finitely many iterations for the independent cascade problem.*

PROOF. The result follows from the fact that the number of feasible first-stage solutions is finite, and from Theorem 4.1. \square

Note that while sampling issues are not considered in the present paper, there is a rich body of work on sampling for stochastic programs. In particular, Kleywegt et al. (2002) show that for discrete stochastic optimization problems, for a sample size of $\Omega\left(\frac{3V}{\epsilon^2} \ln\left(\frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{\alpha}\right)\right)$, the probability that the optimal solution to the sampled problem is an ϵ -optimal solution to the original problem is at least $1 - \alpha$. Here V is a parameter bounding the maximum variance of the difference between an optimal objective value and the objective value of a non- ϵ -optimal solution. Observe that because $|\mathcal{X}|$ has $O(n^k)$ elements in our case, the sample size estimate grows in the order of $k \ln n$. Furthermore, after a candidate solution is found, one can utilize multiple replications method for assessing solution quality to obtain asymptotically valid confidence intervals for the optimality gap (see Homem-de-Mello and Bayraksan, 2014, for a survey of sampling methods for stochastic programming).

Observe that while we focus on the independent cascade model, our proposed model and method is applicable to many extensions of the social network problems studied in the literature. For example, consider the linear threshold model of Kempe et al. (2003). In this model, given the social network $G = (V, A)$, the arcs have deterministic weight $0 < w_{ij} < 1$, such that for all nodes $j \in V$, $\sum_{i:(i,j) \in A} w_{ij} \leq 1$. In addition, each node $j \in V$ selects a threshold ν_j uniformly at random. A node is activated if sum of the weights of its active neighbors is above the thresholds, i.e., $\sum_{i:(i,j) \in A} w_{ij} x_i \geq \nu_j$. Kempe et al. (2003) show that this model also has an equivalent live-arc graph representation, where every node has at most one incoming live arc. In addition, the influence spread is monotone and submodular under the given assumptions. As a result, our stochastic programming method applies to the linear threshold model as well.

Another extension considered in the literature is to replace the cardinality constraint on the number of nodes selected with a knapsack constraint representing a marketing budget where each node has a different cost to market. This model also admits an adapted and more involved 0.63-factor greedy approximation algorithm (see, Khuller et al., 1999; Sviridenko, 2004). In fact, our model is flexible enough to allow any constraints in \mathcal{X} so long as the master problem can be solved with an optimization solver, while the greedy approximation algorithm needs careful adjustment and analysis for each additional constraint. Similarly, the time-constrained influence spread problem studied in Chen et al. (2012) and Liu et al. (2012) can also be solved using our method. In this problem, there is an additional constraint that the number of time periods it takes to influence a node should be no more than a given parameter τ . The resulting influence spread function is monotone and submodular, hence we can use the general form of the submodular inequalities for

$\bar{X} \subseteq V$ given by

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{X}) + \sum_{j \in V \setminus \bar{X}} \rho_j^\omega(\bar{X})x_j. \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, we can efficiently calculate the coefficients $\rho_j^\omega(\bar{X})$ by solving, with breadth-first search, a modified reachability problem limiting the number of hops from the seed set \bar{X} to any other node by τ .

Indeed, in the next section, we show that we can generalize our method to *any* two-stage stochastic program, where the value function of the second stage is a submodular function of the binary variables of the first stage.

5. General Two-Stage Stochastic MIPs where the Second-Stage Value Function is Submodular Note that the decomposition algorithm we propose is more generally applicable to two-stage stochastic programs with binary first-stage decisions, $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$, where the second-stage value function, $\sigma_\omega(x)$ is submodular, and \mathcal{X} represents the set of feasible first stage solutions. The algorithm takes the form of Algorithm 2, where for a given first stage solution, \bar{x} , which is a characteristic vector of the set \bar{X} , and scenario $\omega \in \Lambda$, we use the optimality cut given by (15) if the second-stage value function $\sigma_\omega(x)$ is nondecreasing and submodular. If the second-stage value function $\sigma_\omega(x)$ is nonmonotone and submodular, then we use the optimality cut given by the inequality

$$\theta_\omega \leq \sigma_\omega(\bar{X}) - \sum_{j \in \bar{X}} \rho_j^\omega(V \setminus \{j\})(1 - x_j) + \sum_{j \in V \setminus \bar{X}} \rho_j^\omega(\bar{X})x_j, \quad (16)$$

(see Nemhauser and Wolsey, 1981, for validity).

PROPOSITION 5.1 *Algorithm 2 with optimality cuts (15) and (16) converges to an optimal solution in finitely many iterations for a two-stage stochastic program with binary first-stage decisions, $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$ for which the second-stage value function, $\sigma_\omega(x), \omega \in \Lambda$, ($|\Lambda|$ finite) is submodular nondecreasing and submodular nonmonotone, respectively.*

PROOF. The result follows from the fact that the number of feasible first stage solutions is finite, and from Theorem 4.1 and its analogue for nonmonotone submodular functions given in Nemhauser and Wolsey (1981). \square

6. Computational Experiments In this section we summarize our experience with solving the influence maximization problem using the Benders decomposition method with various optimality cuts proposed in this paper, and the greedy hill-climbing algorithm (Greedy) of Kempe et al. (2003). The Benders algorithms utilize two versions of the optimality cuts: submodular inequalities (12) (denoted by Benders-SubIneqs) and strengthened integer L-shaped cuts (11) (denoted by Benders-LC). The algorithms are implemented in C++ with IBM ILOG CPLEX 12.6 Optimizer. All experiments were executed on a Windows Server 2012 R2 with an Intel Xeon E5-2630 2.40 GHz CPU, 32 GB DRAM and x64 based processor. For

the master problem of the decomposition algorithm, the relative MIP gap tolerance of CPLEX was set to 0.5%, so a feasible solution which has an optimality gap of 0.5% is considered optimal.

6.1 Small-Scale Network First, we study the quality of the solutions produced by Benders and Greedy on a small-scale network for which we can enumerate all possible outcomes of the random process. In these experiments, we are able to capture the random process precisely, and no information is lost through sampling from the true distribution. Note that Benders-SubIneqs and Benders-LC both compute the optimal objective value, so both Benders-SubIneqs and Benders-LC are regarded as Benders in this section. An illustrative network is given in Figure 2 with 9 nodes, 10 directed arcs and independent influence probability $\pi_{ij} = p$ for all $(i, j) \in A$. Our goal is to select $k = 2$ seed nodes, so that the objective value, which is the expected number of nodes influenced by the seed nodes, is maximized. We generate all possible influence scenarios (a total of $2^{10} = 1024$ scenarios). Note that under the assumption that each influence is independent of the others, the probability of scenario ω , which has $\ell \leq 10$ live arcs, is given by $p_\omega = (1 - p)^{10-\ell} p^\ell$.

The solution of Benders and Greedy methods on 1024 scenarios with various values of $p = 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1$ is shown in Table 1. When $p \leq 0.5$, both algorithms have the same objective value. For $0.6 \leq p \leq 1$, Greedy selects node 1 as the seed in the first iteration of Algorithm 1 (line 4 of Algorithm 1) and selects either node 2 or 3 as the seed in the second iteration. However, Benders selects nodes 2 and 3 as the seed nodes, and provides a better objective value than Greedy (up to 12.5% improvement). So while Greedy does better than its worst-case bound (63%), it is within 12.5% of optimality.

Next, instead of generating all 1024 scenarios, we employed Monte-Carlo sampling, and independently sampled different number of scenarios $|\Lambda| = 10, 50$ and 100 according to different p values, and let $p_\omega = 1/|\Lambda|$. We summarize the results of this experiment in Table 2. For eight out of 15 cases, Benders has a higher objective value than Greedy, and in all other cases Greedy attains the optimal objective value (mostly for small influence probabilities $p = 0.1, 0.3$). We also observe that the objective value for the instances with larger number of scenarios are closer to the objective value with all 1024 scenarios. Note that Greedy is a 0.63-approximation algorithm even for the sampled problem, which assumes that the true distribution is given by the $|\Lambda|$ scenarios, whereas Benders provides the optimal solution to the sampled problem.




Figure 2: Network with 9 nodes and 10 arcs with equal influence probabilities p

Table 1: Expected influence obtained from two algorithms for the small-scale network with 1024 scenarios

Algorithm	Objective values with different p									
	$p = 1.0$	$p = 0.9$	$p = 0.8$	$p = 0.7$	$p = 0.6$	$p = 0.5$	$p = 0.4$	$p = 0.3$	$p = 0.2$	$p = 0.1$
Benders	8	7.4	6.8	6.2	5.6	5	4.48	3.92	3.32	2.68
Greedy	7	6.68	6.32	5.92	5.48	5	4.48	3.92	3.32	2.68

Table 2: Expected influence obtained from two algorithms for the small-scale network with $|\Lambda|$ scenarios

$ \Lambda $	Algorithm	Objective values for different p				
		$p = 0.9$	$p = 0.6$	$p = 0.5$	$p = 0.3$	$p = 0.1$
10	Benders	7.1	5.2	4.7	3.4	2.6
10	Greedy	6.8	5.1	4.6	3.4	2.6
50	Benders	7.4	5.84	5.18	3.98	2.68
50	Greedy	6.82	5.66	5.06	3.98	2.68
100	Benders	7.38	5.61	5.04	3.96	2.76
100	Greedy	6.69	5.52	5.04	3.96	2.76

6.2 Large-Scale Network with Real World Dataset To evaluate the efficiency of Benders and Greedy on large networks, we conduct computational experiments on a standard test instance derived from the real world academic collaboration network in the “high energy physics theory” (HEPT) section of the e-print arXiv (www.arxiv.org) (Kempe et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2009; Kempe et al., 2015). The network contains 15,233 nodes, which represent the authors, and 117,782 directed arcs, which represent the co-authorship between each pair of authors in the “high energy physics theory” papers from 1991 to 2003. As in Kempe et al. (2003), we assign uniform influence probability $\pi_{ij} = p = 0.1$ to each arc (i, j) in the network. We generate $|\Lambda| = 50, 100, 200$ and 400 scenarios. We employ Benders-SubIneqs, Benders-LC and Greedy on these instances to find $k = 1$ to 10 seed nodes, which influence the largest expected number of nodes. However, the running time of Benders-LC is extremely slow. Therefore, we only report our results with Benders-SubIneqs and Greedy in Table 3, and discuss the inefficiency of Benders-LC later in Section 6.3. Column “ k ” denotes the number of seed nodes to be selected. Column “User cuts(#)” reports the total number of submodular inequalities (12) added to the master problem of Benders-SubIneqs, and column “Time(s)” reports the solution time in seconds. We do not report the objective values in these experiments, because we are able to prove that despite its worst-case performance guarantee of 63%, Greedy is within 0.5% optimal for these instances. In Kempe et al. (2003) Greedy is tested empirically against other heuristics such as choosing the nodes with k highest degrees in the graph G , because it is said that an optimal solution is not available. Therefore, our computational experiments also provide an empirical test on the greedy

heuristic when the optimal solution is available (to the sampled problem).

From column User cuts(#) in Table 3, we observe that the number of cuts added to the master problem generally increases with the number of seed nodes k (with the exception of $k = 9$ and 10 for $|\Lambda| = 50$ and 100). In other words, more iterations are needed to prove optimality if we have more seed nodes to select. Columns Benders-SubIneqs Time(s) and User cuts(#) show that the overall running time does not necessarily increase with the number of user cuts, as more cuts may help the master problem converge to an optimal solution faster. Recall that the running time of Benders-SubIneqs includes the cut generation time of submodular inequalities, which decomposes by each scenario, and the solution time of the master problem (a mixed-integer program).

From columns Benders-SubIneqs Time(s) and Greedy Time(s), we see that the running time of Greedy increases linearly as the number of seed nodes increases, but the same observation can not be made for the number of scenarios. For example, for $k = 10$, Greedy takes 921 seconds to solve the instance with 50 scenarios, but 5958 seconds for the instance with 100 scenarios. In addition, there is no obvious trend in the solution time of Benders-SubIneqs as we increase k or $|\Lambda|$. We also observe that Benders-SubIneqs is faster than Greedy in 27 out of the 30 instances with $|\Lambda| = 100, 200$ and 400. On average, over all tested instances, Benders-SubIneqs takes less than half the time of Greedy.

6.3 Benders with submodular inequalities and L-shaped cuts In the previous subsection, we set $\pi_{ij} = p = 0.1$, $(i, j) \in A$ in the real world network. Because the influence probability p is very small, the live-arc graphs corresponding to each scenario are large-scale sparse networks. We were not able to solve even the smallest instances (with $k = 1$ and $|\Lambda| = 50$) using Benders-LC after one day. To demonstrate the inefficiency of Benders-LC, we consider a much smaller subset of the sparse HEPT network under one scenario, depicted in Figure 3 with 15 nodes and 4 directed arcs, and compare the performance of Benders-SubIneqs and Benders-LC. In other words, we let $p = 1$, which leads to a deterministic problem (i.e., a unique scenario with objective θ_1 and $p_1 = 1$). We vary the value of k from 1 to 5.




Figure 3: Sparse Network with 15 nodes and 4 arcs with equal influence probabilities p

The total number of user cuts added to the corresponding master problem is shown in Table 4. We observe that compared to Benders-SubIneqs the number of user cuts added to the master problem of Benders-LC

Table 3: Performance of the decomposition algorithm with submodular inequalities and the greedy algorithm

k	$ \Lambda $	$p = 0.1$		
		Benders-SubIneqs		Greedy
		User cuts(#)	Time(s)	Time(s)
1	50	100	64	134
2	50	105	223	224
3	50	150	328	304
4	50	200	410	391
5	50	250	732	476
6	50	258	204	558
7	50	304	1009	641
8	50	366	314	747
9	50	353	367	839
10	50	360	1296	921
1	100	200	185	608
2	100	200	815	1121
3	100	300	265	1604
4	100	410	287	2154
5	100	419	394	2691
6	100	508	363	3241
7	100	677	632	3766
8	100	782	3643	4312
9	100	710	720	5021
10	100	708	701	5958
1	200	400	256	839
2	200	409	281	1459
3	200	601	518	2063
4	200	702	1936	2655
5	200	814	605	3244
6	200	824	714	3830
7	200	1039	716	4440
8	200	1268	1360	5023
9	200	1409	5716	5588
10	200	1423	1398	6173
1	400	800	3898	1326
2	400	803	2007	2226
3	400	1199	3421	3123
4	400	1948	1621	4017
5	400	1616	4748	4904
6	400	1650	1446	5794
7	400	2431	1968	6667
8	400	2562	2104	7552
9	400	2801	2532	8441
10	400	3223	3145	9342
Average		882.05	1333.55	3110.42

grows rapidly as the number of seed nodes k increases. Indeed, the number of user cuts for Benders-LC approached to $\binom{15}{k}$, indicating that Benders-LC is effectively a pure enumeration algorithm for this problem. The strengthened integer L-shaped optimality cuts (11) do not provide any useful information on the objective value when the solution is different from the one that generates the cut. In contrast, submodular inequalities are highly effective for this set of problems. To see why, consider the problem of finding $k = 1$ seed node. The master problem of both Benders-SubIneqs and Benders-LC selects $k = 1$ node arbitrarily, because they do not have any cut at the beginning. Because the sparse network is constituted of many singleton nodes (with no incoming and outgoing arcs), there is a high probability that the master problem selects one singleton at the first iteration. Suppose that the master problem chooses node 15, which was also the choice of CPLEX. Benders-SubIneqs generates the cut

$$\theta_1 \leq 1 + 3x_1 + 2x_2 + x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 + 2x_6 + x_7 + x_8 + x_9 + x_{10} + x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14},$$

and Benders-LC generates the cut

$$\theta_1 \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{14} 14x_i,$$

to be added to the corresponding master problem. At the second iteration, due to the use of the stronger optimality cut, Benders-SubIneqs chooses node 1 and reaches optimality, but Benders-LC chooses one of the 14 nodes arbitrarily. Note that, in the worst case, Benders-LC traces all 15 nodes in the network (and generates 15 optimality cuts) before reaching the optimal solution. Therefore, in the large-scale network of Section 6.2, Benders-LC fails due to the need for a large number of iterations and computational time. In contrast, the submodular inequality guides the master problem to choose nodes with higher marginal influence.

Table 4: Comparison of Benders-SubIneqs and Benders-LC

Algorithm	Number of user cuts with different k				
	$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$	$k = 4$	$k = 5$
Benders-SubIneqs	2	5	11	16	51
Benders-LC	15	106	458	1365	3003

7. Conclusion In this paper, we propose a decomposition algorithm to solve the independent cascade problem arising in social networks. We show that exploiting the submodularity of the influence function is crucial in making the decomposition algorithm computationally effective. Furthermore, we report computational experiments with a standard real world test instance that indicate that the algorithm performs favorably against a popular greedy heuristic for this problem. In most instances with a moderate number of scenarios, our algorithm finds a solution with provable optimality guarantees more quickly than the greedy heuristic, which can only provide a 0.63 performance guarantee. Our algorithm is applicable to many other variants of the influence maximization problem for which the influence function is submodular. Furthermore,

we generalize the proposed algorithm to solve any two-stage stochastic program, where the second-stage value function is submodular.

Our results on optimization-based methods for the basic independent cascade problem provide a foundation to build algorithms for more advanced models, such as the adaptive model of Seeman and Singer (2013), where a subset of additional seed nodes is selected in the second stage based on the realization of some of the uncertain parameters and the seed nodes selected in the first stage. The decomposition methods of Sen (2010); Gade et al. (2014) and Zhang and Küçükyavuz (2014) can be employed in this case to convexify the second stage problems that involve binary decisions. Another possible future research direction is to develop optimization-based methods for the problem of marketing to nodes (Kempe et al., 2003; 2015) to increase their probabilities of getting activated.

Acknowledgments This work is supported, in part, by the National Science Foundation Grant 1055668.

References

- Ahuja, R. K., Magnanti, T. L., and Orlin, J. B. (1993). *Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Benders, J. (1962). Partitioning procedures for solving mixed-variables programming problems. *Numerische Mathematik*, 4(1):238–252.
- Birge, J. R. and Louveaux, F. (1997). *Introduction to stochastic programming*. Springer Verlag, New York.
- Borgs, C., Brautbar, M., Chayes, J., and Lucier, B. (2014). Maximizing social influence in nearly optimal time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '14, pages 946–957. SIAM.
- Chen, W., Lakshmanan, L. V., and Castillo, C. (2013). Information and influence propagation in social networks. *Synthesis Lectures on Data Management*, 5(4):1–177.
- Chen, W., Lu, W., and Zhang, N. (2012). Time-critical influence maximization in social networks with time-delayed diffusion process. In *Proceedings of the 26th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Chen, W., Wang, Y., and Yang, S. (2009). Efficient influence maximization in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '09, pages 199–208, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Cornuéjols, G., Fisher, M. L., and Nemhauser, G. L. (1977). Location of bank accounts to optimize float: An analytic study of exact and approximate algorithms. *Management Science*, 23(8):789–810.

- Domingos, P. and Richardson, M. (2001). Mining the network value of customers. In *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '01, pages 57–66, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Gade, D., Küçükyavuz, S., and Sen, S. (2014). Decomposition algorithms with parametric Gomory cuts for two-stage stochastic integer programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 144(1–2):39–64.
- Hines, P., Balasubramaniam, K., and Sanchez, E. (2009). Cascading failures in power grids. *IEEE Potentials*, 28(5):24–30.
- Homem-de-Mello, T. and Bayraksan, G. (2014). Monte carlo sampling-based methods for stochastic optimization. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, 19(1):56 – 85.
- Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., and Tardos, É. (2003). Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '03, pages 137–146, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., and Tardos, É. (2015). Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. *Theory of Computing*, 11(4):105–147.
- Khuller, S., Moss, A., and Naor, J. (1999). The budgeted maximum coverage problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 70(1):39 – 45.
- Kleywegt, A. J., Shapiro, A., and Homem-de-Mello, T. (2002). The sample average approximation method for stochastic discrete optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(2):479–502.
- Laporte, G. and Louveaux, F. (1993). The integer L -shaped method for stochastic integer programs with complete recourse. *Operations Research Letters*, 13(3):133–142.
- Liu, B., Cong, G., Xu, D., and Zeng, Y. (2012). Time constrained influence maximization in social networks. In *Data Mining (ICDM), 2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on*, pages 439–448.
- Madar, N., Kalisky, T., Cohen, R., Ben-Avraham, D., and Havlin, S. (2004). Immunization and epidemic dynamics in complex networks. *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, 38(2):269–276.
- Nemhauser, G. and Wolsey, L. (1981). Maximizing submodular set functions: Formulations and analysis of algorithms. In Hansen, P., editor, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics (11) Studies on Graphs and Discrete Programming*, volume 59 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*, pages 279 – 301. North-Holland.
- Nemhauser, G., Wolsey, L., and Fisher, M. (1978). An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I. *Mathematical Programming*, 14(1):265–294.

- Nemhauser, G. L. and Wolsey, L. A. (1988). *Integer and Combinatorial Optimization*. Wiley-Interscience, New York, NY, USA.
- Ostfeld, A. and Salomons, E. (2004). Optimal layout of early warning detection stations for water distribution systems security. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 130(5):377–385.
- Seeman, L. and Singer, Y. (2013). Adaptive seeding in social networks. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 459–468.
- Sen, S. (2010). Stochastic mixed-integer programming algorithms: Beyond Benders’ decomposition. In Cochran, J. J., Cox, L. A., Keskinocak, P., Kharoufeh, J. P., and Smith, J. C., editors, *Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., and Ruszczyński, A. (2009). *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. Society for Industrial Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA.
- Sviridenko, M. (2004). A note on maximizing a submodular set function subject to a knapsack constraint. *Operations Research Letters*, 32(1):41 – 43.
- Van Slyke, R. and Wets, R. (1969). L-shaped linear programs with applications to optimal control and stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(4):638–663.
- Wang, C., Chen, W., and Wang, Y. (2012). Scalable influence maximization for independent cascade model in large-scale social networks. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 25(3):545–576.
- Zhang, M. and Küçükyavuz, S. (2014). Finitely convergent decomposition algorithms for two-stage stochastic pure integer programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):1933–1951.