

# BotArtist: Twitter bot detection Machine Learning model based on Twitter suspension

Alexander Shevtsov,<sup>123</sup> Despoina Antonakaki,<sup>1 2</sup> Ioannis Lamprou,<sup>1</sup> Polyvios Pratikakis,<sup>2 3</sup> Sotiris Ioannidis<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Crete.

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Computer Science (ICS) of the Foundation for Research and Technology - Hellas (FORTH)

<sup>3</sup>Computer Science Department - University of Crete

## Abstract

Twitter as one of the most popular social networks, offers a means for communication and online discourse, which unfortunately has been the target of bots and fake accounts, leading to the manipulation and spreading of false information. Towards this end, we gather a challenging, multilingual dataset of social discourse on Twitter, originating from 9M users regarding the recent Russo-Ukrainian war, in order to detect the bot accounts and the conversation involving them. We collect the ground truth for our dataset through the Twitter API suspended accounts collection, containing approximately 343K of bot accounts and 8M of normal users. Additionally, we use a dataset provided by *Botometer-V3* with 1,777 Varol, 483 German accounts, and 1,321 US accounts. Besides the publicly available datasets, we also manage to collect 2 independent datasets around popular discussion topics of the 2022 energy crisis and the 2022 conspiracy discussions. Both of the datasets were labeled according to the Twitter suspension mechanism. We build a novel ML model for bot detection using the state-of-the-art XGBoost model. We combine the model with a high volume of labeled tweets according to the Twitter suspension mechanism ground truth. This requires a limited set of profile features allowing labeling of the dataset in different time periods from the collection, as it is independent of the Twitter API. In comparison with *Botometer* our methodology achieves an average 11% higher ROC-AUC score over two real-case scenario datasets.

## Introduction

Online social media has become an essential part of everyday life. During the past decade, online social platforms have managed to transform the communication routine of our daily life. Due to their growing popularity, online social media gained millions of daily active users that not only consume the information but also create a space for content creators. The main reason behind online social media is real-time access to unlimited information, where registered users are able to share their comments and personal opinion about popular topics. Such high interest in online social phenomena generates the opportunity and the need for different categories of human interactions and content-sharing platforms. Such opportunities lead to the creation of

different online social platforms where each of which provides a unique user experience, with a very similar goal of real-time human communication and content sharing. Twitter, one of the most popular social networks, with millions of active users, is used for news dissemination, political discussions, and social interactions. However, the platform has also been plagued by the presence of bots and fake accounts used to manipulate and spread false information. According to the research community, the usage of manipulation techniques implemented with the use of bot accounts is registered during diverse popular topic discussions. More specifically, studies show that bot accounts are involved in discussions around the 2016 and 2020 US Presidential elections (Golovchenko et al. 2020; Badawy, Ferrara, and Lerman 2018; Howard, Kollanyi, and Woolley 2016; Shevtsov et al. 2022, 2023). Besides the US elections a high bot activity with spreading of misleading information is also detected during election periods (presidential/parliamentary/state) in countries like Germany, Sweden, France, Spain and etc. (Neudert, Kollanyi, and Howard 2017; Pastor-Galindo et al. 2020; Bradshaw et al. 2017; Fernquist, Kaati, and Schroeder 2018; Castillo et al. 2019; Rossi et al. 2020). Furthermore, election discourse is not the only point of interest for bot account creators. Spreading propaganda, advertisement, and fake news are identified during the vaccination debate (Broniatowski et al. 2018), the advertisement of e-cigarette (Allem and Ferrara 2016; Allem et al. 2017) and more recent examples of COVID-19 pandemic (Shahi, Dirksen, and Majchrzak 2021; Ferrara 2020; Yang et al. 2021). This high activity of bot accounts raises concerns in the research community and online social media platforms about the integrity of the shared information. Twitter has been taking measures to detect and suspend these bots to maintain the integrity of the platform. Most of the published studies utilize advanced ML techniques to analyze the content and features (structural/network).

In this study, we present *BotArtist*, a novel machine-learning model for bot detection that utilizes the state-of-the-art XGBoost model combined with a high volume of a labeled dataset according to the Twitter suspension mechanism ground truth. Our method requires only a limited set of profile features that allows the labeling of the dataset in different time periods since it is independent of Twitter API.

We compare *BotArtist* and *Botometer* on two large sepa-

rate datasets and demonstrate that our method achieves on average 11% higher ROC-AUC score and in some cases 20%. Furthermore, we utilize the SHAP model explainability to provide reasoning behind the model’s decisions and clarify the prediction.

The main contributions of the current study involve:

- Development of a novel bot detection model that does not require hundreds of features,
- Achievement of higher performance in comparison to existing modern state-of-the-art models,
- Overcoming the issue of recent Twitter API usage policies, limiting or eliminating access to the Twitter corpus from the research community.

After the paper’s acceptance, we will provide the repository with a detailed explanation and implementation of the experiments as well as all the datasets used in this study.

## Related Work

Bot account detection on Twitter is a challenging task due to the bots’ increasing sophistication. Studies towards this direction make use of supervised (Efthimion, Payne, and Proferes 2018; Feng et al. 2021a; Kantepe and Ganiz 2017; Ng, Robertson, and Carley 2022; Rodríguez-Ruiz et al. 2020; Abreu, Ralha, and Gondim 2020) or unsupervised ML models ((Chavoshi, Hamooni, and Mueen 2016; Minnich et al. 2017; Anwar and Yaqub 2020; Chen et al. 2017; Chen 2018; Wei and Nguyen 2019; Feng et al. 2021b; Antonakaki, Fragopoulou, and Ioannidis 2021)), deep neural networks (Kudugunta and Ferrara 2018; Cai, Li, and Zengi 2017; Ilias and Roussaki 2021; Luo et al. 2020; Hayawi et al. 2022; Feng et al. 2021c; Ping and Qin 2018), language agnostic models ((Knauth 2019), word embeddings (Wei and Nguyen 2019; Feng et al. 2021c; Cai, Li, and Zengi 2017; Heidari, Jones, and Uzuner 2020), explainable ML (Kouvela, Dimitriadis, and Vakali 2020) and ensemble ML (Shukla, Jagtap, and Patil 2021).

*Botornot* (Davis et al. 2016) utilizes machine-learning techniques towards bot detection, while it has been expanded and renamed to *Botometer* (Yang et al. 2019) with the usage of a Random Forest algorithm based on 1200 features. *Twitter Sybil Detector* (TSD) (Alsaleh et al. 2014) also uses ML on 17 features achieving 95% detection ratio, but it struggles to identify hybrid accounts that act as both bots and legitimate users. TSD offers a Twitter Sybils corpus for comparative analysis. *DeBot* (Chavoshi, Hamooni, and Mueen 2016) exploits bots’ synchronous posting habits. Meanwhile, *RT-bust* (Mazza et al. 2019) identifies re-tweeting bots by analyzing their temporal patterns. As shown in (Subrahmanian et al. 2016) DARPA challenged six research groups to detect anti-vaccination bots, while in (Chu et al. 2012) the authors differentiate malicious bots from those that post harmless content (cyborgs).

In (Chavoshi, Hamooni, and Mueen 2016) they detect thousands of bots daily by achieving 94% precision and accumulating 544,868 approximately unique bots for September 2016. They make use of a labeled dataset and apply a novel lag-sensitive hashing technique that clusters user

accounts to correlated sets in near real-time. For example, (Ribeiro et al. 2018) proposes a method to detect and characterize hateful users on Twitter, by using a combination of linguistic and network features.

In (Wei et al. 2016) the authors analyze the characteristics of suspended users on Twitter and their impact on network stability, revealing that suspended users were more likely to be part of small communities and were less active than non-suspended users. Authors in (Majó-Vázquez et al. 2021) examine the role of suspended accounts in political discussions during the 2017 elections in France, the UK, and Germany, while they show that these accounts were more likely to be associated with political extremism and misinformation. Similarly, in (Chowdhury et al. 2021) they examine the factors contributing to the suspension mechanism following the 2020 US presidential election by identifying several factors, including the use of certain keywords, the presence of bots, and the posting of misinformation.

In (Chatzakou et al. 2017) (2017) they propose a method to detect aggression and bullying on Twitter by using a combination of linguistic, temporal, and network features to identify aggressive and bullying tweets with high accuracy, while in (Yildirim et al. 2021) they present a method to reduce hate speech on Twitter by issuing suspension warnings to users violating the platform’s policies. The paper found that issuing suspension warnings could reduce the likelihood of users engaging in hate speech. Authors in (Pierri, Luceri, and Ferrara 2022) analyze the dynamics of Twitter account creation and suspension during major geopolitical events and show that Twitter’s moderation policies varied depending on the type of event and the level of scrutiny from the public and media. Finally, in (Shevtsov et al. 2022) they propose an explainable ML pipeline for Twitter bot detection during the 2020 US Presidential Elections using a hybrid approach that combined deep learning and rule-based methods to improve the accuracy of bot detection.

Compared to the related studies, BotArtist offers a more generic model that depends on only a limited set of statistical and profile features of accounts. Not only is the model straightforward, but its effectiveness is also improved by the latest announcement of Twitter API limitations. As the number of API requests necessary to label the datasets plays a critical role, our model eradicates the need for extra requests or API access. Thus, the research community can provide user profiles that have already been collected, and our model can provide precise labeling without the need for any supplementary information.

## Dataset

Machine learning classification models require a large volume of data to achieve the best possible results. To this end, we collect a dataset that attracted a large volume of users during 2022, one of the most popular topics being the Russo-Ukrainian War. The dataset contains discussions between various countries in multiple languages, which is crucial since our model needs to learn general patterns of bot accounts, rather than focusing on a specific language or country. Specifically, we collect data from over 9 million users posting tweets in more than 70 different languages.

Dataset	Labeling method	Bots	Humans
kaiser-germany	German Politicians and bots	27	516
kaiser-varol	Human annotation	699	1462
kaiser-us	Politicians + new bots	502	928
energy-crisis-22	Twitter compliance	24,028	311,872
conspiracy-22	Twitter compliance	2,812	213,129
Russia-Ukrainian War	Twitter compliance	439,850	8,783,137

Table 1: Datasets used for *BotArtist* creation and comparison with Botometer.

In addition to a large volume of data, we require as much accurate ground truth as possible, to reduce the noise in the training data. For this purpose, we select the accounts that had been suspended for more than six months; this ensures the accounts which were wrongly suspended and recovered. To remove normal accounts, we remove all accounts that had been suspended and recovered, since they likely belonged to the gray zone and could not be accurately identified. Based on this filtering, we identify 8,502,528 unique users, of which 343,322 accounts were bots and 8,159,204 were normal users.

In addition to model creation and evaluation, we were interested in comparing our results with the state-of-the-art bot detection methodology Botometer. To this end, we collect the latest utilized dataset in *Botometer-V3* of Kaiser (Rauchfleisch and Kaiser 2020), which contains three main categories of normal and bot accounts: German politicians, US politicians, and Varol labeled users (see table: 1). Due to data availability, we had to collect the dataset from scratch since the dataset is shared via the user id only. For this purpose, we were not able to collect the exact dataset since some of the users were either suspended, deleted or deactivated and were no longer available. Additionally, we manage to collect Twitter compliance for the dataset where ground truth shows that a large volume of accounts that were labeled as bots were not suspended by Twitter after more than roughly three years. This may indicate that these users were labeled as bots by mistake. We were able to collect 1,777 Varol accounts, 483 German accounts, and 1,321 US accounts.

In addition to the comparison with the already known dataset, we perform a real case comparison between the *Botometer* and *BotArtist*. For this purpose, we use real-time datasets that would be predicted at almost identical times to reduce any time differences and to apply one of the methods. We select two very popular topics around the energy crisis (from September of 2022 until February of 2023) and the conspiracy discussions (from November of 2022 until March of 2023) that were collected via correlated hashtags. For both datasets, we predict new users daily via *Botometer-V3* with the use of Rapid-API and collect real-time suspensions via the Twitter-API compliance mechanism. Additionally, we predict labeled users by *Botometer* via the *BotArtist* model. After three months of data collection and labeling, we store 335,900 and 215,941 user profiles for the energy crisis and conspiracy datasets, respectively.




Figure 1: Machine learning pipeline used for *BotArtist* model creation. Includes feature selection and model fine-tuning; each step is executed during separate K-Fold cross-validation.

## Methodology

Our approach, similar to other bot detection techniques, employs a machine learning methodology. This approach has been chosen due to its ability to produce simpler models without the need for a vast number of samples. By reducing the number of weights and parameters, the complexity of the final model is minimized. To select the optimal classification model, we utilize both the Random Forest model (Breiman 2001) used in the original *Botometer* implementation and the state-of-the-art Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) model (Chen and Guestrin 2016). Both models are employed during K-Fold cross-validation hyper-parameter tuning rounds to ensure a fair comparison between the models and their configurations.

The developed pipeline, illustrated in figure 1, involves dividing the dataset into two portions, namely the train, validation, and hold-out, in an 80/20 ratio respectively. The first portion is used for feature selection, model fine-tuning, selection of the final model and its configuration, while the hold-out dataset is reserved for measuring the model performance over unseen samples. Given the large volume of samples in our dataset, feature selection is performed separately from model fine-tuning to reduce execution time. We have selected Lasso (Tibshirani 1996) feature selection for this procedure to overcome the issue of selecting features that are

Dataset	kaiser-germany		kaise-varol		kaiser-us		energy-crisis-22		conspiracy-22	
Labels	Politicians	Bots	Normal	Bots	Politicians	Bots	Humans	Bots	Humans	Bots
Original paper	516	27	1,462	699	502	928	311,872	24,028	213,129	2,812
<i>Botometer</i>	508	27	1,647	514	499	875	254,900	81,000	166,724	49,217
Active	474	15	1,296	644	485	844	311,872	0	213,129	0
Suspended	5	11	32	27	0	57	0	16,980	0	1,992
Deleted	31	1	130	28	7	26	0	5,548	0	241
Deactivated	6	0	4	0	10	1	0	1,500	0	579

Table 2: Labels according to original paper, *Botometer* prediction and Twitter suspension mechanism. For the case of energy-crisis-22 and conspiracy-22 dataset, we reference this paper as original labels.

preferred by a specific model (Random Forest or XGBoost). Furthermore, we only utilize the train/validation samples for feature selection to minimize the information leakage from the hold-out set. To ensure proper configuration and evaluation of the feature selection procedure, we implement Lasso fine-tuning in K-Fold cross-validation with K=5. This configuration allows for the selection of Lasso parameters that provides higher generalization performance and reduces the possibility of model over-fitting. During the feature selection process, Lasso feature selection retains 27 out of 47 extracted features, reducing the feature space by more than 40%.

After the selection of the most important features, the pipeline proceeds with the model fine-tuning. Both selected classification models have parameters that may impact the accuracy of the model, particularly in the case of XGBoost, which has more than 10 fundamental parameters that require proper fine-tuning. To reduce the execution time and overcome the parameter selection bottleneck, we utilize a widely accepted random sampling methodology that randomly selects a limited number of model configurations for fine-tuning (Bergstra and Bengio 2012). In our case, we provide a high range of parameters for both models, with a total of 1,890 Random Forest and 1,020,600 XGBoost possible configurations. Using random sampling, we select 50 random configurations for each model. All configurations are tested during K-Fold cross-validation with K=5 to properly select the most generalizable configuration.

To optimize the model’s performance in real-world scenarios, we compute an appropriate threshold for the model decision since Machine Learning models are incapable of perfectly separating samples around the 0.5 probability threshold, due to the data imbalance (in the train data and in scenarios of real-time prediction). This necessitates the computation of the threshold that maximizes the model’s performance as presented in the following formula:

$$Best\ Threshold = \max(\sqrt{Sensitivity * Specificity})$$

The aforementioned steps are necessary to create the best possible model that generalizes over the seen data, while maintaining high performance not only on the train/validation dataset but also on the testing and real-case scenarios. In the final stage of our pipeline, we parse our model over the hold-out dataset to obtain explainability over unseen data using the SHAP methodology. Explainability is critical since

it allows the identification of samples and feature patterns that steers the model decisions toward human or bot account prediction.

To utilize *BotArtist* as a real case model, we train it on the entire Russia-Ukrainian War dataset and we utilize the best threshold as the best model threshold for the class prediction.

## Feature Extraction

As mentioned earlier, in this study we pursue the creation of a simple model that in comparison with other bot detection systems does not require a large volume of information or features for accurate prediction. In our case, the profile of the Twitter account triggers our attention. The majority of social media bot accounts are created for the purpose of content promotion and increasing the attention of other registered users. In order to maximize this goal, bot accounts pursue the expansion of social audience. Social expansion is very difficult to achieve without high activity, such as tweets, retweets, comments and etc. Consequently, we need to extract as much information as possible from the user profiles in order to identify extremely active accounts. The difference between very popular social media accounts (also known as celebrities), and bot accounts is that they try to post and share as much content as possible during the day. In order to properly separate normal and bot accounts we extract 47 unique features described in the table: 3.

Proper feature extraction is crucial since it may affect the final model performance. Initially, we extract as features profile information that is provided originally by Twitter API such as the number of followers, friends, likes, tweets, retweets, number of registered lists, user location, post-geo-location usage, background image, default profile flag, verification and account age according to the collection date. Besides that, we compute additional features providing information about the account creators, such as the Jaccard similarity between the username and the screen name of the profile. In the case of massive account creation, those accounts are created by some script while the screen names potentially are similar to usernames. In some cases to overcome the similarity issues, account creators could utilize additional characters such as numbers, characters that do not belong to the number or alphabet sets, or even change lower case to upper case characters. In order to identify such case scenarios we measure in terms of length and percentage the

Feature	Type	Feature	Type	calculation
name_len	count	screen_name_sim	real-valued	Jaccard of (screen_name, user_name)
screen_name_len	count	foll_friends	real-valued	follower / friends
description_len	count	age	real-valued	created_at / collection date
favourites	count	favourites_by_age	real-valued	favourites / account age
listed	count	listed_by_age	real-valued	listed / account age
statuses	count	statuses_by_age	real-valued	statuses / account age
followers	count	followers_by_age	real-valued	followers / account age
friends	count	friends_by_age	real-valued	friends / account age
name_upper_len	count	name_upper_pct	real-valued	percentage of upper case
name_lower_len	count	name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of lower case
name_digits_len	count	name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of digits
name_special_len	count	name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of other characters
screen_name_upper_len	count	screen_name_upper_pct	real-valued	percentage of upper case
screen_name_lower_len	count	screen_name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of lower case
screen_name_digits_len	count	screen_name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of digits
screen_name_special_len	count	screen_name_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of other characters
description_upper_len	count	description_upper_pct	real-valued	percentage of upper case
description_lower_len	count	description_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of lower case
description_digits_len	count	description_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of digits
description_special_len	count	description_lower_pct	real-valued	percentage of other characters
geo	boolean	background_img	boolean	
protected	boolean	default_prof	boolean	
location	boolean			
verified	boolean	url	boolean	

Table 3: List of extracted features for each profile in our dataset.

following characters: upper case, lower case, digits, and special characters. Such measurements allow the extraction of as much information as possible from the user and screen names. Additionally, we compute identical features for the description provided in the user profile.

Besides the textual characteristics of the account, we also compute the growth of the account activity by measuring the volume of the likes, tweets, retweets, followers, and friends of the user according to the age of the account. Additionally, we compute the followers-to-friends relation as a social metric.

The combination of the described metrics provides a total of 47 unique characteristics of the Twitter user profile page.

## Experimental Results

According to the described pipeline (figure: 1) we use the Russo-Ukrainian 2022 War dataset (table1) for the feature selection and the model hyper-parameter selection. Via the developed pipeline, we manage to select only the 27 most important features out of the 47. Based on those selected features and the range of parameters, we discover the best configurations for XGBoost and RandomForest. XGBoost achieves a slightly better average validation performance of 0.875 ROC-AUC in comparison with the 0.857 of the Random Forest. For this reason, we select XGBoost configuration as our final model, with a hold-out set performance of 0.796 ROC-AUC.

The selected model is utilized for comparison with *Botometer*. Initially, we compare the true negative (TN) vs

false positive (FP) performance over the Kaiser datasets (table: 5). We use only those metrics due to the reasons explained in the dataset section. In this dataset, we measure the performance of manual labeling, *Botometer*, and *BotArtist* based on the Twitter suspension mechanism. Based on this assumption, our model achieves higher true negative volume between all the Kaiser datasets. Furthermore, *BotArtist* achieves the lowest false positive predictions. Based on this dataset our model outperforms not only *Botometer* but also manual labeling methods.

In the next steps, we compare the performance between *Botometer* and *BotArtist* on real case datasets such as the energy-crisis-22 and conspiracy-22. The Twitter suspension mechanism provides multiple labels (such as Suspended, Deactivated, and Deleted accounts). We measure the performance of both models over each particular category separately and as a single group where all three categories are merged into a single. It is worth noting that due to the high-class imbalance, both models have low precision scores. To provide transparency regarding our results, we have included recall and precision scores. However, it is important to note that both models can be compared effectively using ROC-AUC scores, which are not influenced by class imbalance.

During the evaluation of the energy crisis dataset, *BotArtist* achieves higher recall, precision, and ROC-AUC values across all categories. Specifically, *BotArtist* achieves a higher ROC-AUC score between 8% for the suspended accounts and 12% for the deactivated and deleted accounts. In this case, our method gives an average ROC-AUC score that

		energy-crisis-22			conspiracy-22		
		Recall	Precision	ROC-AUC	Recall	Precision	ROC-AUC
Normal vs. Suspended	<i>Botometer</i>	0,594	0,127	0,763	<b>0,507</b>	0,021	0,729
	<i>BotArtist</i>	<b>0,781</b>	<b>0,150</b>	<b>0,848</b>	0,481	<b>0,033</b>	<b>0,788</b>
Normal vs. Deactivated	<i>Botometer</i>	0,237	0,005	0,537	0,185	0,002	0,522
	<i>BotArtist</i>	<b>0,469</b>	<b>0,009</b>	<b>0,658</b>	<b>0,375</b>	<b>0,008</b>	<b>0,697</b>
Normal vs. Deleted	<i>Botometer</i>	0,230	0,018	0,525	0,187	0,001	0,491
	<i>BotArtist</i>	<b>0,462</b>	<b>0,033</b>	<b>0,641</b>	<b>0,361</b>	<b>0,003</b>	<b>0,694</b>
Normal vs. All	<i>Botometer</i>	0,487	0,145	0,694	0,413	0,024	0,666
	<i>BotArtist</i>	<b>0,688</b>	<b>0,181</b>	<b>0,788</b>	<b>0,449</b>	<b>0,043</b>	<b>0,761</b>

Table 4: Performance comparison over the energy crisis 2022 and conspiracy 2022 datasets between *BotArtist* and *Botometer*.

	Varol		Germany		US	
model	TN	FP	TN	FP	TN	FP
Manual	1,143	634	468	15	484	836
<i>Botometer</i>	1,312	465	428	55	1,011	309
<i>BotArtist</i>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1,306</b>	<b>14</b>

Table 5: The outcome of the prediction of the Kaiser available labels, based on the Twitter Suspension mechanism, has been documented. It should be noted that all accounts included in the analysis have not been suspended within the last two years and the analysis was only performed on the active accounts. The optimal values are highlighted in the presented data. It is worth noting that in the case of true negatives, higher values are preferable, whereas, for false positives, lower values are more desirable.

is 10% higher than that of *Botometer* across all categories. According to a similar methodology, we measure the performance of both models over the conspiracy dataset. In this comparison, we also have very similar results, with *BotArtist* outperforming the *Botometer* model with a higher ROC-AUC score between 4% for suspended accounts and 20% for deleted profile categories. The overall presented methodology achieves on average 11% more accurate performance (ROC-AUC) in comparison with the *Botometer* model.

### Explainability

Besides the creation of the high-performance model used for bot detection, we aim to shed light on the model decision itself. For this purpose we employ SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) values (Lundberg and Lee 2017) which offer various benefits. One of the most significant advantages of SHAP values is that they are not tied to any particular type of machine learning model and are therefore model-agnostics. Furthermore, SHAP values display local accuracy, and consistency, which are characteristics that are not found simultaneously in other methods. Moreover, the implementation of SHAP is actively supported by an open-source community, is well-documented, and is straightforward to use.

Initially, Shapley values were introduced as a game-theoretic approach for assigning fair payouts to players based on their contribution to the total gain (Shapley 1953). In the predictive machine learning context, Shapley values can be defined as the average marginal contribution of a fea-




Figure 2: *BotArtist* model decision explainability figure produced by SHAP methodology.

ture value across all possible feature coalitions. Based on that, the Shapley value can be interpreted as the difference between the mean prediction for the entire dataset and the actual prediction.

The presentation of Shapley values as a linear model of feature coalitions (Lundberg and Lee 2017), in combination with the game theory allows the allocation of the importance of not only individual players (features) but also among all pairs of them. Consequently, SHAP values can explain the modeling of local interaction effects and provide new insights into the features of the machine learning model.

In our study, we conducted an analysis of the hold-out portion of the Russo-Ukrainian War dataset, which comprised 1,700,507 samples. The purpose of this analysis is

to explain the decision of our model. Figure 2 presents the 20 most important features and their impact on the final decision. The features are sorted in descending order of importance. Based on this order, we observe that the age of the account and the level of social activity since the creation date of the account, are the most critical characteristics of our model.

The presented figure showcases the values of the features, ranging from low (indicated by the blue color), to high (indicated by the red color). Simultaneously, the x-axis provides information on the impact of each feature value on the model decision. Based on the presented results, it is crucial to highlight that the SHAP explanation technique provides insights that align with past related works. For instance, we find that bot accounts tend to have a significantly lower age of the account and a higher density of activity during the account lifetime, when compared to normal accounts, such as statuses, friends, and followers. Moreover, our model shows that bot accounts tend to overlook the geo-location/location information on their profile page.

### **Broader perspective, ethics, and competing interests**

This study builds a bot detection system on Twitter, which can be reused by the research community for the discovery of bots in the Twitter corpus. The current work is already planned to be deployed as a real-time bot detection service. This could be utilized to detect malicious entities working towards censorship and violation of regulations of Twitter, towards a specific malicious activity, political inclination or other means promoting unlawful content.

Due to Twitter's sharing and access policy, the collected dataset contains personally identifiable information (user name, screen name, user id) which we remove in order to keep user anonymity. We keep the user ids as a reference if the account changes status (deactivation/suspension) and the user id no longer provides personal information.

**Motivation.** In order to shed light on the discourse on social media regarding the Russo-Ukrainian war, on the Twitter suspension mechanism, and build a bot detection system, we initially retrieve a dataset from Twitter API. The authors create the dataset, but due to anonymity reasons, we cannot refer to specific names or the projects that funded them.

**Composition.** The instances are 9.8M anonymized Twitter users and 107.7M anonymized messages. We consider that the dataset covers completely the Russo-Ukrainian War since we base its collection on the complete set of related HTs. The instances contain JSON data as returned from Twitter API along with a suspended flag of each account. The instances compose a network of relations in the Twitter graph. As indicated in the section methodology, the dataset is split into train and test sets. There are no indications of noise and no redundancies in the dataset. The dataset contains publicly available anonymized data from Twitter with no offensive content or sensitive information.

**Collection Process.** As mentioned in the methodology the dataset was retrieved by Twitter API based on related HTs

initiated on 23/2/2022 until today, with no ethical review processes, not from individuals.

**Preprocessing/cleaning/labeling.** These procedures are described in the dataset section and the preprocessed data was saved internally, which will be available after acceptance of the paper.

**Uses.** The dataset was used in a parallel study and details cannot be revealed due to the double-blind review process. Also, it could be used for further Twitter analysis. The composition of the dataset may impact future uses only in case Twitter alters data sharing policy.

**Distribution.** The dataset will be available, after paper acceptance under its legal terms, with no third parties, imposed IP-based restrictions, and no export controls or other regulatory restrictions, except Twitter's sharing and access policy.

**Maintenance.** The dataset files will be shared and the authors will be available for contact via the link of an online service, with no further updates after uploading, after the publication of the study. In case of a potential extension please contact the authors.

**AAAI Ethics and Diversity** (AAAI 2023) We conform with the following paragraphs regarding:

**GENERAL ETHICAL PRINCIPLES** 1.1 Contribute to society and to human well-being, acknowledging that all people are stakeholders in computing; 1.2 Avoid harm; 1.3 Be honest and trustworthy; 1.4 Be fair and take action not to discriminate; 1.5 Respect the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works, and computing artifacts.; 1.6 Respect privacy; 1.7 Honor confidentiality.

**2. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES** 2.1 Strive to achieve high quality in both the processes and products of professional work; 2.2 Maintain high standards of professional competence, conduct, and ethical practice; 2.3 Know and respect existing rules pertaining to professional work; 2.4 Accept and provide appropriate professional review; 2.5 Give comprehensive and thorough evaluations of computer systems and their impacts, including analysis of possible risks; 2.6 Perform work only in areas of competence; 2.7 Foster public awareness and understanding of computing, related technologies, and their consequences; 2.8 Access computing and communication resources only when authorized or when compelled by the public good; 2.9 Design and implement systems that are robustly and useably secure.

**3. PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES** 3.1 Ensure that the public good is the central concern during all professional computing work; 3.2 Articulate, encourage acceptance of, and evaluate fulfillment of social responsibilities by members of the organization or group; 3.3 Manage personnel and resources to enhance the quality of working life; 3.4 Articulate, apply, and support policies and processes that reflect the principles of the Code; 3.5 Create opportunities for members of the organization or group to grow as professionals; 3.6 Use care when modifying or retiring systems; 3.7 Recognize and take special care of systems that become integrated into the infrastructure of society;

**4. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODE** 4.1 Uphold, promote, and respect the principles of the Code; 4.2 Treat violations of the Code as inconsistent with membership in the AAI.

### Conclusions and Future Work

In this study, we investigate the ability to create a generic model able to accurately detect Twitter bot accounts. For this purpose, we select a well-known feature category that provides accounts agnostics for most known bot accounts such as age, activity density and etc. Initially, we collect a high volume of normal and bot accounts that are labeled according to the Twitter suspension mechanism ground truth. In order to reduce the noise of our data, we monitor the Twitter suspension mechanism and keep only the accounts that were suspended for more than 6 months. This approach allows us to reduce the noise of the original data. The developed model *BotArtist* performs accurate predictions of bot accounts based only on 27 features, in comparison with *Botometer* which requires 1,209 features for proper prediction (Sayyadiharikandeh et al. 2020). Furthermore, in comparison with two real-case scenario datasets, our model not only achieves similar performance but also manages to outperform the *Botometer* with an average 11% higher ROC-AUC score over the two datasets. In addition, our proposed methodology does not require any access to Twitter API. The research community can provide already collected user-profiles and our model could provide an accurate prediction without any additional information. Besides the model creation, we also provide a decision explanation and present the most important features that push the model decision toward the final prediction via SHAP values. For future work, we look forward to providing a fully working API for further academical usage of our model, in addition to pipeline source code and datasets utilized in this paper. We believe that sharing of created method will allow other researchers not only to utilize but also improve our model.

### References

AAAI. 2023. AAI Ethics and Diversity. <https://aaai.org/about-aaai/ethics-and-diversity/>. Accessed: 2023-04-06.

Abreu, J. V. F.; Ralha, C. G.; and Gondim, J. J. C. 2020. Twitter bot detection with reduced feature set. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI)*, 1–6. IEEE.

Allem, J.-P.; and Ferrara, E. 2016. The importance of debiasing social media data to better understand e-cigarette-related attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 18(8): e219.

Allem, J.-P.; Ferrara, E.; Uppu, S. P.; Cruz, T. B.; Unger, J. B.; et al. 2017. E-cigarette surveillance with social media data: social bots, emerging topics, and trends. *JMIR public health and surveillance*, 3(4): e8641.

Alsaleh, M.; Alarifi, A.; Al-Salman, A. M.; Alfayez, M.; and Almuhsayn, A. 2014. Tsd: Detecting sybil accounts in twitter. In *2014 13th International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications*, 463–469. IEEE.

Antonakaki, D.; Fragopoulou, P.; and Ioannidis, S. 2021. A survey of Twitter research: Data model, graph structure, sentiment analysis and attacks. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 164: 114006.

Anwar, A.; and Yaqub, U. 2020. Bot detection in twitter landscape using unsupervised learning. In *The 21st Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research*, 329–330.

Badawy, A.; Ferrara, E.; and Lerman, K. 2018. Analyzing the digital traces of political manipulation: The 2016 Russian interference Twitter campaign. In *2018 IEEE/ACM international conference on advances in social networks analysis and mining (ASONAM)*, 258–265. IEEE.

Bergstra, J.; and Bengio, Y. 2012. Random search for hyperparameter optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 13(2).

Bradshaw, S.; Kollanyi, B.; Desigaud, C.; and Bolsover, G. 2017. Junk news and bots during the French presidential election: What are French voters sharing over Twitter?

Breiman, L. 2001. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45: 5–32.

Broniatowski, D. A.; Jamison, A. M.; Qi, S.; AlKulaib, L.; Chen, T.; Benton, A.; Quinn, S. C.; and Dredze, M. 2018. Weaponized health communication: Twitter bots and Russian trolls amplify the vaccine debate. *American journal of public health*, 108(10): 1378–1384.

Cai, C.; Li, L.; and Zengi, D. 2017. Behavior enhanced deep bot detection in social media. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI)*, 128–130. IEEE.

Castillo, S.; Allende-Cid, H.; Palma, W.; Alfaro, R.; Ramos, H. S.; Gonzalez, C.; Elortegui, C.; and Santander, P. 2019. Detection of Bots and Cyborgs in Twitter: A study on the Chilean Presidential Election in 2017. In *Social Computing and Social Media. Design, Human Behavior and Analytics: 11th International Conference, SCSM 2019, Held as Part of the 21st HCI International Conference, HCII 2019, Orlando, FL, USA, July 26-31, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 21*, 311–323. Springer.

Chatzakou, D.; Kourtellis, N.; Blackburn, J.; De Cristofaro, E.; Stringhini, G.; and Vakali, A. 2017. Mean birds: Detecting aggression and bullying on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on web science conference*, 13–22.

Chavoshi, N.; Hamooni, H.; and Mueen, A. 2016. Debot: Twitter bot detection via warped correlation. In *Icdm*, volume 18, 28–65.

Chen, T.; and Guestrin, C. 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '16*, 785–794. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450342322.

Chen, Z. 2018. *An unsupervised approach to detect spam campaigns that use botnets on twitter*. Ph.D. thesis, Rice University.



- Chen, Z.; Tanash, R. S.; Stoll, R.; and Subramanian, D. 2017. Hunting malicious bots on twitter: An unsupervised approach. In *Social Informatics: 9th International Conference, SocInfo 2017, Oxford, UK, September 13-15, 2017, Proceedings, Part II* 9, 501–510. Springer.
- Chowdhury, F. A.; Saha, D.; Hasan, M. R.; Saha, K.; and Mueen, A. 2021. Examining factors associated with twitter account suspension following the 2020 us presidential election. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*, 607–612.
- Chu, Z.; Gianvecchio, S.; Wang, H.; and Jajodia, S. 2012. Detecting automation of twitter accounts: Are you a human, bot, or cyborg? *IEEE Transactions on dependable and secure computing*, 9(6): 811–824.
- Davis, C. A.; Varol, O.; Ferrara, E.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2016. Botnot: A system to evaluate social bots. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference companion on world wide web*, 273–274.
- Efthimion, P. G.; Payne, S.; and Proferes, N. 2018. Supervised machine learning bot detection techniques to identify social twitter bots. *SMU Data Science Review*, 1(2): 5.
- Feng, S.; Wan, H.; Wang, N.; Li, J.; and Luo, M. 2021a. Satar: A self-supervised approach to twitter account representation learning and its application in bot detection. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 3808–3817.
- Feng, S.; Wan, H.; Wang, N.; Li, J.; and Luo, M. 2021b. Twibot-20: A comprehensive twitter bot detection benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 4485–4494.
- Feng, S.; Wan, H.; Wang, N.; and Luo, M. 2021c. BotRGCN: Twitter bot detection with relational graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*, 236–239.
- Fernquist, J.; Kaati, L.; and Schroeder, R. 2018. Political bots and the Swedish general election. In *2018 IEEE international conference on intelligence and security informatics (isi)*, 124–129. IEEE.
- Ferrara, E. 2020. What types of COVID-19 conspiracies are populated by Twitter bots? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09531*.
- Golovchenko, Y.; Buntain, C.; Eady, G.; Brown, M. A.; and Tucker, J. A. 2020. Cross-platform state propaganda: Russian trolls on Twitter and YouTube during the 2016 US presidential election. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 25(3): 357–389.
- Hayawi, K.; Mathew, S.; Venugopal, N.; Masud, M. M.; and Ho, P.-H. 2022. DeeProBot: a hybrid deep neural network model for social bot detection based on user profile data. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 12(1): 43.
- Heidari, M.; Jones, J. H.; and Uzuner, O. 2020. Deep contextualized word embedding for text-based online user profiling to detect social bots on twitter. In *2020 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, 480–487. IEEE.
- Howard, P. N.; Kollanyi, B.; and Woolley, S. 2016. Bots and Automation over Twitter during the US Election. *Computational propaganda project: Working paper series*, 21(8).
- Ilias, L.; and Roussaki, I. 2021. Detecting malicious activity in Twitter using deep learning techniques. *Applied Soft Computing*, 107: 107360.
- Kantepe, M.; and Ganiz, M. C. 2017. Preprocessing framework for Twitter bot detection. In *2017 International Conference on Computer Science and Engineering (UBMK)*, 630–634.
- Knauth, J. 2019. Language-agnostic twitter-bot detection. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing (RANLP 2019)*, 550–558.
- Kouvela, M.; Dimitriadis, I.; and Vakali, A. 2020. Bot-Detective: An explainable Twitter bot detection service with crowdsourcing functionalities. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Management of Digital EcoSystems*, 55–63.
- Kudugunta, S.; and Ferrara, E. 2018. Deep neural networks for bot detection. *Information Sciences*, 467: 312–322.
- Lundberg, S.; and Lee, S.-I. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07874*.
- Luo, L.; Zhang, X.; Yang, X.; and Yang, W. 2020. Deepbot: a deep neural network based approach for detecting Twitter bots. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, volume 719, 012063. IOP Publishing.
- Majó-Vázquez, S.; Congosto, M.; Nicholls, T.; and Nielsen, R. K. 2021. The role of suspended accounts in political discussion on social media: Analysis of the 2017 French, UK and German elections. *Social Media+ Society*, 7(3): 20563051211027202.
- Mazza, M.; Cresci, S.; Avvenuti, M.; Quattrociocchi, W.; and Tesconi, M. 2019. Rtbust: Exploiting temporal patterns for botnet detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on web science*, 183–192.
- Minnich, A.; Chavoshi, N.; Koutra, D.; and Mueen, A. 2017. BotWalk: Efficient Adaptive Exploration of Twitter Bot Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2017, ASONAM '17*, 467–474. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450349932.
- Neudert, L.; Kollanyi, B.; and Howard, P. N. 2017. Junk news and bots during the German parliamentary election: What are German voters sharing over Twitter?
- Ng, L. H. X.; Robertson, D. C.; and Carley, K. M. 2022. Stabilizing a supervised bot detection algorithm: How much data is needed for consistent predictions? *Online Social Networks and Media*, 28: 100198.
- Pastor-Galindo, J.; Zago, M.; Nespola, P.; Bernal, S. L.; Celdrán, A. H.; Pérez, M. G.; Ruipérez-Valiente, J. A.; Pérez, G. M.; and Mármol, F. G. 2020. Spotting political social bots in Twitter: A use case of the 2019 Spanish general election. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 17(4): 2156–2170.

- Pierri, F.; Luceri, L.; and Ferrara, E. 2022. How does Twitter account moderation work? Dynamics of account creation and suspension during major geopolitical events. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07614*.
- Ping, H.; and Qin, S. 2018. A social bots detection model based on deep learning algorithm. In *2018 IEEE 18th international conference on communication technology (icct)*, 1435–1439. IEEE.
- Rauchfleisch, A.; and Kaiser, J. 2020. The false positive problem of automatic bot detection in social science research. *PLoS one*, 15(10): e0241045.
- Ribeiro, M.; Calais, P.; Santos, Y.; Almeida, V.; and Meira Jr, W. 2018. Characterizing and detecting hateful users on twitter. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 12.
- Rodríguez-Ruiz, J.; Mata-Sánchez, J. I.; Monroy, R.; Loyola-Gonzalez, O.; and López-Cuevas, A. 2020. A one-class classification approach for bot detection on Twitter. *Computers & Security*, 91: 101715.
- Rossi, S.; Rossi, M.; Upreti, B.; and Liu, Y. 2020. Detecting political bots on Twitter during the 2019 Finnish parliamentary election.
- Sayyadharikandeh, M.; Varol, O.; Yang, K.-C.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2020. Detection of novel social bots by ensembles of specialized classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, 2725–2732.
- Shahi, G. K.; Dirkson, A.; and Majchrzak, T. A. 2021. An exploratory study of COVID-19 misinformation on Twitter. *Online social networks and media*, 22: 100104.
- Shapley, L. S. 1953. A value for n-person games. *Contrib. Theory Games*, 2: 307–317.
- Shevtsov, A.; Oikonomidou, M.; Antonakaki, D.; Pratikakis, P.; and Ioannidis, S. 2023. What Tweets and YouTube comments have in common? Sentiment and graph analysis on data related to US elections 2020. *PLoS one*, 18(1): e0270542.
- Shevtsov, A.; Tzagkarakis, C.; Antonakaki, D.; and Ioannidis, S. 2022. Identification of Twitter Bots Based on an Explainable Machine Learning Framework: The US 2020 Elections Case Study. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 16, 956–967.
- Shukla, H.; Jagtap, N.; and Patil, B. 2021. Enhanced twitter bot detection using ensemble machine learning. In *2021 6th International Conference on Inventive Computation Technologies (ICICT)*, 930–936. IEEE.
- Subrahmanian, V. S.; Azaria, A.; Durst, S.; Kagan, V.; Galstyan, A.; Lerman, K.; Zhu, L.; Ferrara, E.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2016. The DARPA Twitter bot challenge. *Computer*, 49(6): 38–46.
- Tibshirani, R. 1996. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1): 267–288.
- Wei, F.; and Nguyen, U. T. 2019. Twitter bot detection using bidirectional long short-term memory neural networks and word embeddings. In *2019 First IEEE International conference on trust, privacy and security in intelligent systems and applications (TPS-ISA)*, 101–109. IEEE.
- Wei, W.; Joseph, K.; Liu, H.; and Carley, K. M. 2016. Exploring characteristics of suspended users and network stability on Twitter. *Social network analysis and mining*, 6: 1–18.
- Yang, K.-C.; Pierri, F.; Hui, P.-M.; Axelrod, D.; Torres-Lugo, C.; Bryden, J.; and Menczer, F. 2021. The COVID-19 infodemic: twitter versus facebook. *Big Data & Society*, 8(1): 20539517211013861.
- Yang, K.-C.; Varol, O.; Davis, C. A.; Ferrara, E.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2019. Arming the public with artificial intelligence to counter social bots. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 1(1): 48–61.
- Yildirim, M. M.; Nagler, J.; Bonneau, R.; and Tucker, J. A. 2021. Short of suspension: How suspension warnings can reduce hate speech on twitter. *Perspectives on Politics*, 1–13.