

VERIFIED AUTHORS SHAPE X/TWITTER DISCURSIVE COMMUNITIES

A PREPRINT

 **Stefano Guarino**
IAC - CNR
Rome, Italy
s.guarino@iac.cnr.it

Ayoub Mounim
Datalab - Luiss University
Rome, Italy
amounim@luiss.it

Guido Caldarelli
DSMN - Ca' Foscari University
Venice, Italy
guido.caldarelli@unive.it

 **Fabio Saracco**
CREF
Rome, Italy
fabio.saracco@cref.it

May 9, 2024

ABSTRACT

Community detection algorithms try to extract a mesoscale structure from the available network data, generally avoiding any explicit assumption regarding the quantity and quality of information conveyed by specific sets of edges. In this paper, we show that the core of ideological/discursive communities on X/Twitter can be effectively identified by uncovering the most informative interactions in an authors-audience bipartite network through a maximum-entropy null model. The analysis is performed considering three X/Twitter datasets related to the main political events of 2022 in Italy, using as benchmarks four state-of-the-art algorithms – three descriptive, one inferential –, and manually annotating nearly 300 verified users based on their political affiliation. In terms of information content, the communities obtained with the entropy-based algorithm are comparable to those obtained with some of the benchmarks. However, such a methodology on the authors-audience bipartite network: uses just a small sample of the available data to identify the central users of each community; returns a neater partition of the user set in just a few, easy to interpret, communities; clusters well-known political figures in a way that better matches the political alliances when compared with the benchmarks.

Our results provide an important insight into online debates, highlighting that online interaction networks are mostly shaped by the activity of a small set of users who enjoy public visibility even outside social media.

1 Introduction

Online communities emerge quite naturally due to the general tendency of users to follow and interact with someone with whom they share common interests, experiences, connections, or political views [Conover et al., 2011a,b, 2012]. When analyzing the discussion around a specific subject or interest, the term “discursive community” can be used to highlight that these groups of users often share a common set of language, assumptions, values and ways of thinking that shape their debate around a particular topic or issue and thus contribute to the formation of the same “discourse” [Becatti et al., 2019, Radicioni et al., 2021a]. These communities can serve as a source of support and shared knowledge, but can also create “echo chambers” in which members are only exposed to a narrow range of perspectives and only encounter information that reinforces their existing beliefs [Jamieson and Cappella, 2008, Garrett, 2009, Del Vicario et al., 2016, Zollo et al., 2017]. This is the perfect breeding ground for political parties and activists who aim to persuade or influence people’s opinions or behaviors, or to promote a particular political or ideological agenda [Guarino et al., 2020]. To

understand the role of discursive communities, it is thus fundamental to find effective ways to detect them and capture their main structural features.

Since the map of interaction can be described as a temporal varying complex network [Caldarelli, 2007], the community detection corresponds to the identification of categorical assortative mixing patterns in this network. This informal definition, however, leaves room for interpretation and led, in the last decades, to many community detection algorithms being proposed, each rooted onto a different rationale. At a high level, we can distinguish between *descriptive* and *inferential* approaches [Peixoto, 2023]. Descriptive methods try to identify groups of nodes that are tightly interconnected while being loosely connected to the remainder of the network. In modularity maximization, the connection patterns in the actual network are measured explicitly and compared to their expected values in a randomized null model. In other cases, the groups are detected based on the outcome of simulated dynamic processes, such as label propagations or random walks, that are affected by the varying density of edges within and between the groups [Newman, 2010]. Inferential methods, on the other hand, follow a Bayesian approach, assuming a generative model for the network – e.g., a degree-corrected block model – and identifying the maximum-likelihood partition given the observed graph [Peixoto, 2019]. Different algorithms provide, in general, different partitions that are hard to compare and evaluate in the absence of a ground truth.

Finding sound community structure in online social networks is further complicated by these complex systems displaying a high level of random noise [De Clerck et al., 2022a,b]. Recently, entropy-based null models were presented in the literature of Complex Networks [Cimini et al., 2019]: they represent a tailored and, at the same time, unbiased tool for detecting the statistically significant signal in complex networks. In the case of social networks, they were implemented in order to uncover coordinated behaviours of social bots [Caldarelli et al., 2020, Bruno et al., 2022], different semantic networks [Radicioni et al., 2021a,b, Mattei et al., 2021], accounts displaying the same information diets [Guarino et al., 2021] and the formation of discursive communities and their structures [Becatti et al., 2019, Caldarelli et al., 2021, Mattei et al., 2022, De Clerck et al., 2022a,b, Pratelli et al., 2023]. In Ref. [Becatti et al., 2019] a method to infer the presence of discursive communities on Twitter was first proposed, which addresses both the aforementioned issues at once. The key observation is that we should not treat all users of an online social network alike: the great majority of users act as the audience or the amplifiers for a tiny minority of content creators (while social networks are mostly characterised by an assortative mixing [Catanzaro et al., 2004], the activity is always characterised by Zipf’s/Pareto’s law). These content creators are the only users for which we have plenty of information, and their similarity can be finely measured based on whether they spark engagement in the same audience. Noise removal is guaranteed by the use of an entropy-based approach to measure engagement. This finally leads to a two-step algorithm to detect interpretable communities: (i) first, cluster the content creators having similar audiences; (ii) then, extend the clustering to the audience based on the content they liked the most. In this paper, we will refer to this algorithm as BiDC_{\top} (*Bipartite network induced Discursive Communities*), where \top is the chosen set of content creators – potentially, any subset of the vertex set.

The original method as presented in Ref. [Becatti et al., 2019] relies on two main assumptions. First, that the main creators of content are verified users, i.e. users that, at least in the pre-Musk era, underwent a verification procedure to check their identity, due to their relevance in the public discourse. The assumption that verified users are the main content creators is based on several observations over different datasets that indeed verified users tend more to create new content than to share the existing one [Becatti et al., 2019, Caldarelli et al., 2020, 2021]. The second assumption is that retweets capture efficiently the engagement of users in the debate. This is an “old” result, made on multiple pieces of evidence: using the keyword used, comparing the political position of retweeted accounts and so on [Conover et al., 2011a,b, 2012]. Such a procedure was shown to be effective in many use cases: in national elections, political and societal debates, it was shown to capture the main political alliances [Becatti et al., 2019, Caldarelli et al., 2020, 2021, Radicioni et al., 2021a, Mattei et al., 2022, Bruno et al., 2022, Pratelli et al., 2023].

In this paper, we thoroughly evaluate the BiDC_{\top} algorithm proposed in [Becatti et al., 2019], focusing on its stability with respect to the criterion used to select the content creators \top , and, most importantly, to its performance when compared to other out-of-the-box community detection algorithms. To this end, we make use of three large X/Twitter datasets linked to the main political events in Italy in 2022. We measure the similarity of the partitions obtained with different algorithms, and we further evaluate their accuracy based on their grouping of a set of ~ 300 manually annotated public figures having a well-known political affiliation. While there might be several reasons for the discursive communities not coinciding with the political parties, we expect that politicians involved in a public debate about a topical political issue tend to connect with others having similar positions on the topic.

We consider three possible choices for \top : verified users ($\top = V$), influential users ($\top = I$, cfr. Ref. [González-Bailón et al., 2013]) and top H-index users ($\top = H$). We show that, once the attitude of the “anchor set” to create new content is evident, its choice plays a limited role in the outcome of the algorithm. Regardless of \top , the partitions obtained with BiDC_{\top} are similar, in terms of information content, to those provided by standard descriptive community detection

algorithms, but significantly different from those produced with a state-of-the-art inferential approach. We observe that the outcome of the inferential algorithm proposed in [Peixoto, 2019] is hardly related with the debate, either too fragmented or completely unbroken. On the other hand, BiDC detects communities, that, with respect to descriptive algorithms, tend to better correspond to the political coalitions at the time the debate took place. In some sense, BiDC provides an explanation and a statistical framework for the patterns that descriptive algorithms measure or exploit, while producing a neater and more interpretable partition.

Altogether, our analysis helps clarify that discursive communities are pivoted on a limited number of content creators and that we can focus on clustering the verified users based on their audience to gain a meaningful and interpretable partition of the network. The method of Ref. [Becatti et al., 2019] – and the other variations that we tested – implicitly assumes that discursive communities are driven by the content creators. Since we observe limited differences from the partitions obtained with other standard community detection algorithms, our results logically imply that: 1. the structure of the retweet networks is strongly modular, i.e. that, besides small details, the organization of the retweet network in terms of communities is quite evident and therefore nearly all approaches can capture it; 2. the assumption that discursive communities are driven by a few content creators is correct.

In the following, we will show evidence that justifies our conclusions. The manuscript is organized as follows: we first present the main philosophy of the discursive community detection algorithm in Section 2; we then provide the results of our tests in Section 3; we discuss a few important aspects of our findings in Section 4; finally, we conclude in Section 5 framing our research within the context of the research in computational social science.

2 Entropy-based detection of discursive communities

The main philosophy underlying the BiDC algorithm is that the public debate on X/Twitter – and, arguably, on other social media – is organized around the activity of a relatively small set of popular content creators, with most other “standard” users essentially behaving as their audience. What we call discursive communities thus naturally emerge when the audience members recognize elements of similarity in the content shared by some of the creators, and they cluster around those that they perceive as closer to their own way of thinking, values, political views or stance on the debated topic. While descriptive community detection algorithms can effectively detect this meso-scale structure, they could benefit from a pre-processing stage capable of extracting, from the original retweet data, a more informative similarity network of content creators. BiDC does so relying on suitable statistical benchmarks.

As recently underlined by a couple of sibling papers [De Clerck et al., 2022a,b], using a proper statistical validation is indeed critical for OSNs, that are particularly prone to noise due to real-time interactions among different users and to the multitude of actions that can be performed. In this sense, entropy-based null-models provide a general tool that is, by definition, unbiased and can be used to detect the informative signal from the random noise. The method essentially consists in: defining an *ensemble* of graphs, i.e. the set of all possible graphs having the same number of nodes as the observed network; maximizing the Shannon entropy of the ensemble, fixing some constitutive properties of the original system [Park and Newman, 2004]; maximizing the (log-)likelihood of the observed network [Garlaschelli and Loffredo, 2008], in order to get the numerical values of the parameters of an effective fitness model [Caldarelli et al., 2002]. Remarkably, this framework mimics Jaynes’ derivation of statistical ensembles in Physics starting from Information Theory [Jaynes, 1957].

In the following we will first recap the main concepts of maximum-entropy models, and then briefly present the BiDC algorithm. The interested reader can find more technical details in the appendix.

2.1 General framework

Let us start from a real network G^* (in the following, all quantities related to the observed network will be denoted by an asterisk *). Firstly, let us define a set \mathcal{G} – the *ensemble* – including all possible graphs having the same number of nodes N as in G^* ¹. Let us identify a vector of quantities \vec{C} that are fundamental for the description of the real system. A proper benchmark for G^* would be completely random, but for the information contained in $\vec{C}(G^*)$: in this way it is possible to highlight all properties of G^* that are not trivially due to \vec{C} . Translating this *rationale* in maths, we need to perform a constrained maximisation of the Shannon entropy (in order to have a maximally random benchmark) associated to the ensemble, where the constraints are exactly $\vec{C}(G^*)$. In this sense, the (ensemble) average $\langle \vec{C} \rangle$ will be set exactly to $\vec{C}(G^*)$.

¹Since the number of nodes is fixed in the randomization, we drop the asterisk * from N .

If S is the Shannon entropy, defined as

$$S = - \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} P(G) \ln P(G),$$

then we can perform the constrained maximisation using the method of Lagrange multipliers, i.e. by maximising S' defined as

$$S' = S + \vec{\theta} \cdot (\vec{C}(G^*) - \langle \vec{C} \rangle) + \alpha \left(1 - \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} P(G) \right),$$

where $\vec{\theta}$ is the vector of Lagrange multipliers associated with \vec{C} and α is the Lagrangian multiplier associated to the normalization of the probability $P(G)$. The probability solving the maximization problem above has the standard functional form of exponential random graphs:

$$P(G) = \frac{e^{-\vec{\theta} \cdot \vec{C}(G)}}{Z(\vec{\theta})} \quad (1)$$

where $Z = e^{\alpha} = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} e^{-\vec{\theta} \cdot \vec{C}(G)}$ is the partition function. In order to get the numerical value of the Lagrangian multipliers $\vec{\theta}$ we have to explicitly impose

$$\langle \vec{C} \rangle = \vec{C}(G^*). \quad (2)$$

It can be shown that the condition in Eq. 2 can be obtained also through the maximisation of the (log-)likelihood [Garlaschelli and Loffredo, 2008, Cimini et al., 2019].

2.2 Discursive communities

The BiDC algorithm for the detection of discursive communities consists of the following steps:

- Split the nodes of the network into two sets \top and \perp , and build the bipartite subgraph composed of just the edges from \top to \perp ; in this network, a link (u, t) from $u \in \top$ to $t \in \perp$ exists if t retweeted u at least once in the examined period.
- Perform the validated projection of this bipartite network onto the \top layer, using the Bipartite Configuration Model (*BiCM* [Saracco et al., 2015]) as the null model. The BiCM is a maximum-entropy bipartite model obtained by constraining the expected degree sequences of nodes of both layers (cfr. Appendix A). Such a process draws an edge (u, v) between $u, v \in \top$ if the frequency of common neighbours of u and v in the bipartite network cannot be explained by the degree sequences alone.
- Run the Louvain community detection algorithm [Blondel et al., 2008] on the validated monopartite projection to identify communities for the nodes in \top . To get rid of the node-order dependence of Louvain [Fortunato, 2010], the algorithm is executed multiple times, each time with a different random reshuffling of the input nodes, and the partition having the greatest modularity is finally selected.
- Extend the community labels to the nodes in \perp employing the Raghavan label propagation algorithm [Raghavan et al., 2007], performed on the global retweet network, where edges correspond to retweets. The label propagation is executed keeping the labels of all nodes in \top fixed.

The partition of the vertex set into \top and \perp should be done in such a way to distinguish between popular content creators (\top) and standard users (\perp). For fixed \top , BiDC $_{\top}$ detects communities of content creators based on audience-induced similarity, and propagates the labels of the content creators to their audience of standard users. In theory, the choice of \top could significantly affect the final result. In the very first formulation of the BiDC algorithm [Becatti et al., 2019], the \top set was composed of *verified* users, i.e. those users (at least, in the pre-Musk era of Twitter) whose identity had been certified by Twitter. The choice was justified by a few observations: they tend to tweet more and retweet less than average, they are public figures, and, for this reason, the publicly opinions they express tend to be more consistent across time, allowing the creation of a loyal “fan” base. Anchoring the discursive communities onto verified users was shown to be effective, especially in the case of political discourses, such as during election campaigns or societal debates [Becatti et al., 2019, Caldarelli et al., 2020, 2021, Radicioni et al., 2021a,b, Mattei et al., 2021, 2022, Bruno et al., 2022]. Other than verified users, in the following we will test two alternative choices for \top : *influential* and *top H-index* users. Influential users are defined, according to the classification presented in Ref. [González-Bailón et al., 2013], as those users having more followers than friends (i.e. the accounts a user follows, sometimes referred to as “followees” in the literature), and that received more mentions than they sent. With H-index we mean the Hirsch

index [Hirsch, 2005], commonly used to evaluate the academic impact of a researcher, adapted to Twitter’s mode of operation: we say that a Twitter user has H-index h in the considered dataset, if the dataset contains at least h retweets for h of their tweets. By top H-index we mean $H\text{-index} \geq 3$; albeit this might seem a small threshold, we observed that the empirical H-index distribution has an elbow at 3 and only 1 – 2% of the users meet the threshold.

3 Data and analysis

To evaluate and compare different approaches to community detection on Twitter, we collected Twitter data regarding three topics that gave rise to significant discussions on Italian Twitter in recent years. For each such topic of discussion, we identified a set of relevant keywords that were used to collect tweets using Twitter’s Academic API. A summary of the datasets considered in this paper is reported in Table 1.

Table 1: A summary of the datasets considered in this paper

Dataset name	Dataset topic	Unique users	Unique tweets
President	Debate around the President of the Republic. The political debate ended with the re-election of Sergio Mattarella on January 29, 2022.	119.018	711.497
Crisis	Debate around the political crisis that led to the fall of the Draghi government on July 21, 2022.	113.876	1.414.181
Elections	Debate around the Italian general elections held on September 25, 2022, that led to Giorgia Meloni becoming the new Prime Minister.	222.356	2.784.951

We used these data to compare the partitions obtained for different definitions of the anchor set \top , and to compare our method to four off-the-shelf community-detection algorithms: (i) Louvain, a heuristic for modularity maximization; (ii) label propagation, a message passing algorithm where each node tries to align with the majority of its neighbors; (iii) infomap, which is based on finding the optimal encoding for random walks on the graph; (iv) inference nested, whose rationale is inferring the parameters of a degree-corrected block-model through a maximum-likelihood approach.

3.1 Pairwise clustering similarity.

We assess whether the users are clustered in a consistent way when running different algorithms on the same data. To this end, we use the V-measure with $\beta = 1$, denoted VM_1 in the following [Rosenberg and Hirschberg, 2007]. For any two partitions P and Q , $VM_1(P, Q)$ is 0 if $I(P, Q) = 0$, and it is 1 if $I(P, Q) = S(P) = S(Q)$, where S denotes the Shannon entropy and I the mutual information. VM_1 shares many of the desirable properties of the Variation of Information [Meilă, 2007] – in particular, satisfying the metric axioms – while being independent of $S(P)$ and $S(Q)$. This makes it possible to directly compare the results obtained with different combinations of algorithms and/or datasets. Figure 1 shows the VM_1 between each pair of partitions, for the three datasets, also considering the partitions induced on just the verified, influential and top H-index users.

If we focus on the partitions obtained with $BiDC_{\top}$, for different choices for the \top layer, we observe that the VM scores are generally large, indicating that the algorithm is robust with respect to the choice of the set \top of content creators. The partitions obtained with $BiDC$ are also generally consistent with those obtained with the four off-the-shelf algorithms, especially with Louvain and label propagation. The only exception is the inference nested algorithm, that returns partitions different from all other algorithms. Finally, we notice that the users with high H-index are partitioned in a very stable way, indicating that these users are likely deeply-rooted in their discursive communities. Nevertheless, based on Figure 1, there is no reason to prefer $BiDC_H$ over $BiDC_V$ or $BiDC_I$.

3.2 Comparison with a ground truth.

We construct a ground truth of ~ 300 verified accounts of Italian politicians, manually assigning each of them to their political party, and we evaluate how well each algorithm matches the ground truth. This time, we use the VM_{β} with β varying between 0 and ∞ . If P is the ground truth, $VM_0(P, Q)$ measures the *homogeneity* of Q with respect to P , which is maximized when each cluster of Q is a subset of some class of P – in our case, when Q identifies political factions within a party [Rosenberg and Hirschberg, 2007]. Conversely, $VM_{\infty}(P, Q)$ measures the *completeness* of Q with respect to P , which is maximized when each class of P is a subset of some cluster of Q – in our case, when




Figure 1: VM₁ between the partitions obtained with BiDC_⊤ for different choices of the ⊤ anchor set, and for different datasets, restricted to different subsets of accounts, i.e. verified, influentials, top H-index and all accounts, respectively.

Q identifies political alliances between parties. We support the quantitative analysis with a qualitative analysis, by graphically showing how each political party contributes to each of the obtained communities.

By letting β vary in $[0, +\infty]$, in Figure 2 we consider both scenarios in which sub-communities emerge within a party (e.g., a political movement/trend), or super-communities emerge across parties (e.g., a political coalition). The results suggest that the latter happens more often, as the measured VM _{β} is almost always increasing in β . BiDC_V has consistently good scores, and it often outperforms all other algorithms, including BiDC_I and BiDC_H. This is especially notable in two cases: in the president dataset for $\beta < 10$, and in the elections dataset for $\beta > 2$.

To better understand why, in Figure 3 we present four Sankey diagrams that show how the members of each political party contribute to the communities extracted by the two best algorithms for the president and elections datasets. Based on Figures 3a, we observe that, contrarily to BiDC_V, the label propagation algorithm groups the three center-right parties together, and the “Movimento 5 Stelle” and the “Partito Democratico” together, which explains why it has a higher VM₊ score. However, the latter behavior is surprising and arguably misleading, since the two parties were at the time often in conflict and supported different candidates. Based on Figures 3b, instead, we notice that BiDC_V captures very well, and better than the Louvain algorithm, that elections’ main coalitions, composed, respectively, by: “Movimento 5 Stelle” alone; “Partito Democratico” with “+Europa”; “Azione” with “Italia Viva”; “Fratelli d’Italia”, “Lega” and “Forza Italia”. More in general, Figure 3 clarifies that the BiDC_V finds a limited number of neat and interpretable communities, whereas other well-known algorithms, despite the overall good performance, generate a large number of small communities that provide a fragmented and noisy picture of the mesoscale structure of the debate.




Figure 2: VM_β , for $\beta \in [0, +\infty]$, between the partitions obtained with $BiDC_\top$ with $\top = H$ and with four off-the-shelf algorithms, for different datasets.



(a) President dataset, BiDC_V (left) vs. label propagation (right).(b) Elections dataset, BiDC_V (left) vs. Louvain (right).

Figure 3: Sankey diagrams for selected datasets and algorithms, showing how different political parties contribute to the extracted communities.

4 Discussion

In Section 3, we provided evidence in support of the efficacy of the BiDC class of algorithms in extracting the mesoscale organization of political debates on X/Twitter. With respect to other widely used descriptive community detection algorithms, BiDC has the advantage of producing a neater partition of the network, with just a few easy to interpret communities. The rationale of BiDC is that the organization into discursive communities is essentially determined by the close relationship between a small number of content creators and their audience. With this in mind, there are some aspects worth dwelling on.

The importance of verified users in the emergence of communities. As anticipated in previous papers (see, for instance, [Becatti et al., 2019]), BiDC_V finely replicates the affiliation of accounts of politicians and political parties, while having a few practical advantages over other choices for the anchor set \mathbb{T} : the binary partition can be performed only based on a vertex attribute, and using the fewest nodes and edges from the original retweet network. As shown in Fig. 4, I and H are larger sets than V , and are composed of users who are more active and whose central role in the network is evident. While the comparison presented in Section 3.2 may be influenced by the manually annotated users being a subset of the anchor set V , it remains significant that the results obtained with BiDC_V are, at least, no worse than those obtained using, as a matter of fact, more information. Our results suggest that discursive communities are driven by the activity of public, recognizable figures, whose stance on the debated topic is presumably well-known, and with whom other users can identify.




Figure 4: Frequency of anchor accounts (first row) and frequency of the retweets they received (second row) in the various datasets.

The importance of statistical validation and modeling. Fig. 5 shows, for the Elections dataset, the projection of the bipartite verified-unverified network onto the layer V , comparing the non-validated projection (top) with the validated one (bottom). The annotated accounts of politicians and political parties have been colored according to the political alliance they belonged to². Projecting the bipartite network onto the V layer without performing any selection of informative edges produces a graph with no visible community structure. In contrast, the validated projection produces a clearly modular graph in which the different political alignments are discernible by eye. This points towards the importance of detecting highly informative patterns in the available data as the only viable approach to identifying the drivers of the network’s organization. From a technical point of view, using a community detection algorithm on the non-validated projection means losing sight of how well two content creators were actually connected in the original bipartite graph, whereas in the validated projection the information about the bipartite nature of the system has already been accounted for in the validation process.

²Therefore, PD and +Europa in red, M5S in yellow and FI, Lega, and FdI in blue.




Figure 5: The non-validated (top panel) and validated (bottom panel) projection of the bipartite network of verified and unverified accounts. The manually annotated accounts of politicians and political parties are coloured according to their alliance: in blue Forza Italia (FI), Lega and Fratelli d'Italia (FdI); in red PD and +Europa; in yellow Movimento 5 Stelle; in magenta Azione and Italia Viva. The structure of the validated network (bottom panel) is particularly remarkable since, before the election, a negotiation (then failed) between the coalitions of Azione and Italia, and PD and +Europa took place to form a greater alliance.

5 Conclusions

In Ref. [Newman, 2016], Newman describes community detection as “the division of the nodes of an observed network into groups such that connections are dense within groups but sparser between them”. This informal definition lies at the base of all descriptive methods, that, more or less explicitly, assume that the probability of observing an edge depends on just the groups to which the two nodes belong, plus, possibly, their intrinsic propensity to connect with others. In the same paper, Newman proves that this is, actually, the underlying rationale of modularity maximization, arguably the most widely used community detection algorithm.

In this paper, we focused on X/Twitter and on so-called *discursive* communities, i.e. the sub-groups that naturally emerge in the debates taking place in Online Social Networks (OSNs) when the users form clusters united by a common narrative, language or value system. What we observe in OSNs is a network of interactions, where edges exist for a combination of factors – e.g. the visibility, the status and the behaviour of different users on and off the platform, and the platform’s algorithm – and where understanding what led to the creation of a community is almost as important as detecting the community itself. We studied the BiDC class of algorithms [Becatti et al., 2019] for the detection of discursive communities, whose main idea is to extract an undirected similarity network of content creators from the directed interaction network, by discounting both the users’ activity and the tweets’ virality. This similarity network can be partitioned with standard descriptive algorithms, and the obtained communities can then be propagated to all other users of the original retweet network.

By comparing the communities obtained using BiDC with annotated accounts of politicians and political parties, we showed that BiDC finely replicates the organization of the debate in discursive communities driven by political alliances. In addition, we observed that: using the set of verified users as the content creators works better than other, more “reasonable”, choices based on the users’ activity patterns, despite using less than 20% of the original dataset to build the similarity network; the partition obtained with standard descriptive algorithms, such as Louvain and label propagation, are noisy versions of those obtained with BiDC, whereas a more rigorous inference method produces uninformative communities, possibly because it tries to fit the wrong model to the data.

Our results pave the way towards a better understanding of what leads to the emergence of discursive communities, of which users have a pivotal role in this process, and of what modeling efforts are needed to make statistical inference effective in this context. The analysis also highlights that the verification tag effectively provides a mark of relevance in X/Twitter debates, which may be due to the effective selection of the platform of the accounts to be verified or to the prestige that the verification tag gives to the account. Since these tags can now be paid for, exploring such hypotheses is a relevant direction for future research.

References

- Michael D. Conover, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Matthew Francisco, Bruno Gonçalves, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. Political polarization on twitter. In *Proceedings of the international aaai conference on web and social media*, volume 5, pages 89–96, 2011a.
- Michael D Conover, Bruno Gonçalves, Jacob Ratkiewicz, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Predicting the political alignment of twitter users. In *2011 IEEE third international conference on privacy, security, risk and trust and 2011 IEEE third international conference on social computing*, pages 192–199. IEEE, 2011b.
- Michael D. Conover, Bruno Gonçalves, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Partisan asymmetries in online political activity. *EPJ Data Science*, 2012. ISSN 21931127. doi:10.1140/epjds6.
- Carolina Becatti, Guido Caldarelli, Renaud Lambiotte, and Fabio Saracco. Extracting significant signal of news consumption from social networks: the case of twitter in italian political elections. *Palgrave Communications*, 5: 1–16, 12 2019. ISSN 20551045. doi:10.1057/s41599-019-0300-3.
- Tommaso Radicioni, Fabio Saracco, Elena Pavan, and Tiziano Squartini. Analysing twitter semantic networks: the case of 2018 italian elections. *Scientific Reports* 2021 11:1, 11:1–22, 6 2021a. ISSN 2045-2322. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-92337-2. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-92337-2>.
- Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Joseph N. Cappella. *Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media Establishment*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- R. Kelly Garrett. Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective exposure among internet news users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14:265–285, 1 2009. ISSN 10836101. doi:10.1111/J.1083-6101.2009.01440.X.
- Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Fabio Petroni, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H. Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):554–559, 2016. doi:10.1073/pnas.1517441113.

- Fabiana Zollo, Alessandro Bessi, Michela Del Vicario, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and L. Shekhtman. Debunking in a world of tribes. *PLoS ONE*, 7:e0181821(12), 2017. URL <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181821>.
- Stefano Guarino, Noemi Trino, Alessandro Celestini, Alessandro Chessa, and Gianni Riotta. Characterizing networks of propaganda on twitter: a case study. *Applied Network Science*, 5(1):1–22, 2020.
- Guido Caldarelli. *Scale-free networks: complex webs in nature and technology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
- Tiago P Peixoto. *Descriptive vs. inferential community detection in networks: Pitfalls, myths and half-truths*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- M. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. OUP Oxford, 2010. ISBN 9780199206650. URL <https://books.google.it/books?id=-DgTDAQAQBAJ>.
- Tiago P Peixoto. Bayesian stochastic blockmodeling. *Advances in network clustering and blockmodeling*, pages 289–332, 2019.
- Bart De Clerck, Luis EC Rocha, and Filip Van Utterbeeck. Maximum entropy networks for large scale social network node analysis. *Applied Network Science*, 7(1):68, 2022a.
- Bart De Clerck, Filip Van Utterbeeck, Julien Petit, Ben Lauwens, Wim Mees, and Luis EC Rocha. Maximum entropy networks applied on twitter disinformation datasets. pages 132–143, 2022b.
- Giulio Cimini, Tiziano Squartini, Fabio Saracco, Diego Garlaschelli, Andrea Gabrielli, and Guido Caldarelli. The statistical physics of real-world networks. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 1(1):58–71, January 2019. doi:10.1038/s42254-018-0002-6.
- Guido Caldarelli, Rocco De Nicola, Fabio Del Vigna, Marinella Petrocchi, Fabio Saracco, Fabio Del Vigna, Marinella Petrocchi, and Fabio Saracco. The role of bot squads in the political propaganda on twitter. *Communications Physics*, 3:1–15, 12 2020. ISSN 23993650. doi:10.1038/s42005-020-0340-4.
- Matteo Bruno, Renaud Lambiotte, and Fabio Saracco. Brexit and bots: characterizing the behaviour of automated accounts on twitter during the uk election. *EPJ Data Science* 2022 11:1, 11:1–24, 3 2022. ISSN 2193-1127. doi:10.1140/EPJDS/S13688-022-00330-0. URL <https://epjdatascience.springeropen.com/articles/10.1140/epjds/s13688-022-00330-0>.
- Tommaso Radicioni, Tiziano Squartini, Elena Pavan, and Fabio Saracco. Networked partisanship and framing: A socio-semantic network analysis of the italian debate on migration. *PLOS ONE*, 16:e0256705, 3 2021b. ISSN 1932-6203. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0256705. URL <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0256705>.
- Mattia Mattei, Guido Caldarelli, Tiziano Squartini, and Fabio Saracco. Italian twitter semantic network during the covid-19 epidemic. *EPJ Data Science* 2021 10:1, 10:1–27, 9 2021. ISSN 2193-1127. doi:10.1140/EPJDS/S13688-021-00301-X. URL <https://link.springer.com/articles/10.1140/epjds/s13688-021-00301-xhttps://link.springer.com/article/10.1140/epjds/s13688-021-00301-x>.
- Stefano Guarino, Francesco Pierri, Marco Di Giovanni, and Alessandro Celestini. Information disorders during the covid-19 infodemic: The case of italian facebook. *Online Social Networks and Media*, 22:100124, 3 2021. ISSN 2468-6964. doi:10.1016/J.OSNEM.2021.100124.
- Guido Caldarelli, Rocco De Nicola, Marinella Petrocchi, Manuel Pratelli, and Fabio Saracco. Flow of online misinformation during the peak of the covid-19 pandemic in italy. *EPJ Data Science* 2021 10:1, 10:1–23, 7 2021. ISSN 2193-1127. doi:10.1140/EPJDS/S13688-021-00289-4. URL <https://epjdatascience.springeropen.com/articles/10.1140/epjds/s13688-021-00289-4>.
- Mattia Mattei, Manuel Pratelli, Guido Caldarelli, Marinella Petrocchi, and Fabio Saracco. Bow-tie structures of twitter discursive communities. *Scientific Reports* 2022 12:1, 12:1–23, 7 2022. ISSN 2045-2322. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-16603-7. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-16603-7>.
- Manuel Pratelli, Fabio Saracco, and Marinella Petrocchi. Entropy-based detection of Twitter echo chambers. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2308.01750, August 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2308.01750.
- Michele Catanzaro, Guido Caldarelli, and Luciano Pietronero. Social network growth with assortative mixing. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 338(1-2):119–124, 2004.
- Sandra González-Bailón, Javier Borge-Holthoefer, and Yamir Moreno. Broadcasters and hidden influentials in online protest diffusion. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 2013. ISSN 00027642. doi:10.1177/0002764213479371.
- Juyong Park and Mark E J Newman. Statistical mechanics of networks. *Physical Review E*, 70(6):66117, dec 2004. ISSN 1539-3755. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.70.066117.

- Diego Garlaschelli and Maria I. Loffredo. Maximum likelihood: Extracting unbiased information from complex networks. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 78:1–5, 2008. ISSN 15393755. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.78.015101.
- Guido Caldarelli, Andrea Capocci, Paolo De Los Rios, and Miguel A Muñoz. Scale-free networks from varying vertex intrinsic fitness. *Physical Review Letters*, 89(25):258702, 2002.
- E.T. Jaynes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *The Physical Review*, 106:181–218, 1957. ISSN 0031-899X. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.106.620.
- Fabio Saracco, Riccardo Di Clemente, Andrea Gabrielli, and Tiziano Squartini. Randomizing bipartite networks: the case of the world trade web. *Scientific Reports*, 5:10595, 9 2015. ISSN 2045-2322. doi:10.1038/srep10595. URL <http://www.nature.com/articles/srep10595>.
- Vincent D. Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 10008:6, 2008. ISSN 1742-5468. doi:10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/P10008. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.0476>.
- Santo Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, 486:75–174, 2010. ISSN 03701573. doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2009.11.002.
- Usha Nandini Raghavan, Réka Albert, and Soundar Kumara. Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 2007. ISSN 15393755. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.76.036106.
- J. E. Hirsch. An index to quantify an individual’s scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(46):16569–16572, November 2005. ISSN 1091-6490. doi:10.1073/pnas.0507655102. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0507655102>.
- Andrew Rosenberg and Julia Hirschberg. V-measure: A conditional entropy-based external cluster evaluation measure. In *Proceedings of the 2007 joint conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and computational natural language learning (EMNLP-CoNLL)*, pages 410–420, 2007.
- Marina Meilă. Comparing clusterings—an information based distance. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98(5):873–895, May 2007. doi:10.1016/j.jmva.2006.11.013. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2006.11.013>.
- Mark EJ Newman. Equivalence between modularity optimization and maximum likelihood methods for community detection. *Physical Review E*, 94(5):052315, 2016.
- Nicolò Vallarano, Matteo Bruno, Emiliano Marchese, Giuseppe Trapani, Fabio Saracco, Giulio Cimini, Mario Zanon, and Tiziano Squartini. Fast and scalable likelihood maximization for exponential random graph models with local constraints. *Scientific Reports* 2021 11:1, 11:1–33, 7 2021. ISSN 2045-2322. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-93830-4. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-93830-4>.
- Fabio Saracco, Mika J. Straka, Riccardo Di Clemente, Andrea Gabrielli, Guido Caldarelli, and Tiziano Squartini. Inferring monopartite projections of bipartite networks: An entropy-based approach. *New Journal of Physics*, 2017. ISSN 13672630. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/aa6b38.
- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 57:289–300, 1995. doi:10.2307/2346101.

A Entropy based null-models

A.1 Bipartite Configuration Model

The framework described above can be adapted to bipartite networks. In particular, in the following we will use the degree sequences of nodes of both layers as constraints: in this case, the null-model takes the name of Bipartite Configuration Model (or *BiCM* [Saracco et al., 2015]).

Let us call the two layers of a bipartite network \top and \perp and let N_{\top} and N_{\perp} be their dimensions; nodes belonging to the \top -layer will be denoted by Latin indices, while the ones belonging to the \perp -layer will be denoted by Greek ones. Any bipartite network is completely described by its biadjacency matrix \mathbf{B} , i.e. a $N_{\top} \times N_{\perp}$ matrix whose entries $b_{i\alpha} = 1$ if nodes $i \in \top$ is connected to $\alpha \in \perp$ and $b_{i\alpha} = 0$ otherwise. The degree of a node $i \in \top$ ($\alpha \in \perp$), i.e. the number of connections that the nodes have, is simply $k_i = \sum_{\alpha} b_{i\alpha}$ ($h_{\alpha} = \sum_i b_{i\alpha}$).

Following the procedure sketched in Section 2 returns that the probability of observing the generic (bipartite) graph G_{Bi} is

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(G_{\text{Bi}}) &= \frac{e^{-\sum_i \theta_i k_i(G_{\text{Bi}}) - \sum_\alpha \eta_\alpha h_\alpha(G_{\text{Bi}})}}{Z(\vec{\theta}, \vec{\eta})} \\
 &= \prod_{i,\alpha} \frac{e^{-(\theta_i + \eta_\alpha) b_{i\alpha}(G_{\text{Bi}})}}{1 + e^{-(\theta_i + \eta_\alpha)}} \\
 &= \prod_{i,\alpha} p_{i\alpha}^{b_{i\alpha}(G_{\text{Bi}})} (1 - p_{i\alpha})^{(1 - b_{i\alpha}(G_{\text{Bi}}))},
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\vec{\theta}$ and $\vec{\eta}$ are the Lagrangian multipliers associated with the degree sequences on, respectively, layers \top and \perp . Eq. 3 indicates that probabilities per graph factorize in terms of independent probabilities per link $p_{i\alpha} = \frac{e^{-(\theta_i + \eta_\alpha)}}{1 + e^{-(\theta_i + \eta_\alpha)}}$. To get the numerical values of the Lagrangian multipliers, we can impose the maximization of the likelihood. In the present analysis, we used the python module `bicm` to calculate the numerical values of the probabilities: `bicm`, described in Ref. [Vallarano et al., 2021] as a submodule of `NEMtropy`, is also a standalone module.

A.2 BiCM-validated projection of bipartite networks

Using BiCM as a benchmark permits to validate the co-occurrences in the real network [Saracco et al., 2017]. In fact, observed co-occurrences are simply the “projection” of the information contained in the bipartite network into one of the two layers, say \top :

$$V^{ij} = \sum_\alpha b_{i\alpha} b_{j\alpha}, \forall i \neq j \in \top$$

(in Ref. [Saracco et al., 2015] co-occurrences were also called *V-motifs* since, if the two layers of the bipartite networks are drawn horizontally, they sketch a “V” between the layers). Since in BiCM the probabilities per link are independent, then

$$\langle V^{ij} \rangle = \sum_\alpha p_{i\alpha} p_{j\alpha}, \forall i \neq j \in \top.$$

In practice, the entire BiCM distribution of each V^{ij} can be calculated: they are Poisson-Binomial distributions, i.e. the extension of Binomial distribution in which each event has a different probability. Therefore, it is possible to calculate the p-value associated to each observed co-occurrence $(V^{ij})^*$, according to the relative BiCM distribution. Since the number of different co-occurrences is $\binom{N_\top}{2}$, we need multiple hypothesis testing. In the present manuscript, we implemented the False Discovery Rate (*FDR* [Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995]) since it controls the rate of False Positives. Again, also the validated projection used in the present manuscript was calculated using the python module `bicm`.

B The V-measure for clustering similarity

To measure the similarity between two partitions P and Q , we make use of the V-measure (VM_β), a parametric measure of cluster similarity proposed by Rosenberg and Hirschberg in [Rosenberg and Hirschberg, 2007].

Let $S(P)$ be the Shannon entropy of P , and $S(P | Q)$ be the conditional entropy of P given Q . We make use of the following measures:

$$\begin{aligned}
 h(P, Q) &= 1 - \frac{S(P | Q)}{S(P)} \quad \text{is the } \textit{homogeneity} \text{ of } Q \text{ with respect to } P \\
 c(P, Q) &= 1 - \frac{S(Q | P)}{S(Q)} \quad \text{is the } \textit{completeness} \text{ of } Q \text{ with respect to } P
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that $h = 1$ if and only if the clusters obtained with Q are sub-clusters of those obtained with P , whereas $c = 1$ if and only if the clusters obtained with Q are super-clusters of those obtained with P . Now, we define $\text{VM}_\beta(P, Q)$ as the harmonic mean of h and c , weighted by the parameter β :

$$\text{VM}_\beta(P, Q) = \frac{(1 + \beta)h(P, Q)c(P, Q)}{\beta h(P, Q) + c(P, Q)}$$

$VM_\beta(P, Q)$ can be rewritten as

$$VM_\beta(P, Q) = \frac{(1 + \beta)I(P, Q)}{S(P) + \beta S(Q)}$$

where $I(P, Q)$ is the mutual information between P and Q .

For $\beta = 1$ we have

$$VM_1(P, Q) = \frac{2I(P, Q)}{S(P) + S(Q)} = 1 - \frac{VI(P, Q)}{S(P) + S(Q)}$$

i.e., the VM_1 accounts for the mutual information between the two partitions in a way that does not depend on their entropy, being equivalent to the Variation of Information [Meilă, 2007], normalized by the total entropy of the partitions. With respect to other information-theoretic metrics, the VM_1 and the VI have the advantage of being two distances – in particular, of satisfying the triangle inequality. Further, the VM_1 always takes values in $[0, 1]$, making it possible to directly compare the scores obtained for different combinations of algorithms and/or datasets.