

Detecting Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior in Likes on Social Media: Proof of Concept

Laura Jahn¹, Rasmus K. Rendsvig¹, and Jacob Stærk-Østergaard^{1,2}

¹Center for Information and Bubble Studies, Department of Communication, University of Copenhagen

²Animal Welfare and Disease Control, Department of Veterinary and Animal Science, University of Copenhagen

Abstract

Coordinated inauthentic behavior is used as a tool on social media to shape public opinion by elevating or suppressing topics using systematic engagements—e.g. through ‘likes’ or similar reactions. In an honest world, reactions may be informative to users when selecting on what to spend their attention: through the wisdom of crowds, summed reactions may help identifying relevant and high-quality content. This is nullified by coordinated inauthentic liking. To restore wisdom-of-crowds effects, it is therefore desirable to separate the inauthentic agents from the wise crowd, and use only the latter as a voting ‘jury’ on the relevance of a post. To this end, we design two *jury selection procedures* (JSPs) that discard agents classified as inauthentic. Using machine learning techniques, both cluster on binary vote data—one using a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM JSP), one the *k*-means algorithm (KM JSP)—and label agents by logistic regression. We evaluate the jury selection procedures with an agent-based model, and show that the GMM JSP detects more inauthentic agents, but both JSPs select juries with vastly increased correctness of vote by majority. This proof of concept provides an argument for the release of reactions data from social media platforms through a direct use-case in the fight against online misinformation.

Keywords: Coordinated inauthentic behavior, bot detection, social media, wisdom of crowds, simulation, agent-based modeling

1 Introduction

In April 2022, we bought 100 Twitter likes for 3.85 USD through a readily accessible website. These 100 likes sufficed to catapult the liked tweet to the top of the *Top* feed of #dkpol, the main Twittersphere for discussing Danish politics. There, it stayed for several hours.¹ This illustrates that Twitter’s content sorting algorithm may be easily hacked to bring selected items to users’ attention using only likes.

Our tweet was clearly marked as off-topic for #dkpol, but could have been misinformation. Our “inauthentic likes” could thus have been used with the intent to mislead or manipulate—and this would not be uncommon: when deploying *influence operations* (IOs) on social media platforms to

shape public opinion (Nizzoli et al. 2021), a central strategy is to exploit the platforms’ content sorting algorithms to highlight posts to users, a process known as *attention hacking* (Goerzen and Matthews 2019). Attention hacking through likes requires coordination of likes to maximize effect. As the liking behavior does not reflect authentic personal beliefs, it is an example of so-called *coordinated inauthentic behavior* (CIB) (Pacheco et al. 2021; Schoch et al. 2022; Nizzoli et al. 2021).² Coordinated inauthentic behavior may be exhibited by humans and bots alike.

Liking is an engagement type common across social media platforms, but as different platforms use different labels, we refer to *reactions*, understood as one-click engagements where users may select one option from a short pre-defined list as their ‘reaction’ to a post, with users’ choices typically summed and presented as a quantified metric beneath the item. Reactions include perhaps most famously Facebook’s original ‘Like’ and their now five other reaction emojis, the hearts/likes on Instagram, TikTok and Twitter, and Reddit’s up- and downvotes Weber and Neumann (2021). Importantly, all these reactions inform the platforms’ algorithmic content sorting, and thus steer users’ attention.

In an honest world, reactions may be informative in steering attention: through the wisdom-of-crowds, summed reactions may help identify relevant, well-produced, or otherwise high quality content as attention-worthy, so it may be presented to users at the top of their news feed (Bhadani et al. 2022). Alas, that reactions serve as attention-steering exactly makes them—along with other quantified attention metrics (Giglietto et al. 2020b)—a target candidate for influence operations that spread misinformation based on coordinated inauthentic behavior (CIB-based IOs). Accounts (often bots) used to hack users’ attention simulate authentic interest in a topic through reacting to social media posts (Goerzen and Matthews 2019). While not actively posting content, they seek to elevate or suppress specific topics in the public perception, flood platforms with misinformation, and boost narratives counter to an authentic public interest (Takacs and McCulloh 2019). The identification of

¹When the hashtag was viewed in private browser tab without being logged or when logged in with a new Twitter profile. The tweet was clearly marked as a test, and published by an account with almost no network or activity.

²As many platforms’ sorting algorithms assign higher rank to posts that many users have engaged with—e.g., through liking, upvoting, sharing, retweeting or commenting—attention hacking influence operations orchestrate coordinated engagements through coordinated inauthentic behavior to maximize their effect (Nizzoli et al. 2021).

such computational propaganda is difficult as modern bots mask their identity, mimicking human behavior to an increased extent (Beatson et al. 2021; Bradshaw and Howard 2017).

When CIB-based IOs target reactions, the wisdom-of-crowds effect is lost. Scholars have called for ways to promote the Internet’s potential to strengthen rather than diminish democratic virtues (Lazer et al. 2018), e.g., by redesigning online environments to enable informed choice of attention expenditure by providing transparent crowd-sourced voting systems (Lorenz-Spreen et al. 2020). Here, current implementations of reactions are in the ballpark, yet strongly flawed as they may be hacked by CIB-based IOs. Adopting exactly a voting perspective, this paper develops a computational approach to detect and remove CIB influence on reactions, with the aim to restore reactions’ wisdom-of-crowds effects.

Detecting and removing coordinated inauthentic behavior targeted to reactions is a neglected area of research (perhaps partially because relevant data is difficult for researchers to obtain despite often being public, a topic we return to below and in the concluding remarks). In general, computational approaches to combat CIB have not been studied extensively (Nizzoli et al. 2021). Recent research has explored user information-based coordination such as account handle sharing, content-based coordination (e.g., synchronized co-posting of images, hashtags, text, and links), attention metric-based coordination such as co-retweeting, or timing-based coordination (Kirn and Hinders 2022; Pacheco et al. 2021; Nizzoli et al. 2021; Giglietto et al. 2020b,a; Grimme, Assenmacher, and Adam 2018; Weber and Neumann 2021). Despite reactions being a commonly adopted and an easily manipulatable mechanism, research on CIB more narrowly targeted at reactions is quite scarce. Borderlining relevancy are studies on purchased likes not of posts, but of *pages* [*followers*] on Facebook [Twitter] (Ikram et al. 2017; De Cristofaro et al. 2014; Beutel et al. 2013) [(Aggarwal and Kumaraguru 2015)]. This stream of work tries to understand the modus operandi of page like farms [follower farms] (De Cristofaro et al. 2014) [(Aggarwal and Kumaraguru 2015)] and develops supervised classification models based on demographic, temporal, and social characteristics (Ikram et al. 2017) [(Aggarwal and Kumaraguru 2015)]. Here, notably, Ikram et al. (2017) find that their bot classifier has difficulty detecting page like farms that mimic regular like-spreading over longer timespans, and conclude that Beutel et al. (2013)’s unsupervised approach to detect page like farms—even developed with data from inside Facebook—yielded large false positive errors.³ Directly about reactions to posts is Torres-Lugo et al. (forthcoming 2022)’s study of metric inflation through strategic deletions on Twitter. They analyze coordination in repetitive (*un*)liking

³Also in the closely related field of bot detection has the detection of bots that are mainly designed to engage through reactions gone unstudied, again perhaps due to data restrictions. For a systematic review of the bot detection literature, see (Orabi et al. 2020).

on *deleted* tweets in influence operations that seek to bypass daily anti-flooding tweeting limits. From a curation point of view, looking at unlikes is a very smart move, as this data is in fact available to purchase from Twitter. Alas, the approach is inapplicable to tweets that remain online, such as those central to CIB-based IOs that push narrative through political astroturfing (Schoch et al. 2022).

1.1 A Voting and Simulation Approach to Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior

To study CIB targeted at reactions, we methodologically take a voting perspective on reactions and a computer simulation approach to validate the proposed methods.

With the voting perspective, we conceptualize reactions as votes about the epistemic quality of an information item. We restrict attention to a two-reaction case, with one reaction interpreted as a vote *for* the item being of high quality, the other a vote against. We adopt this voting perspective as it allows us to clearly explicate a structure of reactions as binary voting, to specify different patterns and varying degrees of coordination (Nizzoli et al. 2021), and to define and quantify the aptitude of a group of users with respect to tracking quality.

Further, it allows us to draw on intuitions from the *Condorcet Jury Theorem*⁴ (Condorcet 1785): while many weakly competent authentic judgments may lead to a highly accurate collective judgment through simple majority vote, such positive wisdom-of-crowds effects may be counteracted by the non-independence exhibited by coordinated inauthentic behavior.

The latter motivates the paper’s fundamental approach to counter CIB influence, namely to design *jury selection procedures* (JSPs). The core idea is this: given a collection of votes from a voting population of agents, a JSP searches the collection for coordinated voting and from the findings classifies agents as inauthentic or authentic, before finally returning a subset of the population—the *jury*—whose votes are tallied to determine the epistemic quality of a post. I.e., a JSP censors a subset of the population’s votes in order to restore wisdom-of-crowds effects for the remainder.

Methodologically, the paper is also a computer simulation paper. We develop an agent-based model (ABM) in which agents vote on the quality of fictitious posts. The ABM includes agents that vote authentically—in accordance with their private beliefs about the quality of the post and the assumptions of the Condorcet Jury Theorem—and some that do not, either by voting only inauthentically or coordinately inauthentically. Over synthetic vote data generated by the ABM, we test and validate the machine learning-based JSPs that we develop.

Validating with synthetic data circumvents three main challenges in detecting coordinated inauthentic users (lacking reproducibility, lacking data availability, and lacking ground truth), while suffering the downside that synthetic

⁴When all jurors vote *independently* and are *better than random* at voting correctly, the probability of a correct majority judgment approaches 1 as the jury size approaches ∞ .

data has limited ecological validity. First, empirical social media studies of bots remain problematic to replicate and reproduce due to a time-sensitivity of the relevant data (Martini et al. 2021; Samper-Escalante et al. 2021; Bebensee, Nazarov, and Zhang 2021). Attempts to collect the same data twice are likely to fail, as traces of coordination may be altered or deleted after an influence operation was concluded. While e.g. Twitter grants generous academic research access to historic tweets through their API, accounts involved in CIB may evade detection as they are no longer retrievable in their original appearance (Torres-Lugo et al. forthcoming 2022). The shortcomings in data reproducibility make CIB/bot detection frameworks difficult to compare, as these typically require live data access (Martini et al. 2021). Data and analyses of the methods proposed here are time-insensitive and reproducible (cf. Data Availability Statement and Supplementary Material⁵).

Second, data availability limits research. Large scale studies may simply be impossible due to data access restrictions (Martini et al. 2021; Bliss et al. 2020; Pasquetto, Swire-Thompson et al. 2020). Specifically data concerning users’ reactions is very difficult for researchers to obtain: none of the currently existing datasets include it,⁶ and neither Meta, Twitter nor Reddit supply this data in necessary scope (Bliss et al. 2020; Pasquetto, Swire-Thompson et al. 2020). We outline data collection strategies in connection with empirical validation of our methods in the concluding remarks. Data from an ABM can be (re)synthesized in any quantity.

Third, there is an issue with lacking ground truth as researchers do not have access to the empirical truth about accounts involved in coordinated inauthentic behavior. Qualified guesses can be made based on suspicious similarities in behavior or profile features, but *de facto*, it remains unknown whether two users’ actions are authentically correlated or inauthentically coordinated, or how many fully or partially automated accounts exist in a total population (Magelinski, Ng, and Carley 2022; Martini et al. 2021; Samper-Escalante et al. 2021; Chavoshi, Hamooni, and Mueen 2017; Beutel et al. 2013). Specifically for reaction-based CIB, it seems infeasible to create a labeled dataset that even *approximates* the ground truth: labeling accounts individually e.g. via crowd-sourcing or the well-established bot classifier *Botometer* will likely fail as *i*) single accounts will often seem inconspicuous unless looked at in concert at a collective level (Magelinski, Ng, and Carley 2022; Grimme, Assenmacher, and Adam 2018; Yang et al. 2019, 2020a),⁷ and *ii*) collective level labeling is impossible due to current data restrictions as reactions data is available only

in severely limited quantities, if at all.⁸

By validating over an ABM where we specify which agents are involved in CIB, we gain transparency and a ground truth. We get precise baselines, exact measurements of the effect of our methods, and certainty about the degrees of misclassification. We elaborate on this below. Hereby, the ABM validation allows us to provide methodologically robust proof of concept for the JSP approach.

1.2 Existing Work and Contributions

Little work exists on identifying and eliminating inauthentic votes and JSPs. Galeazzi, Rendsvig, and Slavkovik (2019) suggest to remove inauthentic influence by identifying an independent jury via the χ^2 test of independence. Their model takes sharing-induced diffusion in social networks as evolving crowdvoting. Their main results pertain to JSP time-complexity, with their least requiring suggestion still exponential in the jury size (a direct consequence of using χ^2). In addition, we find that the number of data points required for χ^2 application (see Sec. 3) makes their JSPs practically inapplicable and computationally unserviceable. A performance comparison with their bot detecting scheme is therefore impossible beyond contrasting data requirements.

The central goal of this paper is to develop jury selection procedures that raise the correctness of vote by majority of juries, complementing (Galeazzi, Rendsvig, and Slavkovik 2019). The methodological voting perspective allows us to define a metric of success for the methods we develop: majority correctness scores (MCSSs). Majority correctness scores give a direct perspective on the collective epistemic practice of a group of agents, providing a more conclusive perspective than misclassification scores. Beyond raising majority correctness scores, we desire *accurate* JSPs that minimize misclassification of *i*. authentic agents as inauthentic and *ii*. inauthentic agents as authentic (i.e., minimize *i*. false positive and *ii*. false negative errors). The first values *vox populi* and penalizes censorship (Shao et al. 2018), while the second is a *precautionary principle* against inauthentic influence. Further, we desire *feasible* JSPs that use only data that is obtainable by social media platforms and that requires little to no preprocessing, have few to no supervised elements (Orabi et al. 2020; Grimme, Assenmacher, and Adam 2018), and have reasonable complexity.

This paper develops two JSPs, evaluated with respect to vote data generated by the agent-based model. The ABM is presented in Sec. 2 where varying baseline agent populations’ majority correctness scores (MCSSs) are inspected, on which inauthentic activity has a substantial negative impact.

The core JSP machinery is presented in Sec. 3. Each jury selection procedure invokes a classifier method that decomposes the ABM data into singular values (SVD), applies a clustering strategy (either a Gaussian Mixture

⁵Code to reproduce and analyse the data can be found at the GitHub repository LJ-9/Coordinated-Inauthentic-Behavior-Likes-ABM-Analysis.

⁶See e.g. Indiana University’s Bot Repository, a resourceful, centralized repository of annotated datasets of Twitter social bots: <https://botometer.osome.iu.edu/bot-repository/datasets.html>.

⁷*Botometer*’s feature-based approach considers accounts one at a time and does therefore not pick up on group anomalies based on suspicious similarity (Yang et al. 2019, 2020a).

⁸Twitter is the only platform that offers *any* access, with limitations of 75 requests per 15 minutes, each granting only the most recent 100 liking users of a single tweet. See <https://developer.twitter.com/en/docs/twitter-api/tweets/likes/api-reference/get-tweets-id-liking-users>.

Model (GMM) or the k -means algorithm (KM)), and labels agents using a non-standard application of logistic regression on the qualitative property of the post voted on. In related work, vote data—such as US congress roll call data—has been successfully grouped employing dimensionality reduction, e.g., (Yang et al. 2020b; Porter et al. 2005; Sirovich 2003; Poole 2000). Our approach is novel in applying such methods in the realm of digital propaganda using simple binary input data. Dimensionality reduction and clustering methods have so far been applied to less sparse data structures, such as HTTP-level traffic patterns (Suchacka 2019; Suchacka and Iwański 2020), textual data of tweets (Kirn and Hinders 2022), or rich datasets with behavior-based features (number of friends/followers, mentions and hashtags, etc.) like in detection of spam bots on social media sites (e.g., (Ahmed and Abulaish 2013)). A systematic review on detection of bots on social media (Orabi et al. 2020) further discusses unsupervised methods, e.g. (Chavoshi, Hamooni, and Mueen 2017; Chen and Subramanian 2018), yet to our knowledge only Galeazzi, Rendsvig, and Slavkovik (2019) attempt to flag agents given just binary vote data (i.e., with no added information about e.g. temporal coordination as in (Beutel et al. 2013; Grimme, Assenmacher, and Adam 2018; Magelinski, Ng, and Carley 2022; Pacheco et al. 2021; Schoch et al. 2022)) obtainable intra-platform by social media sites.

In Sec. 4, we define and evaluate the GMM and KM jury selection procedures. We show that both are highly successful, as they select juries that have vastly increased majority correctness scores compared to baseline juries. Moreover, the GMM JSP outperforms the KM JSP with respect to its accurate and particularly pre-cautious results. Sec. 5 summarizes the main findings and discusses ethical considerations, model assumptions, and data collection.

Technically, we contribute a novel, reactions-based approach to detect CIB, implemented in two variants evaluated to have positive effects over synthetic ABM data, thus showing proof of concept. Societally, the proof of concept provides a direct argument to be raised to social media platform to open access to reactions data: the data is necessary to evaluate, tweak and deploy promising methods (i.e., JSPs) to combat coordinated inauthentic behavior and thus to inhibit the spread of misinformation.

2 Agent-Based Model (ABM)

We evaluate the two jury selection procedures over data generated by the following agent-based model. A model *run* consists of a fixed set of agents partitioned into agent types (see below), and a sequence of independent *voting rounds*. Each round concerns a given post (which we do not explicitly represent) and whether the post is of high or low quality, on which agents vote $\{1, -1\}$ (1 for high, -1 for low). We think of these votes as users’ reactions, and call 1 an *upvote* and -1 a *downvote*.

Agents are either *authentic* or *inauthentic*. We formally define the agents types in Sec. 2.2 below. We think of authentic agents as regular social media users that use their

up- and downvotes to inform about post quality (e.g., analogously to Metaxas et al. (2015) who showed that by retweeting, users on Twitter signal trust in the message). Authentic agents vote independently according only to their competence-based beliefs about post quality: they satisfy the assumptions of the Condorcet Jury Theorem. Inauthentic agents do not: with different patterns and varying degrees, they coordinate their votes through properties distinct from quality. On social media, inauthentic behavior can both be witnessed among human controlled and automated accounts. Given the scale of influence operations, it is relevant to think about inauthentic behavior in terms of so-called *social bots*: “Computer programs designed to use social networks by simulating how humans communicate and interact with each other” (Abokhodair, Yoo, and McDonald 2015). The design of our inauthentic agents draws inspiration from the social bot classes *astroturfing bots* (that create “the appearance of widespread support for a candidate or opinion” (Ratkiewicz et al. 2011)) and *influence bots* (“Realistic automated identities that illicitly shape discussion” (Subrahmanian et al. 2016)) (Orabi et al. 2020).

2.1 Post Properties, Competences and Beliefs

Let A be a finite set of agents and $I = \{1, 2, 3\}$ an index set for properties. A voting round concerns a given post, and commences with the (Monte Carlo like) sampling of a state

$$s = (p_i, C_a(p_1), B_a(p_i))_{i \in I, a \in A} \in \mathbb{R}^{3+|A|+|A|+3|A|+|A|^2}$$

where each p_i represents a property of the post, $C_a(p_1)$ is agent a ’s competence in evaluating whether the post has property p_1 and $B_a(p_i)$ is a ’s belief about whether the post has property p_i . Properties $(p_i)_{i \in I} = (p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \{-1, 1\}^3$ are sampled independently from a binomial distribution with probabilities $P(p_i = 1) = (1 - P(p_i = -1))$, given as noise levels in Sec. 2.4. Each p_a is sampled as p_3 , and is a private property used by some agent types.⁹ We say that the post has property p_i if $p_i = 1$, else that it does not. Property p_1 represents whether the post has high or low quality, and is the only property relevant to authentic agents. Inauthentic agents act also on additional properties, as described below.

Each agent $a \in A$ is assigned a competence $C_a(p_1)$ to determine whether the post has high quality, p_1 .¹⁰ To evaluate p_1 , it is assumed that all agents are better than fair coin tosses but not perfect: $C_a(p_1) \in [0.65, 0.95]$. We chose $[0.65, 0.95]$ for $C_a(p_1)$ to expedite convergence towards a 100% MCS for authentic agents while ensuring imperfect competence. Any closed, convex subinterval of the open $(0.5, 1)$ would yield similar results w.r.t. MCS, more or less quickly. Competences are uniformly resampled each round, to capture that agents’ expertise may vary from post to post. Inauthentic agents are assumed perfectly competent in evaluating properties p_2 and p_3 , which they use to coordinate their actions:

⁹We include p_a and $B_a(p_b)$ for all agents $a, b \in A$ in the state for description simplicity. In the simulation implementation, we only sampled p_a and $B_a(p_a)$ for agents a that make use of p_a .

¹⁰Even if p_1 is irrelevant to the agent’s voting behavior. This is to simplify the implementation of the model simulation.

$C_a(p_2) = C_a(p_3) = 1$. Properties and competences probabilistically determine agents' beliefs: for all $a \in A, i \in I$, the beliefs $B_a(p_i) \in \{-1, 1\}$ are sampled with

$$C_a(p_i) = P(B_a(p_i) = p_i). \quad (1)$$

If $B_a(p_i) = 1$, then a believes that the post has property p_i , else a believes it does not.¹ If $B_a(p_i) = p_i$, then a 's belief about p_i is correct. Hence, (1) states that the probability of agent a 's beliefs about p_i being correct equates a 's competence with respect to p_i . For two rounds and their states s and s' , all sampling is independent, and in each state s , each $C_a(p_1)$ is independent from $C_b(p_1)$, $a \neq b$. No correlations between properties are assumed due to the interpretations of p_2 and p_3 , stated below.

2.2 Agent Types

We define 10 agent types. Each agent type is a behavior-defining function that maps an agent's beliefs to votes. The set of agent types is $\{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$, each defined and described below. A *population* is a map $\mathcal{P} : A \rightarrow \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$ that assigns each agent an agent type.

Intuitively, $\{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$ contains the following agent types: A is the *authentic* agent type, and the inauthentic agents come in three types that incorporate different patterns of coordination—*boosters* B_i , *distorters* D_i , and *lone wolves* L_i . Each inauthentic type votes based on beliefs about a property *distinct* from quality. Boosters and distorters vote respectively given properties p_2 and p_3 to coordinate their inauthentic behavior in-group. Lone wolves do not coordinate. Each group contains three sub-types: one main to our story which *upvotes on cue* ($i = \uparrow$), and two auxiliary that *downvote on cue* ($i = \downarrow$) or *both up-and downvote on cue* ($i = \updownarrow$). We include the auxiliary sub-types to create a more noisy—and thus harder to maneuver—setting for the JSPs. We hope the notation is mnemonically helpful rather than distracting.

Throughout, the largest population is $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$, defined for an agent set A , $|A| = 1900$, with 1000 agents assigned to A and 100 agents to each $X \in \{B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$. This size and ratio allows for flexibly choosing subpopulations with sizes large enough to produce robust votes. We mainly study subpopulations (restrictions) of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$. We specify these subpopulations by stating the size of the pre-image of the agent types (which is sufficient as precise agent identity will not matter), where we write $|X|$ for $|\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}^{-1}(X)|$ for agent type X . The four main subpopulations are subsets of either 1000 agents (\mathcal{P}_{All} containing all agents types, with 100 agents of each type) or 200 agents ($\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$ each with 100 authentic agents and 100 agents of either type $B\uparrow$, $D\uparrow$ or $L\uparrow$). Thus, let \mathcal{P}_{All} be the restriction of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$ with $|X| = 100$ for each $X \in \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$, let $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$ be the restriction of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$ with $|A| = |B\uparrow| = 100$ and $|X| = 0$ for $X \in \{B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}} \setminus \{B\uparrow\}$, and let $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$ be given as $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$ replacing $B\uparrow$ with respectively $D\uparrow$ and $L\uparrow$. We may further specify subpopulations of \mathcal{P}_{All} , $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$

¹Hence, agents never suspend judgment, even on properties irrelevant to their voting behavior. Superfluous beliefs have no effects, and are only to simplify implementation.

like we specify subpopulations of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$. These restrictions mainly serve to describe what happens when we reduce the number of authentic agents. We write e.g. “ $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$ for $|A| = 25$ ” to mean the subpopulations of $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$ with 125 agents in total, 25 of them authentic.

Authentic Agents. Authentic agents—agents a of type A —correspond to those assumed in the Condorcet Jury Theorem: they vote fully in accordance with their beliefs about quality (p_1), independently of others, and with a competence strictly above 0.5. The vote of an authentic agent a in state s is $A(a, s) \in \{-1, 1\}$, given by the following table:

	$B_a(p_1) = 1$	$B_a(p_1) = -1$
$A(a, s)$	1	-1

In this and the below tables, row index ($A(a, s)$) denotes the agent type and the cell content denotes the action taken in the circumstances specified in the column index (e.g. $B_a(p_1) = 1$).

Boosters. Boosters vote in a coordinated partisan fashion, aiming to swing the majority vote in a direction given by p_2 , irrespective of quality (p_1). Hence boosters exhibit CIB. In social media terms, we think of p_2 as disconnected from quality (p_1), but as representing that the post, e.g., originates from a specific source, expresses a given viewpoint, or—taking booster agents as bots—as tagged for special action by a handler.

The main *Upvote Booster* $B\uparrow$ has as goal to boost and amplify p_2 posts: they upvote (“Yes, the post has p_1 ”) if they believe the post has property p_2 , and else vote authentically (to hide their inauthentic activities). For auxiliaries, the *Downvote Booster* $B\downarrow$ ‘inverts’ $B\uparrow$: $B\downarrow$ demotes non- p_2 posts by downvoting if they believe the post does not have p_2 , and else vote authentically, while the *Both Booster* $B\updownarrow$ combine the inauthentic behaviors of $B\uparrow$ and $B\downarrow$ by always voting according to p_2 , and never authentically. The vote of an agent a of type $B_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$ in state s is $B_i(a, s)$ given by

	$B_a(p_2) = 1$	$B_a(p_2) = -1$
$B\uparrow(a, s)$	1	$A(a, s)$
$B\downarrow(a, s)$	$A(a, s)$	-1
$B\updownarrow(a, s)$	1	-1

The table also refers to the authentic agent type A to make it visually explicit in which cases the Up- and Downvote Boosters behave authentically.

Distorters. Distorters seek to create noise among the votes by, on cue, voting against their beliefs about quality. They vote in a coordinated, but non-partisan fashion: triggered by p_3 , they vote contrary to their private beliefs about quality (p_1). As with p_2 , we think of p_3 as encoding a property of the post distinct from quality, such as, e.g., tag, source or viewpoint. The D agents seek to water down the majority view and damper public impressions of consensus, thus exhibiting one form of *concern trolling* (Goerzen and Matthews 2019).

The main *Upvote Distorter* $D\uparrow$ votes authentically (to hide) except when they believe the post has p_3 but not p_1 : then they distort by voting contrary to their belief about p_1 (e.g., they upvote low quality posts of a given viewpoint to

dampen consensus impressions). For auxiliaries, the *Downvote Distorter* D_{\downarrow} ‘inverts’ D_{\uparrow} : they vote authentically except when believing the post has both p_1 and p_3 ; then they distort by voting contrary to their beliefs about quality. The *Both Distorter* D_{\updownarrow} join the inauthentic behaviors of D_{\uparrow} and D_{\downarrow} : if they believe the post has p_3 , then they vote contrary to their p_1 beliefs (e.g., to always sow distrust about content from a given source, or of a given viewpoint). The vote of an agent a of type $D_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$ in state s is $D_i(a, s)$ given by

	$B_a(p_3)=1$, and $B_a(p_1)=1$	$B_a(p_3)=1$, and $B_a(p_1)=-1$	$B_a(p_3) = -1$
$D_{\uparrow}(a, s)$	$B_a(p_1)$	$-1 \cdot B_a(p_1)$	$A(a, s)$
$D_{\downarrow}(a, s)$	$-1 \cdot B_a(p_1)$	$B_a(p_1)$	$A(a, s)$
$D_{\updownarrow}(a, s)$	$-1 \cdot B_a(p_1)$	$-1 \cdot B_a(p_1)$	$A(a, s)$

Lone Wolves. Lone wolves also create noise among the votes by voting against their beliefs about quality. They do so exactly as the distorters, but without coordination through p_3 . We interpret these agents as individual users that—cued by a personal property—upvote contra their beliefs about quality (L_{\uparrow} , main, *Upvote Lone Wolf*), e.g., out of sympathy, downvote contra their beliefs about quality (L_{\downarrow} , aux., *Downvote Lone Wolf*), e.g., out of anger or spite, or both (L_{\updownarrow} , aux., *Both Lone Wolf*).

Instead of voting given shared property p_3 , a lone wolf, i.e., an agent a of type $L_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$, votes on a personal property $p_a \in \{-1, 1\}$, believing $B_a(p_a) \in \{-1, 1\}$ with $P(B_a(p_a) = p_a) = 1$. For all $a, b \in A$, properties p_a, p_b are sampled as p_3 , but if $a \neq b$, p_a and p_b are sampled independently. The voting rules for each L_i , $i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}$, is obtained by replacing p_3 with p_a in the table for D_i .

2.3 Majority Vote and Correctness

We are interested in how agent populations’ votes fair with respect to *majority correctness*, both before (baseline experiments) and after we have applied our two jury selection procedures. A *jury* is a set of agents $J \subseteq A$. Let $(v_a)_{a \in J}$, $v_a \in \{1, -1\}$ be a *voting profile* of J with respect to the post. The *majority vote* of $(v_a)_{a \in J}$ is whichever of 1 and -1 that gets more votes, tie-breaking to 1, giving the post the benefit of doubt. I.e., the majority vote of $(v_a)_{a \in J}$ is -1 if $\sum_{a \in J} v_a < 0$, else 1. The majority vote is *correct* if it equals the post’s quality, $p_1 \in \{1, -1\}$. Finally, the *majority correctness score* (MCS) of a jury over a set of voting rounds is the percentage of correct majority votes of the jury in those rounds. The MCS of a jury is a measure of its competence with respect to tracking quality, and is the jury performance indicator of interest in this paper.

2.4 Parameters and Generated Dataset

Using R to implement the ABM,² we chose three *noise level* parameter combinations for the sampling of properties:

²We implemented the ABM from the ground up to retain freedom in agent design and as the simplicity of the encoded behavior and generated data do not invoke advanced features of existing ABM simulation packages and programs, such as Netlogo (Wilensky 1999), Laputa (Angere 2010; Olsson 2013), or Hashkat (Ryczko et al. 2017).

	$P(p_1 = 1)$	$P(p_2 = 1)$	$P(p_3 = 1)$
LOW	0.75	0.75	0.9
MID	0.75	0.5	0.5
HIGH	0.75	0.1	0.1

These noise levels were chosen to produce different voting patterns, and to introduce varying degrees of coordination and correlations among votes, in turn producing three levels of difficulty for vote-based agent classification. Quality (p_1) is fixed across levels, leaving authentic agents unaffected. Inauthentic agents perform less (coordinated) inauthentic activities in higher levels, as p_2 and p_3 decrease. They thus mimic authentic agents more (more noise), raising the difficulty of classification. The sampling of p_2 is asymmetric to avoid mirrored results in low and mid noise for B_{\downarrow} and B_{\uparrow} given that booster agents solely rely on p_2 . We chose a symmetric setup for $P(p_3 = 1)$ as distorters and lone wolves’ votes are not solely determined by p_3 , but influenced by the sampling of p_1 , too, hence making completely mirrored votes less likely. For each noise level, we performed 100 runs, each based on a random seed and with voting rounds $r = 1000$, producing a dataset with $3 \times 100,000$ (state, vote profile) pairs. Each was done for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Full}}$, thus counting 1900 agents: 1000 authentic and 100 of each inauthentic type. Sec. 2.5 displays diverse population ratios that explore the effect of authentic agents in minority and majority on MCS. Throughout, results are based on and evaluated against a datasubset with $r = 500$. As all runs and rounds are independent, choosing fewer or more voting rounds is without problem. Other values of r are mentioned explicitly when robustness checks are discussed.

2.5 Baseline Majority Correctness Scores

To showcase varying populations’ behaviors, we illustrate two sets of baseline MCS results in Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1 shows 7 populations’ MCSs as a function of the number $|A|$ of authentic agents in the population. As expected from the Condorcet Jury Theorem, the MCS of authentic agents alone converges to 100%, with 25 agents sufficing. This is representative for all noise levels, as noise does not affect authentic agents. Figure 1 is filtered to rounds with $p_2 = p_3 = 1$, so B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} are ‘actively inauthentic’ (and both always upvote). Given this filter, the figure is representative for all noise levels for B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} . The effect of L_{\uparrow} is level specific (but unaffected by the filter).

We make three observations concerning the main, upvoting inauthentic agents B_{\uparrow} , D_{\uparrow} and L_{\uparrow} of Figure 1. **First**, the left-most part of Figure 1 shows populations with $|A| = 1$, a very hospitable environment for inauthentic activity. Here, each of B_{\uparrow} , D_{\uparrow} and L_{\uparrow} exhibit a MCS of 75%. This is an artifact of how their behavior interacts with the sampling frequency for p_1 . For B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} , the MCS of 75% follows as Figure 1 is filtered for $p_2 = p_3 = 1$, and only contains rounds where both always upvote. As $p_1 = 75\%$, they are thus correct 75% of the time. Though not all L_{\uparrow} always upvote in these rounds, they do so individually with a 96.5% chance (assuming average $C_a(p_1) = 0.8$). As a group, they thus sway the majority vote to 1 with high probability, again correct with 75%. **Second**, B_{\uparrow} , D_{\uparrow} and L_{\uparrow} each exhibit




Figure 1: Baseline MCS of \mathcal{P} with $|A| = 1, 3, 5, 10, 25, 50, \dots$, for $p_2 = p_3 = 1$. Colored: populations with single inauthentic type in low noise. L/M/H: populations with multiple inauthentic types $\mathcal{P} = \{B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$, with $|B_i| = |D_i| = |L_i| = 100$ in low (L), mid (M), high (H) noise. Find MCS of $\mathcal{P}_{A11}, \mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}, \mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}, \mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$ at $|A| = 100$.

their maximal lowering effect on the MCS while $|A| = 100$. This is a motivating factor in focusing on populations with $|A| = 100$, the MCSs of which we return to in Table 2. **Third**, for $|A| > 100$, B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} negatively influence the MCS identically, as both upvote in the shown rounds, with their effect declining from a MCS of 75% at $|A| = 125$ to an MCS of 100% by $|A| = 225$. For $|A| > 100$, to form an incorrect majority, inauthentic agents must be ‘aided’ by authentic agents that happen to vote incorrectly. The probability that enough such exist to overcome the correctly voting authentic agents drops as $|A|$ grows. With $|A| \geq 225$, B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} are seen to have lost all effect. L_{\uparrow} have a less robust effect, as they vote in an uncoordinated fashion, and are thus more quickly outnumbered by authentic agents’ votes.

Finally, the effect of the 900 inauthentic agents jointly drops with higher noise levels, i.e., with decreased activity. In the high activity case (low noise), the 900 inauthentic agents seem ‘overwhelmed’ already by between 325 and 475 authentic agents. This is correct on the aggregate level, but 900 inauthentic agents do not equate 900 inauthentic actions: given the filter, some types act authentically always (B_{\downarrow}) or sometimes ($D_{\downarrow}, D_{\updownarrow}, L_{\downarrow}, L_{\updownarrow}$). Additionally, some types partially cancel each other (e.g., D_{\uparrow} and L_{\downarrow}) or even themselves (e.g., D_{\updownarrow}) out.

Figure 2 shows MCS summary plots of all inauthentic agent types in isolation and jointly, as a function of $|A|$, not filtered for properties. As noise increases, the figure evinces how inauthentic agents’ impact on MCS decreases. Note how in low noise, agent types $D_{\updownarrow}, D_{\uparrow}, L_{\updownarrow}$, and L_{\uparrow} are more effective than B_i for each $i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}$ in lowering the MCS as the former agent types directly counteract correct majority voting concerning quality (p_1). The picture flips in the high noise level given how p_1, p_2 , and p_3 are sampled (Sec. 2.4).

3 Classification

Our jury selection procedures (GMM and KM JSPs) classify the set of agents into two agent groups: authentic and inauthentic. Each jury selection procedure invokes a classifier method that decomposes the ABM data into singular values (SVD), applies a clustering strategy—either a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) or the k -means algorithm (KM)—and




Figure 2: Baseline MCS of \mathcal{P} with $|A| = 1, 3, 5, 10, 25, 50, \dots$ for low (left), mid (mid), high (right) noise and all agent types. L/M/H: $\mathcal{P} = \{B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \updownarrow\}}$, $|B_i| = |D_i| = |L_i| = 100$ in low (L), mid (M), high (H) noise. Find MCS of $\mathcal{P}_{A11}, \mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}, \mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}, \mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$ at $|A| = 100$.




Figure 3: Exemplary, representative scatterplot of $U_q D_q$ for $n = 1000$ for \mathcal{P}_{A11} and $r = 500$, in low (left), mid (mid), high (right) noise.

labels agents using logistic regression on the quality property p_1 of the post voted on.

We assume p_1 known, as we know of the general setting: the agents vote on quality. We do not assume knowledge of p_2 and p_3 , or even of their existence. The input dataset consists of binary votes of n agents over a given number of voting rounds r , where $r > n$ is not a requirement regarding the machinery. Yet the more observations r , the better we cluster. Data requirements are thus feasible, in contrast to the χ^2 test suggested by Galeazzi, Rendsvig, and Slavkovik (2019) that requires p_1 known plus at least 1 observation for each of the 2^n possible voting round outcomes.

For each ABM run, the classification analysis is performed on five resampled (with replacement) datasets with $r = 500$ and n either 1000 for \mathcal{P}_{A11} or 200 for $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}, \mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$. For each of the bootstrapped datasets, we calculate the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{V}^T$ of the $n \times n$ sample correlation matrix \mathbf{X} of the vote data. For clustering, we consider the first $q = 2$ dimensions’ eigenvectors, i.e., the first two columns of the $n \times p$ orthogonal matrix \mathbf{U} where $n = p$, weighted with the corresponding eigenvalue collected in the diagonal $p \times p$ matrix \mathbf{D} . Hence, we cluster on the q partial components $U_q D_q$ (Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009). Figure 3 shows the scatterplots of $U_q D_q$, illustrating more blurred clustering

environments as the noise level increases from low to high.

We contrast the probabilistic Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) and the deterministic k -means (KM) algorithm for clustering the components. The soft clustering GMM is more memory-intensive, while the hard clustering KM algorithm is faster. We choose GMM and k -means as they are among the simplest, most well-known, and most efficiently implementable unsupervised clustering methods (Hastie, Tibshirani, and Friedman 2009). Both cluster the weighted eigenvectors into k groups, $k = 2, \dots, 20$ (in testing, 20 proved sufficient as upper bound). In the GMM, k is chosen by maximizing the log-likelihood according to the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). The BIC penalizes the number of parameters more heavily than Akaike's Information Criterion, aiming for a model fit with fewer parameters to avoid overfitting (Scrucca et al. 2016). In the KM algorithm, k is estimated with the gap statistic, which compares the change in the within-cluster dispersion with that under a reference null distribution (Tibshirani, Walther, and Hastie 2001).

Having clustered the data into k groups, the mean vote per voting round of those agents clustered together—i.e., the row sums of k subsets of the vote data, viz. k $r \times 1$ vectors—are used in a logistic regression model with the two-level factor p_1 as the response variable. Put differently, the k coefficients refer to the clusters' mean vote per voting round given the quality of posts. To select those clusters comprising inauthentic agents, we add the lasso penalty term to the optimization, $\sum_{j=1}^k \|\beta_j\|_1$ with k predictor variables (clusters), as implemented in the R package `glmnet` (Friedman, Hastie, and Tibshirani 2010). Coefficients consequently shrunk to 0 when regressing on p_1 receive the label 'inauthentic'. Coefficients *not* shrunk to 0 receive the label 'authentic'. Lasso regularization was chosen over the ridge regularization as the former shrinks coefficients to 0 and thereby imposes sparseness. In contrast, the ridge penalty never fully removes variables. Coefficients shrunk to 0 accordingly do not play an important role when regressing on p_1 and therefore receive the label 'inauthentic'. These labels are then forwarded to the agents found in each cluster.

Note that logistic regression is applied in a non-standard way. In this paper, the goal of the logistic regression is *not* to predict each vote per voting round into the categorical dependent variable p_1 , in contrast to classical approaches where the dependent variable describes the classes in which one is interested. We seek to classify each agent as inauthentic or authentic which we do via hard classification through shrinking components to 0 and an additional labeling step. This makes traditional classifier metrics like a receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC curve) and a corresponding area under the curve score (AUC score) inapplicable. Instead, Sec. 3.1 discusses false positive and false negative classification errors to transparently and separately assess the two desiderata vox populi and precaution.

Once the classification analysis is completed on all 5 bootstrapped datasets, each agent has been classified as either 'authentic' or 'inauthentic' 5 times. Only if an agent received the 'authentic' label at least 4 out of 5 times, the over-




Figure 4: GMM (blue) and KM (orange) mean misclassification and standard deviation in \mathcal{P}_{A11} in low (L), mid (M), and high (H) noise.

all 'authentic' label will be granted. Else, the agent is over-all classified as 'inauthentic'. The $4/5$ classification threshold was fixed pragmatically to balance runtime efficiency and precaution against inauthentic influence. Simple majority would exhibit less precaution and more vox populi, while a $19/20$ classification threshold (95%) would heavily increase runtime. We discuss this modeling choice further in the final remarks (Sec. 5.2).

3.1 Classification Results

In order to evaluate the GMM and KM classifier methods, we first inspect the misclassification results for \mathcal{P}_{A11} for $r = 500$, second comment on selected robustness observations, and third examine classifier accuracy for smaller sub-populations \mathcal{P}_{B+} , \mathcal{P}_{D+} , and \mathcal{P}_{L+} for $r = 500$.

First, in population \mathcal{P}_{A11} , GMM classifies well in the low (mid) noise case, accurately misclassifying only 4% (11%) of authentic agents as inauthentic, and 3% (4%) of inauthentic agents as authentic (Table 1), exhibiting both vox populi and precaution. As expected, classifier accuracy reduces in the high noise case given that inauthentic agents hide and mimic authentic behavior, i.e., often vote authentically and are accordingly difficult to detect. However, here the inauthentic agents' impact on majority correctness scores is limited (Figure 2) despite a 35% false negative error. Indeed, as Figure 2 suggests, it is B_- and B_+ agents that negatively affect the MCS to the largest extent in the high noise case, and both GMM and KM identify these agent groups accurately as inauthentic (Figure 4). Moreover, classification results in Figure 4 and Table 1 show how GMM outperforms KM in all noise levels with regard to identifying inauthentic agents, exhibiting less false negative misclassification. Thus, GMM overall clusters more precautiously than KM.

Second, robustness checks given \mathcal{P}_{A11} show differences between GMM and KM. Results based on fewer observations ($r = 250$ instead of $r = 500$) affect false negative errors less for GMM, but notably for KM. E.g., GMM still does not misclassify any booster or distorter agents, while KM's false negative errors ($\frac{\text{Mean}}{\text{SD}}$) rise in low noise as follows

		B_+		B_-		B_+		D_+		D_-		D_+	
r		500	250	500	250	500	250	500	250	500	250	500	250
KM		.44	.56	.39	.52	.37	.51	.54	.68	.39	.52	.24	.34
		(.41)	(.43)	(.5)	(.5)	(.48)	(.5)	(.44)	(.4)	(.5)	(.5)	(.36)	(.41)

with similar trends observable in mid and high noise. Based on more observations ($r = 750$ ($r = 1000$) instead of

		LOW				MID				HIGH			
GMM	Authentic	All	B \uparrow	D \uparrow	L \uparrow	All	B \uparrow	D \uparrow	L \uparrow	All	B \uparrow	D \uparrow	L \uparrow
	Inauthentic	.04 (.04)	—	—	.03 (.05)	.11 (.13)	—	.00 (.008)	.04 (.03)	.5 (.26)	.01 (.02)	.01 (.02)	.09 (.06)
KM	Authentic	.2 (.4)	—	—	.002 (.006)	.07 (.17)	.01 (.03)	.00 (.01)	.016 (.016)	.31 (.29)	.03 (.004)	.05 (.07)	.01 (.03)
	Inauthentic	.43 (.28)	.13 (.00)	.05 (.06)	.00 (.001)	.48 (.12)	.13 (.003)	.05 (.06)	.06 (.11)	.56 (.16)	.13 (.01)	.44 (.41)	.97 (.07)

Table 1: GMM and KM mean misclassification and standard deviation ($\frac{\text{Mean}}{\text{SD}}$; ‘—’ is short for $\frac{.00}{.00}$) of authentic (G) and inauthentic (N) agents in populations \mathcal{P}_{All} , $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$, for each noise level. E.g., for low noise in $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$, GMM perfectly classifies, while KM misclassifies no authentic agents, but 5% inauthentic agents (SD = 6%).

$r = 500$), both GMM and KM classify all inauthentic agent types but $L\uparrow$ more precautiously in difficult high noise environments. Misclassification in high noise for the main inauthentic agent types improve thusly:

r	B \uparrow			D \uparrow			L \uparrow		
	500	750	1000	500	750	1000	500	750	1000
GMM	.19 (.32)	.09 (.2)	.11 (.24)	.47 (.24)	.29 (.19)	.25 (.16)	.54 (.22)	.36 (.2)	.33 (.17)
KM	.7 (.34)	.5 (.39)	.49 (.38)	.69 (.25)	.46 (.26)	.43 (.28)	.73 (.23)	.53 (.24)	.51 (.25)

However, in the same case, false positive errors increase: authentic agent misclassification worsens from $\frac{.5}{.26}$ to $\frac{.67}{.24}$ ($\frac{.73}{.19}$) for GMM, and from $\frac{.3}{.29}$ to $\frac{.48}{.3}$ ($\frac{.54}{.32}$) for KM. In contrast to GMM, KM demonstrates robustness shortcomings as its classification accuracy notably improves with increased $|A| = 1000$. This difference is pronounced in false positive errors in low (mid) noise levels for $r = 500$: KM improves from mean misclassification $\frac{.2}{.4}$ to $\frac{.00}{.00}$ ($\frac{.07}{.17}$ to $\frac{.01}{.01}$), while GMM misclassification changes from $\frac{.04}{.04}$ to $\frac{.1}{.06}$ ($\frac{.11}{.13}$ to $\frac{.07}{.07}$). Neither notably improves false positive errors in the high noise case, but the misclassification exhibits lower SD (KM: $\frac{.3}{.29}$ to $\frac{.31}{.15}$, GMM: $\frac{.5}{.26}$ to $\frac{.47}{.16}$). Full robustness results can be produced with the Supplementary Material.

Third, in small sub-populations $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$, we accurately classify inauthentic agents as such without significant costs of false positive errors: GMM weakly outperforms KM throughout (it does at least as good everywhere, and sometimes strictly better), and strictly outperforms KM in the high noise case (it does strictly better everywhere), cf. Table 1. In $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$, both perform well in low and mid noise cases, however, fail to accurately distinguish between A and $L\uparrow$ in the high noise case, causing large false negative errors. Yet again, $L\uparrow$ agents do not have a robust effect in watering down MCSS (Figure 1), given their uncoordinated and camouflaging behavior.

4 Jury Selection and Majority Correctness

The GMM and KM classifications of agents as authentic or inauthentic directly provide *jury selection procedures* (JSPs): select the largest jury that includes only agents classified as authentic. This defines the GMM and KM JSPs.

Evaluation Conditions To evaluate the GMM and KM JSPs, we compare the majority correctness scores of the juries they select from \mathcal{P}_{All} , $\mathcal{P}_{B\uparrow}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D\uparrow}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{L\uparrow}$ with $r =$

500. The low number of authentic agents and rounds result in more diffuse clustering environments and situations in which inauthentic agents have strong negative effects on MCSS (cf. Sec. 2.5).

Expected Juries For each JSP, population, and noise level, we produce 3 expected juries—the average, best and worst cases—based on mean misclassification scores and standard deviations. Let $\mathcal{P} : A \rightarrow \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}$ be a population. Assume that for each agent type $X \in \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}$, we have a misclassification score δ_X . As a JSP removes agents classified as inauthentic, the selected jury will contain $(1 - \delta_X)|A|$ authentic agents and $\delta_X|Y|$ inauthentic agents, for each inauthentic agent type $Y \in \{B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}$. As specific agent identity does not matter for behavior and thus for MCSS, it is not important exactly *which* agents of each type are removed, only the percentage is important. We implemented selecting agents as juries as follows:

For each agent type $X \in \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}$, let X^{-1} denote the agents of that type, i.e., $\mathcal{P}^{-1}(X) \subseteq A$. Enumerate each such X^{-1} so that $X^{-1} = \{x_1, \dots, x_{|X^{-1}|}\}$. Let δ_X represent a misclassification score, and let $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ be the floor function which rounds down to closest integer. Given this, we define the agents of type X to *keep* in the jury to be

$$X(\delta_X) = \{x_k \in X^{-1} : k \leq \min(\lfloor |X^{-1}| \cdot \delta_X \rfloor, |X^{-1}|\}\}.$$

I.e., $X(\delta_X)$ contains the first $(1 - \delta_X)$ percent (rounded down to closest integer) of X^{-1} . The min operation is needed as δ_X may exceed 1 if standard deviation is added.

To obtain the average, best and worst case expected juries, we either directly use δ_X equal to the mean misclassification score M_X of X , or add or deduct two standard deviations. I.e., we use $\delta_X = M_X$ for the average, $\delta_X = \max(0, M_X - 2\sigma_X)$ for the best, and $\delta_X = \min(M_X + 2\sigma_X, 1)$ for the worst case jury. The average [best / worst] expected jury of \mathcal{P} is then the set of agents

$$G(1 - \delta_G) \cup \bigcup_{Y \in \{A_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}} Y(\delta_Y)$$

with $\delta_X = M_X$ [$\delta_X = \max(0, M_X - 2\sigma_X)$ / $\delta_X = \min(M_X + 2\sigma_X, 1)$] for each $X \in \{A, B_i, D_i, L_i\}_{i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow, \uparrow\}}$.

I.e., the average expected jury contains the mean percentage of authentic agents classified as authentic plus the mean percentage of each inauthentic type misclassified as authentic. The best and worst cases are similar, just factoring in standard deviation.

	FILTER: NONE			FILTER: $p_2=p_3=1$			FILTER: NONE			FILTER: $p_2=p_3=1$		
	B_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM	B_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM	D_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM	D_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM
	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W
LOW	81.11 (1.99)	---	---	74.83 (2.75)	---	---	77.43 (2.18)	---	---	74.83 (2.75)	---	---
MID	87.50 (1.39)	---	---	75.41 (3.8)	---	---	87.62 (1.6)	---	---	75.41 (3.8)	---	---
HIGH	97.58 (.73)	---	---	77.17 (21.54)	---	---	97.59 (.73)	---	---	77.17 (21.54)	---	---
	L_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM	L_{\uparrow}	GMM	KM	All	GMM	KM	All	GMM	KM
	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W	Base	B A W	B A W
LOW	74.94 (2.25)	---	---	74.93 (2.77)	---	---	66.21 (2.18)	92.41 (1.27)	---	82.19 (1.98)	64.21 (2.27)	74.83 (2.75)
MID	99.98 (.07)	---	---	99.99 (.07)	---	---	75.12 (2.08)	---	100.00 (.02)	97.07 (.77)	92.99 (1.1)	75.41 (3.8)
HIGH	---	---	---	---	---	---	98.37 (.45)	99.90 (.14)	---	99.95 (.1)	94.18 (11.34)	91.02 (12.79)

Table 2: Mean MCS and standard deviation ($\text{Mean}_{(\text{SD})}$; ‘-’ is short for $\frac{100.00}{(0.00)}$) for populations $\mathcal{P}_{B_{\uparrow}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D_{\uparrow}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{L_{\uparrow}}$ and \mathcal{P}_{All} in their baseline form (Base) and in the best (B), average (A) and worst (W) cases for each of the GMM and KM JSPs, for $r = 500$ either unfiltered or filtered so B_{\uparrow} and D_{\uparrow} are active ($p_2 = p_3 = 1$). Each of the 8 sub-tables (with tinted upper left corner for population subscript) allows *i*) comparisons of a population’s MCS with those of the JSPs’ best, average and worst case juries, and *ii*) comparisons of the MCSs of the two KM and GMM JSPs.

Jury Results Table 2 summarizes GMM and KM JSP’s mean majority correctness scores and SD for populations $\mathcal{P}_{B_{\uparrow}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{D_{\uparrow}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{L_{\uparrow}}$ and \mathcal{P}_{All} in key conditions. In $\mathcal{P}_{B_{\uparrow}}$, KM and GMM JSPs result in MCSs that clearly show how removing agents classified as inauthentic from the baseline jury suffices to yield perfect MCSs, despite 13% misclassification among inauthentic agents by both KM and GMM (Table 1). Similar observations hold for $\mathcal{P}_{D_{\uparrow}}$, where the GMM JSP achieves maximum MCS. The setback in the KM high noise case is explained by difficulties in distinguishing authentic from inauthentic agents: The non-precautious misclassification of inauthentic agents as authentic forecloses the jury to achieve a higher MCS when the inauthentic agents are activated. For GMM and KM JSPs in $\mathcal{P}_{L_{\uparrow}}$, we might expect lower MCSs given rather substantial misclassification numbers in the high noise case (Table 1). Yet, we observe perfect MCSs, explained by the non-coordinated way that L_{\uparrow} act inauthentically. Hence, difficulties classifying this subgroup for both classifiers are mitigated by its limited effect on lowering MCSs. Note how $\mathcal{P}_{L_{\uparrow}}$ is unaffected by the filter in Table 1: L_{\uparrow} agents act on their individual beliefs about quality, i.e., they act uncoordinated on their personal property, which cannot be filtered for per voting round without changing the population size.

Assessing JSPs given \mathcal{P}_{All} , we show the MCSs achieved through the GMM method strictly dominate those from KM in low and mid noise cases, both in terms of mean value and SD. Moreover, the GMM JSP strictly outperforms baseline juries in all noise cases when looking at average and best juries. Merely in high noise, worst case, we observe that neither the GMM nor the KM JSP outperforms the baseline jury.

5 Concluding Remarks

Influence or information operations such as coordinated inauthentic behavior (CIB), e.g. performed by attention hacking bots, shape public opinion by elevating or suppressing topics through coordinatedly up- or downvoting social media posts, mimicking authentic behavior to avoid detection,

nullifying online voting judgments’ reliability. To restore wisdom-of-crowds effects, this paper designed two accurate and feasible *jury selection procedures* (JSPs) that discard agents classified as inauthentic from the voting jury.

Comparing the GMM and KM JSPs, the main difference is accuracy: The GMM JSP detects more inauthentic agents, exhibiting smaller false negative errors and hence more precaution. Both JSPs select juries with vastly increased *majority correctness scores* (MCSs), with preponderantly better scores for the GMM JSP. Overall, the application of either almost fully restores wisdom-of-crowds effects, despite the presence of inauthentic agents. In the low and mid noise cases, inauthentic agents strongly affect the baseline MCSs negatively, but both JSPs successfully eliminate this effect. Only in populations with a high degree of hiding (i.e., high noise, where inauthentic agents act mainly authentically), the JSPs do not significantly increase MCSs. However, in these cases the inauthentic agents also exhibit negligible negative effects on MCSs.

The latter highlights a trade-off for inauthentic attention hacking behavior: attention hackers must balance their accounts’ activity to, on the one hand, hide their true identity by acting authentically, and, on the other, act in a coordinated manner to sway the majority vote. We believe this may be exploited in designing attention hack resistant social media vote systems. Employing JSPs means inauthentic actors must hide more often, raising the cost of influence for the attention hackers that handle them. Further, JSPs could be combined with a user reputation system that only publicly displays a user’s vote if the user has logged enough (ignored) votes. Beyond raising bot startup costs, this may provide early data for JSPs.

We round off with a discussion of ethical considerations, model assumptions, and data collection.

5.1 Ethical Considerations

Any suppression of information in public fora raises ethical concerns about censorship. The suppression of reactions to

social media posts is no different. Generally, we find that the suppression of coordinated inauthentic behavior as used by attention hackers is defensible, justified by the aim to combat misinformation online. We omit further discussion of this point. However, in applying automated techniques based on classification, there is always a risk that misclassification occurs. If the classification is used for censorship—as is the case here—misclassification may then lead to unrightful censorship.

The JSPs risk unjustified censorship on two points: the unrightful censorship of individuals due to behavioral correlation with inauthentic agents, and the unrightful censorship of groups due to an authentic disagreement with the notion of quality assumed by JSP deployers.

Concerning individuals, then we designed the JSPs with a focus on the two stated desiderata *vox populi* (to minimize false positive errors, i.e., to preserve as many authentic agents as possible) and *precaution* (to minimize false negative errors, i.e., to eliminate as many inauthentic agents as possible). *Vox populi* implies a desire to not unrightfully censor individuals, but is opposed by *precaution*: the most precautionous model censors all, while the model that preserves most voices censors none. Given our ABM and its parameters, employing *ends-justify-the-means* reasoning, and taking the correct evaluation of posts’ quality to be the primary end, we find it worth compromising *vox populi* over deprioritizing *precaution*: as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, deprioritizing *precaution* quickly threaten the wisdom-of-crowds effect as few inauthentic agents in the jury drastically lower the majority correctness score, while compromising with *vox populi* by allowing small fractions of authentic agents to be labelled as inauthentic is—with respect to MCS—absorbed by the wisdom of crowds exhibited by even a small jury of only authentic agents.

In the classification, the balance between *vox populi* and *precaution* is controlled by the classification threshold. As classification threshold, we precautionously chose that agents should be labelled authentic 4 of 5 times to be classified as authentic. This choice did not cause tremendous collateral damage to *vox populi*. While we deem especially the GMM JSP a precautionous method, it still exhibits low ($< .11$) false positive misclassification errors throughout, except for \mathcal{P}_{A11} in high noise. The KM JSP, similarly shows low false positive errors ($< .1$) except for \mathcal{P}_{A11} in low and high noise (cf. Table 1). The approach remains flexible to emphasizing *vox populi* further by lowering the $4/5$ classification threshold.

Concerning group censorship, it is relevant that our approach assumes an agreed-upon notion of *truth about the quality of posts* for which a commonly acknowledged arbiter exists. This is a fundamental premise of our method: if no such notion exists, majority correctness scores lose their meaning and the assumptions of the classifiers are unmet. Such a notion of quality is of paramount importance in relation to fake news, where, arguably, “objective” quality exists, embodied e.g. by the Principles of Journalism. However, the criteria for what constitutes quality may lead to marginalization of groups. E.g., sympathizers of Alex Jones and InfoWars might be marginalized by censorship if quality is equated with adhering to the Principles of Journalism, or

sympathizers of the black feminist Combahee River Collective may be marginalized if quality is equated with adhering to ideals of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People of the 1970s. Therefore, the notion of quality used in applications should be carefully defined, and preferably made open to the public e.g. by inclusion in community standards or terms and conditions of social media platforms.

Due to the risk of unrightful censorship, we would always suggest that users are made aware of censorship decisions that concern them and are given the option to appeal. This, of course, also allows accounts used in IOs to appeal, but appeal adds a non-trivial maintenance cost to e.g. large bot collectives.

5.2 Assumptions of the ABM and Classification

While our contribution hopefully serves as a proof of concept for jury selection procedures as a tool to counter reaction-oriented CIB-based IOs, the simulated environment is not in a one-to-one correspondence with the plethora of environments found on social media platforms. We discuss how modeling choices relate to social media platforms and how assumptions may be relaxed, first concerning the ABM, then the classification.

On social media platforms, it is likely that human users at times vote inauthentically to a low degree that should not be penalized by censorship. Such inauthentic voting violates the ABM’s assumptions about authentic agents who vote given only their competence-based beliefs. Our classification results indicate, however, that the authenticity assumption may be relaxed. *Lone wolfs* in the high noise case behave *almost* authentically, and may be interpreted as generally, but not fully, authentic, uncoordinated users. These agents are further—by the GMM JSP—often *misclassified* as authentic in high noise (cf. L sections of Figure 4 and Table 1), but correctly classified for low and mid noise, which indicates that the GMM method may be tuned to tolerate a degree of uncoordinated, inauthentic behavior.

Further, on social media, vote participation is not complete: most users do not react to most posts. For simplicity, we have not included abstaining as an option in the ABM, but all steps including MCS calculation and jury selection would be unaffected. As we return to below, also the classification can accommodate for a less complete vote participation.

Concerning classification, disciplines not directly related to social media applications and misinformation research show how dimensionality reduction and SVD procedures can be applied to empirical data to disclose coordinated voting groups and patterns: US Congress roll call votes have been clustered based on scores similar to the weighted eigenvectors used in this paper (Yang et al. 2020b; Porter et al. 2005; Sirovich 2003; Poole 2000). SVD Scatterplots of votes as suggested by Porter et al. (2005), for instance, provide proxies for party stance. While Yang et al. (2020b) explore roll call vote data only 1-dimensionally, we expand the application and cluster on 2 partial components; both their and our applications can be generalized to more dimensions to increase precision in less exposing vote environments. Moving towards social media applications, this can

become relevant for votes with not only binary but several options from which to choose, such as vote data reflecting Facebook’s 6 reactions.

We rely on unsupervised methods that disclose coordination that go unnoticed by supervised methods that take only features of individual accounts into consideration (Khaund et al. 2022; Orabi et al. 2020; Grimme, Assenmacher, and Adam 2018; Cresci et al. 2017). We add a single supervised learning element—logistic regression—to apply labels to agent clusters found by the unsupervised steps. In the logistic regression, we have used that authentic votes correlate with post quality (possibly allowing for noise in observing quality). Other subjective assumptions could be used to steer labeling while producing equally efficient jury selection procedures.

Besides limiting supervision, the input data needs of the GMM and KM jury selection procedures are vastly more feasible than Galeazzi, Rendsvig, and Slavkovik (2019)’s: we rely on 500 observations, where the χ^2 test would require at least 2^{1000} for our population \mathcal{P}_{A11} . In empirical application, obtaining 500 votes of one user group may still be a challenge. A mitigating factor is that the proposed JSPs can accommodate for missing data, and, for validation, only the inauthentic agents need to be fixed over several voting rounds, while the authentic agents may vary, as these vote independently. Thus, we can lift the assumption that all agents are always presented with, and vote, on every post.

5.3 Empirical Validation and The Release of Reactions Data

Empirical data—in contrast to simulated data—to further validate jury selection procedures remains difficult to obtain (Bliss et al. 2020; Pasquetto, Swire-Thompson et al. 2020; Torres-Lugo et al. forthcoming 2022). Among the platforms that provide APIs for academic purposes, only Twitter releases user-IDs of (public) profiles that have clicked the like-button. However, while Twitter provides generous academic access to historical data for researchers, the platform does not allow to automatically scrape *comprehensive* lists of users that have liked, but only releases the user-IDs of the 100 *most recent* liking users of any single post. Additionally, lists of liking users may be requested at most 75 times per 15 minutes. For small-scale Twitter environments where posts receive few likes, these restrictions may be balanced by using a suitably timed algorithm. However, for large political hashtags like #MakeAmericaGreatAgain or #Brexit where CIB-based IOs may be feared to be in play, the current data restrictions make it practically impossible to obtain a complete picture of liking behavior.

The proof of concept for JSPs provided in this paper provides a direct use case for reactions data in the fight against online misinformation. The data is necessary to evaluate, tweak and deploy the suggested methods. The paper thus provides a direct argument for a more comprehensive release of and access to reactions data to researchers, e.g. under full anonymization and non-disclosure agreements or via open API access to publicly available data.

References

- Abokhodair, N.; Yoo, D.; and McDonald, D. W. 2015. Dissecting a social Botnet: Growth, content and influence in Twitter. *CSCW 2015 - Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, 839–851.
- Aggarwal, A.; and Kumaraguru, P. 2015. What they do in shadows: Twitter underground follower market. In *2015 13th Annual Conference on Privacy, Security and Trust (PST)*, 93–100. IEEE.
- Ahmed, F.; and Abulaish, M. 2013. A generic statistical approach for spam detection in Online Social Networks. *Computer Communications*, 36(10-11): 1120–1129.
- Angere, S. 2010. Knowledge in a social network. *Synthese*, 167–203.
- Beatson, O.; Gibson, R.; Cunill, M. C.; and Elliot, M. 2021. Automation on Twitter: Measuring the Effectiveness of Approaches to Bot Detection. *Social Science Computer Review*, 1–20.
- Bebensee, B.; Nazarov, N.; and Zhang, B.-T. 2021. Leveraging node neighborhoods and egograph topology for better bot detection in social graphs. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 11(1): 1–14.
- Beutel, A.; Xu, W.; Guruswami, V.; Palow, C.; and Faloutsos, C. 2013. Copycatch: Stopping group attacks by spotting lockstep behavior in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, 119–130.
- Bhadani, S.; Yamaya, S.; Flammini, A.; Menczer, F.; Ciampaglia, G. L.; and Nyhan, B. 2022. Political audience diversity and news reliability in algorithmic ranking. *Nature Human Behaviour*.
- Bliss, N.; Bradley, E.; Garland, J.; Menczer, F.; Ruston, S.; Starbird, K.; and Wiggins, C. 2020. An Agenda for Disinformation Research. Quadrennial paper, CRA Computing Community Consortium (CCC).
- Bradshaw, S.; and Howard, P. N. 2017. Troops, Trolls and Troublemakers: A Global Inventory of Organized Social Media Manipulation. *Computational Propaganda Research Project*, 2017(12): 1–37.
- Chavoshi, N.; Hamooni, H.; and Mueen, A. 2017. DeBot: Twitter Bot Detection via Warped Correlation. *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, ICDM*, 817–822.
- Chen, Z.; and Subramanian, D. 2018. An Unsupervised Approach to Detect Spam Campaigns that Use Botnets on Twitter.
- Condorcet, M. M. d. 1785. *Essai sur l’Application de l’Analyse à la Probabilité des Décisions Rendues à la Pluralité des Voix*. Paris.

- Cresci, S.; Di Pietro, R.; Petrocchi, M.; Spognardi, A.; and Tesconi, M. 2017. The Paradigm-Shift of Social Spambots: Evidence, Theories, and Tools for the Arms Race. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web companion*, 963–972.
- De Cristofaro, E.; Friedman, A.; Jourjon, G.; Kaafar, M. A.; and Shafiq, M. Z. 2014. Paying for likes? Understanding Facebook Like Fraud Using Honeypots. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Internet Measurement Conference*, 129–136.
- Friedman, J.; Hastie, T.; and Tibshirani, R. 2010. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33(1): 1–22.
- Galeazzi, P.; Rendsvig, R. K.; and Slavkovik, M. 2019. Improving Judgment Reliability in Social Networks via Jury Theorems. In Blackburn, P.; Lorini, E.; and Guo, M., eds., *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction (LORI 2019)*, volume 11813 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 230–243. Springer.
- Giglietto, F.; Righetti, N.; Rossi, L.; and Marino, G. 2020a. Coordinated Link Sharing Behavior as a Signal to Surface Sources of Problematic Information on Facebook. *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 85–91.
- Giglietto, F.; Righetti, N.; Rossi, L.; and Marino, G. 2020b. It takes a village to manipulate the media: coordinated link sharing behavior during 2018 and 2019 Italian elections. *Information Communication and Society*, 23(6): 867–891.
- Goerzen, M.; and Matthews, J. 2019. Black hat trolling, white hat trolling, and hacking the attention landscape. *The Web Conference 2019 – Companion of the World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2019*, 2: 523–528.
- Grimme, C.; Assenmacher, D.; and Adam, L. 2018. Changing Perspectives: Is It Sufficient to Detect Social Bots? In Meiselwitz, G., ed., *Social Computing and Social Media. User Experience and Behavior*, 445–461. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Hastie, T.; Tibshirani, R.; and Friedman, J. 2009. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction*. Springer, 2nd edition.
- Ikram, M.; Onwuzurike, L.; Farooqi, S.; Cristofaro, E. D.; Friedman, A.; Jourjon, G.; Kaafar, M. A.; and Shafiq, M. Z. 2017. Measuring, Characterizing, and Detecting Facebook Like Farms. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)*, 20(4): 1–28.
- Khaund, T.; Kirdemir, B.; Agarwal, N.; Liu, H.; and Morstatter, F. 2022. Social Bots and Their Coordination During Online Campaigns: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 9(2): 530–545.
- Kirn, S. L.; and Hinders, M. K. 2022. Ridge count thresholding to uncover coordinated networks during onset of the Covid-19 pandemic. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 12.
- Lazer, D. M. J.; Baum, M. A.; Benkler, Y.; Berinsky, A. J.; Greenhill, K. M.; Menczer, F.; Metzger, M. J.; Nyhan, B.; Pennycook, G.; Rothschild, D.; Schudson, M.; Sloman, S. A.; Sunstein, C. R.; Thorson, E. A.; Watts, D. J.; and Zittrain, J. L. 2018. The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380): 1094–1096.
- Lorenz-Spreen, P.; Lewandowsky, S.; Sunstein, C. R.; and Hertwig, R. 2020. How behavioural sciences can promote truth, autonomy and democratic discourse online. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(11): 1102–1109.
- Magelinski, T.; Ng, L.; and Carley, K. 2022. Synchronized Action Framework for Detection of Coordination on Social Media. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety*, 1.
- Martini, F.; Samula, P.; Keller, T. R.; and Klinger, U. 2021. Bot, or not? Comparing three methods for detecting social bots in five political discourses. *Big Data and Society*, 8.
- Metaxas, P. T.; Mustafaraj, E.; Wong, K.; Zeng, L.; O’Keefe, M.; and Finn, S. 2015. What Do Retweets Indicate? Results from User Survey and Meta-Review of Research. *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Web and Social Media, ICWSM 2015*, 658–661.
- Nizzoli, L.; Tardelli, S.; Avvenuti, M.; Cresci, S.; and Tesconi, M. 2021. Coordinated Behavior on Social Media in 2019 UK General Election. In *Proc. International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, volume 15, 443–454.
- Olsson, E. J. 2013. A Bayesian Simulation Model of Group Deliberation and Polarization. In *Bayesian Argumentation*, 113–133. Springer.
- Orabi, M.; Mouheb, D.; Al Aghbari, Z.; and Kamel, I. 2020. Detection of Bots in Social Media: A Systematic Review. *Information Processing and Management*, 57.
- Pacheco, D.; Hui, P.-M.; Torres-Lugo, C.; Truong, B. T.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2021. Uncovering Coordinated Networks on Social Media: Methods and Case Studies. In *Proc. International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*, volume 15, 455–466.
- Pasquetto, I. V.; Swire-Thompson, B.; et al. 2020. Tackling misinformation: What researchers could do with social media data. *HKS Misinformation Review*, 1(8).
- Poole, K. T. 2000. Nonparametric Unfolding of Binary Choice Data. *Political Analysis*, 8(3): 211–237.
- Porter, M. A.; Mucha, P. J.; Newman, M. E.; and Warmbrand, C. M. 2005. A network analysis of committees in the U.S. House of Representatives. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102(20): 7057–7062.
- Ratkiewicz, J.; Meiss, M.; Conover, M.; Gonçalves, B.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2011. Detecting and Tracking Political Abuse in Social Media. *Proceedings of the Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 297.

- Ryczko, K.; Domurad, A.; Buhagiar, N.; and Tamblyn, I. 2017. Hashkat: large-scale simulations of online social networks. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 7(1): 1–13.
- Samper-Escalante, L. D.; Loyola-González, O.; Monroy, R.; and Medina-Pérez, M. A. 2021. Bot Datasets on Twitter: Analysis and Challenges. *Applied Sciences*, 11(9): 4105.
- Schoch, D.; Keller, F. B.; Stier, S.; and Yang, J. H. 2022. Coordination patterns reveal online political astroturfing across the world. *Scientific Reports*, 12.
- Scrucca, L.; Fop, M.; Murphy, T. B.; and Raftery, A. E. 2016. mclust 5: Clustering, Classification and Density Estimation using Gaussian Finite Mixture Models. *The R Journal*, 8(1): 289–317.
- Shao, C.; Ciampaglia, G. L.; Varol, O.; Yang, K. C.; Flammini, A.; and Menczer, F. 2018. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature Communications*, 9(1).
- Sirovich, L. 2003. A pattern analysis of the second Rehnquist U.S. Supreme Court. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(13): 7432–7437.
- 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.
- Suchacka, G. 2019. Improving Clustering Of Web Bot And Human Sessions By Applying Principal Component Analysis. *Communications of the ECMS*, 33(1).
- Suchacka, G.; and Iwański, J. 2020. Identifying legitimate Web users and bots with different traffic profiles – an Information Bottleneck approach. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 197: 1–18.
- Takacs, R.; and McCulloh, I. 2019. Dormant bots in social media: Twitter and the 2018 U.S. senate election. In *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining, ASONAM 2019*, 796–800.
- Tibshirani, R.; Walther, G.; and Hastie, T. 2001. Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 63(Part 2): 411–423.
- Torres-Lugo, C.; Pote, M.; Nwala, A.; and Menczer, F. forthcoming 2022. Manipulating Twitter Through Deletions. In *Proceedings of the 16th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media (ICWSM)*.
- Weber, D.; and Neumann, F. 2021. Amplifying influence through coordinated behaviour in social networks. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 11(1): 1–42.
- Wilensky, U. 1999. NetLogo. Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- 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: 48–61.
- Yang, K.-C.; Varol, O.; Hui, P.-M.; and Menczer, F. 2020a. Scalable and Generalizable Social Bot Detection through Data Selection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, 1096–1103.
- Yang, V. C.; Abrams, D. M.; Kernell, G.; and Motter, A. E. 2020b. Why Are U.S. Parties So Polarized? A "Satisficing" Dynamical Model. *SIAM Review*, 62(3): 646–657.