

Post-hoc Evaluation of Nodes Influence in Information Cascades: The Case of Coordinated Accounts

NICCOLÒ DI MARCO, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

SARA BRUNETTI, University of Siena, Italy

MATTEO CINELLI, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

WALTER QUATTROCIOCCI, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

In the last years, social media has gained an unprecedented amount of attention, playing a pivotal role in shaping the contemporary landscape of communication and connection. However, Coordinated Inauthentic Behaviour (CIB), defined as orchestrated efforts by entities to deceive or mislead users about their identity and intentions, has emerged as a tactic to exploit the online discourse. In this study, we quantify the efficacy of CIB tactics by defining a general framework for evaluating the influence of a subset of nodes in a directed tree. We design two algorithms that provide optimal and greedy post-hoc placement strategies that lead to maximising the configuration influence. We then consider cascades from information spreading on Twitter to compare the observed behaviour with our algorithms. The results show that, according to our model, coordinated accounts are quite inefficient in terms of their network influence, thus suggesting that they may play a less pivotal role than expected. Moreover, the causes of these poor results may be found in two separate aspects: a bad placement strategy and a scarcity of resources.

CCS Concepts: • **Networks** → *Network algorithms*; • **Applied computing**; • **Mathematics of computing** → *Trees*; **Graph algorithms**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Trees, Influence, Coordinated Inauthentic Behaviour

ACM Reference Format:

Niccolò Di Marco, Sara Brunetti, Matteo Cinelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2024. Post-hoc Evaluation of Nodes Influence in Information Cascades: The Case of Coordinated Accounts. 1, 1 (January 2024), 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Social media has transformed how we connect and share information, thus reshaping some of the mechanisms that we use for engaging with the world. Platforms that have been initially designed for entertainment, are increasingly becoming the principal environment in which opinions and views take form, determining a new tendency in information consumption [1–3].

However, this radical change came at the cost of a number of downsides such as online harassment, toxicity and hateful speech [4, 5], polarisation [6–10] and the spreading of misleading information [1, 11–17]. In this landscape, special attention has been posed to investigate the phenomenon of *Coordinated Inauthentic Behaviour* (CIB) which, according to Meta’s definition, is "the use of multiple Facebook or Instagram assets, working in concert to engage in inauthentic

Authors’ addresses: **Niccolò Di Marco**, niccolo.dimarco@uniroma1.it, Sapienza University of Rome, Viale Regina Elena 295, Roma, Italy; **Sara Brunetti**, sara.brunetti@unisi.it, University of Siena, Siena, Italy; **Matteo Cinelli**, matteo.cinelli@uniroma1.it, Sapienza University of Rome, Viale Regina Elena 295, Roma, Italy; **Walter Quattrociocchi**, walter.quattrociocchi@uniroma1.it, Sapienza University of Rome, Viale Regina Elena 295, Roma, Italy.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1

behaviour, where the use of fake accounts is central to the operation". More in detail, according to the platform's Community Standards (<https://transparency.fb.com/en-gb/policies/community-standards/inauthentic-behavior/>), the concept of *inauthentic behaviour* refers to people who "misrepresent themselves on Facebook, use fake accounts, artificially boost the popularity of content or engage in behaviours designed to enable other violations". Related to CIB researchers investigated the phenomenon of *Coordinated Behavior* (CB), which can be defined as an unexpected, suspicious, or exceptional similarity among users of a group [18].

Recent studies highlight that accounts displaying CIB, CB and social bots (i.e. software agents that communicate autonomously on social media and other platforms, having different uses and purposes [19–22]) may have played a role in relevant events [23] such as political elections [24–26], and in disseminating false information [27–31]. It follows that, beyond detection challenges [18, 32–34], one key reason to study such accounts relies on their potential to manipulate public opinion by swaying the narrative and influence the perceptions and views of a large audience [35].

In this work, we measure the influence of such potentially malicious accounts as the numerosity of the audience they interact with. In particular, we introduce a general framework that allow us to compare their influence with two different theoretical (post-hoc) models for coordinated accounts placement in information cascades:

- (1) first we consider an optimal model, in which we identify the number and disposition of coordinated accounts to ensure the maximal influence over the tree, without imposing any constraints on the number of coordinated accounts to be used;
- (2) second, we focus on a greedy strategy in which we have a fixed number of coordinated accounts to place to maximise the influence (i.e. limited capabilities case).

Notably, the algorithms provided can be extended to any other influence problem modelled using binary labels on trees. Using simulations on synthetic data, we show that, on average, it is possible to exert maximum influence using a limited number of coordinated accounts whose value highly depends on the height of the considered tree. Furthermore, the labelling that corresponds to the optimal placement results to be rare compared to the whole set of possible arrangements of node labels. As a case study, we compare the influence obtained by our models in a large dataset made of $\sim 50K$ Twitter cascades, built starting from 1.4M of tweets about the 2019 UK political elections [25].

Our results show that, according to our modelling, coordinated accounts exert a much lower influence than the one obtained using both the unconstrained algorithm and the greedy strategy. The reasons for this behaviour have to be searched in two distinct factors: a limited number of available resources (i.e. coordinated accounts) and a bad placement strategy. We conclude by noticing that, in general, the observed placement closely resembles a random placement rather than a specific strategy.

Despite the limitations of our post-hoc models, our results suggest that CB may exert a limited influence, contrary to what is expected.

2 DEFINITIONS

We consider a directed tree $T = (V, E)$ such that $|V| = n$. In particular, each node represents a user, while a directed edge indicates the direction of the flow of information among them. To distinguish between coordinated and non-coordinated users, we assign a binary label ℓ_v to each node, such that v belongs to the coordinated users if and only if $\ell_v = 1$. To keep us general, we say that v is a 1-node if $\ell_v = 1$ and a 0-node otherwise. We collect the labels in the vector ℓ .

We denote with $N(v)$ the out-neighbourhood of a node v (without v itself) and as $d(v)$ its out-degree. Moreover, we define $d_0^\ell(v) = \{w \in N(v) \mid \ell_w = 0\}$, i.e. the number of 0-nodes in the out-neighbourhood of v . A similar definition holds for $d_1^\ell(v)$.

Given a labelling ℓ , we denote the subset of 1-nodes in V by $V_1^\ell = \{v \in V \mid \ell_v = 1\}$, and its cardinality by $k_\ell = |V_1^\ell|$, i.e. the number of 1-nodes in V .

Finally, $p_\ell(w)$ is the binary variable indicating if the parent of w is a 1-node (i.e. it has a direct interaction with a coordinated account).

We define the *influence* of a configuration (T, ℓ) as

$$I_\ell(T) = \sum_{v \in V_1^\ell} d_0^\ell(v). \quad (1)$$

Equation (1) counts the number of non-coordinated users that are connected (i.e. share content) of a coordinated one. Therefore, it provides a measure of the impact that coordinates users exert on non-coordinated ones.

We are interested in defining an algorithm that searches the labelling (i.e. the disposition of coordinated accounts) that maximises (1). We denote the optimum influence among all the labelings by $I_\ell^*(T)$ and its labeling using the minimum number of coordinated accounts by $\ell^*(T)$. Accordingly, we denote as V_1^* and $k^*(T) = |V_1^*|$ the set of optimal 1-nodes and its cardinality. We highlight that, when the context is clear, we will omit ℓ and T from all the previous notations.

For example, consider the tree depicted in Figure 1. Among all the possible labels, the optimal one has $I^* = 6$ and $k^* = 2$. Indeed, even for any labelling of size $k = 3$, the influence reaches at most 6.




Fig. 1. Example of an optimal configuration. The coordinated accounts are highlighted in red.

Interestingly, it is possible to give some constraints over the possible values of I^* and k^* . In more detail, let T_n be the set of all directed trees with n vertices. Then, $\max\{I^*(T) : T \in T_n\} = n - 1$ and it is obtained for the configuration depicted in Figure 2 (a). Note that it corresponds also to the lower bound for k^* . On the other hand, $\min\{I^*(T) : T \in T_n\} = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and it is obtained for the configuration depicted in Figure 2 (b) which also provides the upper bound for k^* .

Therefore, for a general directed tree T on $n \geq 2$ vertices, the following inequalities hold:

$$\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \leq I^*(T) \leq n - 1, \quad (2)$$

procedure on the selected 49,331 tweets and their retweets the same number of information cascades was reconstructed. Details about the structure of such cascades are provided in Table 1.

Number of cascades	49331
Minimum number of nodes	1
Maximum number of nodes	9066
Minimum number of coordinated accounts	0
Maximum number of coordinated accounts	236

Table 1. Data breakdown of the cascades collected from Twitter.

3.2 Optimal placement of coordinated accounts without constraints on their number

In this section we design an algorithm that, starting from a directed tree T rooted at node r , provides $I^*(T)$ and $V_1^*(T)$. We highlight that, in this section, we are not imposing an upper bound to the number of 1-nodes, resembling a case of unlimited resource capability.

For a node v , let $MI(v)$ denote the value of the maximum influence in the subtree of T rooted at v , and V_1 denote the set of the coordinated accounts of T . Moreover, let $MIyes(v)$ and $MIino(v)$ be the values of the maximum influence of the subtree rooted in v that includes v in V_1 , and that excludes v from V_1 , respectively. Our aim is to compute $MI(r) = \max\{MIyes(r), MIino(r)\}$.

We give a recursive definition of $MIyes(r)$ and $MIino(r)$. The base cases are obtained when the height of the tree is zero or one. If the height is zero, it means that $V = \{r\}$ and $E = \emptyset$. In this case, $MIyes(r) = MIino(r) = 0$, and $MI(r) = MIino(r) = 0$ since the maximum influence is 0.

If the height is one and $V = \{r = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ then, without loss of generality, let $E = \{(v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_1, v_n)\}$ (i.e. T is the tree depicted in Figure 2a). Then, $MIyes(r) = \sum_{w \in N(r)} (MIino(w) + 1)$, since if $r \in V_1$ the maximum influence is equal to the sum of the children nodes not belonging to V_1 . In this case $MIino(w) = 0$ for all $w \in N(r)$ being leaves, and so we get

$$MI(r) = MIyes(r) = \sum_{w \in N(r)} 1 = d(r).$$

Suppose T has height more than one. The maximum influence is computed by considering the maximum influence of the subtrees rooted at the children of r . Let's denote the children of r by $w_1, \dots, w_{d(r)}$, and $T_1 \dots T_{d(r)}$ the subtrees rooted at each child of r . Then, the following recurrence relation describes how to obtain $MI(r)$:

$$MI(r) = \max \begin{cases} MIino(r) = \sum_{w \in N(r)} \max(MIyes(w), MIino(w)) \\ MIyes(r) = \sum_{w \in N(r)} \max(MIyes(w), MIino(w) + 1) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Indeed, if the maximum influence is obtained by $r \notin V_1$, then it is the sum of the values of the maximum influences for the subtrees rooted at its children. Otherwise, if it is obtained for $r \in V_1$, it is the sum of the values of the maximum influences for the subtrees rooted at its children and adding one for every child that is not a coordinated node.

We memoize the functions $MIyes$ and $MIino$ into the tree itself by defining two fields for each node v , that is $v.MIyes$ and $v.MIino$. The algorithm computes the label of each node $v.l$ by comparing $v.MIyes$ and $v.MIino$. Node v is included in V_1 if and only if $v.MIyes > v.MIino$ (i.e. if $d_0(v) > 0$).

The implementation uses a post-order tree traversal realised by one recursive call. We denote the label obtained by the algorithm as \bar{l} .

Algorithm 1 TreeMaxInfluence

Require: v
Ensure: $I^*(T_\theta), V_1^{\bar{\ell}}$

```

 $v.MIno \leftarrow 0$ 
 $v.MIyes \leftarrow 0$ 
if  $v$  is a leaf then
   $v.\ell \leftarrow 0$ 
  return  $v.MIno$ 
else
  for each child  $w$  of  $v$  do
     $treeMax \leftarrow TreeMaxInfluence(w)$ 
     $v.MIno \leftarrow v.MIno + treeMax$ 
    if  $treeMax = w.MIno$  then
      Increment count
    end if
  end for
   $v.MIyes \leftarrow v.MIno + count$ 
  if  $v.MIyes > v.MIno$  then
     $v.\ell \leftarrow 1$ 
    return  $v.MIyes$ 
  else
     $v.\ell \leftarrow 0$ 
    return  $v.MIno$ 
  end if
end if

```

$\triangleright v \notin V_1$
 \triangleright the Max Influence value is zero
 \triangleright It has at least one child
 \triangleright Compute the field MIno of v
 \triangleright Count the children $w \notin V_1$
 \triangleright Compute the field MIyes of v
 $\triangleright v \in V_1$
 \triangleright Return the Max Influence value
 $\triangleright v \notin V_1$
 \triangleright Return the Max Influence value

THEOREM 1. *TreeMaxInfluence(r) computes the optimal value of the influence of T in $O(|V|)$ time.*

PROOF. Suppose to start with an optimal labelling of each of the subtrees rooted at the children w_i of r , i.e. T_i , with $i = 1, \dots, d(r)$. If $r.MIyes \leq r.MIno$ then r is not inserted in V_1 and the configuration is optimal.

Otherwise, if $r.MIyes > r.MIno$, r is included into V_1 . If all the r -children are 0-nodes, $r.MIyes$ is the optimum. Suppose that $MI(r) > r.MIyes$, that is, it is not optimal and let ℓ be the computed labelling. Notice that since $r.MIyes > r.MIno$ and $r.MIyes = r.MIno + d_0(r)$, then $d_0(r) > 0$. Since $r.MIyes$ is not optimal, there are at least two nodes w_i, w_j such that $\ell(w_i) = 0$, and $\ell(w_j) = 1$. We have that $w_j.MIyes > w_j.MIno$, where $w_j.MIyes = w_j.MIno + d_0(w_j)$. Thus, $d_0(w_j) > 0$ which implies $w_j.MIyes - 1 \geq w_j.MIno$. To increase the influence in the tree rooted at r with $r \in V_1$, one more child should be added to the 0-nodes. Therefore let $\bar{\ell}$ be the new labelling that differ only for $\bar{\ell}(w_j) = 0$. This leads to a change of

$$\Delta(I) = 1 - w_j.MIno - w_j.MIyes = d_0(r) + 1 - d_0(r) + w_j.MIno - w_j.MIyes \quad (5)$$

since all the other terms cancel each others (they are unchanged in the two labellings). Moreover, by $w_j.MIyes - 1 \geq w_j.MIno$ follows that $\Delta(I) \leq 1 + w_j.MIyes - 1 - w_j.MIyes \leq 0$. This means that the influence cannot be increased, and hence it was maximal.

To conclude, since each node is visited once and some constant-time operations are applied in each case, the algorithm runs in $O(|V|)$ time. \square

Although Algorithm 1 returns the optimal value of the influence, it is possible that $|V_1^{\bar{\ell}}| \geq k^*$. To solve this problem and obtain I^* , we use Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 *clear1nodes***Require:** $T = (V, E), V_1^{\bar{\ell}}$ **Ensure:** A minimum 1-labelling ℓ^* **if** $d_0^{\bar{\ell}}(r) = 0$ and $d_0^{\bar{\ell}}(w_i) = 1$ for each $w_i \in N(r)$ **then** $r.\ell = 1$ $w_i.\ell = 0$ for $w_i \in N(r)$ **end if****for** each $v \in V_1^{\bar{\ell}}$ **do** **if** $d_0^{\bar{\ell}}(v) = p_{\bar{\ell}}(v)$ **then** $v.\ell \leftarrow 0$ $\triangleright v \notin V_1$ **end if****end for**

The correctness of the algorithm easily follows: if all the children of r are 1-nodes and their out-degree is 1, we can simply put r in the 1-nodes and remove all its children. This procedure reduces the number of used coordinated accounts without changing the influence. Moreover, since each node $v \in T$ has exactly one father (except for the root), the only case in which v does not contribute to the influence is when $d_0(v) = 1$ and its father is a 1-node. The algorithm runs in $O(k^*)$.

A visual example of the running of Algorithm 2 is depicted in Figure 3.




Fig. 3. (a) a directed tree and the label obtained trough Algorithm 1. The 1-nodes highlighted by the blue arrows can be removed. (b) After a run of Algorithm 2 the nodes are deleted and V_1^* is returned.

3.3 A greedy placement with constraints on the number of coordinated accounts

In this section we propose a greedy strategy to face the case in which we want to maximize I with a fixed number k of coordinated accounts.

We define the *switch*(v, w) operator that, starting from a labelling ℓ , provides a new labelling $\bar{\ell}$ that increase the obtained influence:

DEFINITION 1. Let ℓ be a labelling of nodes of a given directed tree T . Suppose $v \in V_1^{\ell}$ and $w \in V \setminus V_1^{\ell}$; the switching operator *switch*(v, w) exchanges the labels between v and w , i.e. it sets $\ell_v = 0$ and $\ell_w = 1$.

Thus, the operator provides a new labelling $\bar{\ell}$, where $V_1^{\bar{\ell}} = (V_1^{\ell} \setminus \{v\}) \cup \{w\}$.

Based on this idea, we apply the following strategy: we start by including sequentially that of the k nodes which contribute the most to the influence. Then, we try to increment the influence by applying *trySwitch*. When it is no longer possible to increase I using a call of *switch*, the algorithm stops.




Fig. 4. An example of how *switch* is applied.

To formally define the concept of increment, consider a node $v \in V_1^l$ and $w \in V \setminus V_1^l$. Switching $l(v)$ with $l(w)$ leads to an increment if

$$d_0^l(v) < \Delta(v, w) := d_0^{\bar{l}}(w) - p_{\bar{l}}(w) + p_{\bar{l}}(v), \quad (6)$$

where \bar{l} is the label resulting from *switch*(v, w).

The motivation is easily obtained: $d_0^{\bar{l}}(w)$ counts the number of 0-nodes in the out-neighbour of w . Moreover, when changing v with w it is possible to add 1 to the influence if the parent of v is a 1-node, i.e. $p_{\bar{l}}(v) = 1$. Similarly, we subtract 1 from the influence if the parent of w is a 1-node i.e. $p_{\bar{l}}(w) = 1$.

Summarizing, if (6) is satisfied, *switch*(v, w) assures that $I_{\bar{l}} > I_l$.

Algorithm 4 implements the pseudo-code of the greedy strategy.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Growth rate of I^* and k^*

In this section we are interested in determining the growth rate of I^* and k^* depending on the number of nodes (i.e. users) and on height of the tree. Although those values are bounded, as shown in (2)-(3), finding an explicit expression for them it's beyond the scope of this work.

To obtain an approximation we consider $N = 100$ random trees made up of $5 \leq n \leq 100$ nodes. We apply to each of them Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 to obtain I^* and k^* . Then, we average the results over the N graph realisations for each of the n values. We plot the results in Figure 5(a) and (b).

Interestingly, we observe in both cases a linear relation ($p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.99$) in which the slope is much lower than 1 (≈ 0.28) in the case of k^* while closer to the unity (≈ 0.6) in the case of I^* . This suggests that it is possible to reach the point of maximum influence using approximately $0.3 \cdot n$ coordinated accounts. Moreover, they are sufficient to exert a great influence on the tree (approximately $0.6 \cdot n$).

Algorithm 3 *trySwitch***Require:** $T = (V, E), \ell$ **Ensure:** $\tilde{\ell}$ $check = TRUE$ **while** $check$ **do**▷ Try to apply *switch* $check = FALSE$ **for** $v \in V_1^\ell$ **do****if** $d_0(v) < \max_{u \in V \setminus V_1^\ell} \Delta(v, u)$ **then**

▷ It is possible to increase the influence

 $check = TRUE$ $S = \{w \in V \setminus V_1^\ell \mid \Delta(v, w) = \max_{u \in V \setminus V_1^\ell} \Delta(v, u)\}$ choose randomly $u \in S$ $\ell = switch(v, u)$ **end if****end for****end while** $\tilde{\ell} = \ell$ **Algorithm 4** An heuristic for the optimal bot placement**Require:** $T = (V, E), \ell, k$ **Ensure:** an approximation $\tilde{\ell}$ of the optimal solution**for** $i = 1 : k$ **do**▷ Place the first k nodes $W = \{w \in V \setminus V_1^\ell \mid d_0(w) - p_\ell(w) = \max_{u \in V} (d_0(u) - p_\ell(u))\}$ Select randomly a node $v \in W$ $\ell(v) = 1$ **end for** $\tilde{\ell} = trySwitch(T, \ell)$

To evaluate the impact of the tree's height on I^* and k^* , we consider several random directed trees having a fixed number of nodes ($n = 50$), and height spanning between 1 and n . For each h , we generate $N = 100$ random trees having height h . Similarly to the previous case, we then average the results obtained by our algorithms, which are shown in Figure 5(c) and (d). As depicted, I^* drops dramatically as soon as the height increases, and starts to decrease more softly when $h \geq 10$. A symmetrical result holds for k^* . This suggests an expected result, i.e. for a fixed number of users in the conversation, information cascades in which the majority of the retweets are close to the original user (i.e. the associated tree has a low height) can be covered with fewer coordinated accounts, obtaining a greater impact.

However, the Figure also suggests that from a certain height threshold ($\approx 20 \cdot n$ in our simulation case) I^* starts to show greater stability with respect to the increase in the height of the tree.

Symmetrical results hold for k^* .

4.2 Phase diagram of the relative positions of node labels

In Section 3 we defined an algorithm that finds one of the optimal placements node labels. Interestingly, the same problem can be translated into finding an assignment of binary node metadata such that the number of (directed) edges between 1-nodes and 0-nodes is maximised [37].




Fig. 5. Upper row: relation between the number of nodes of a tree and (a) mean optimal influence (b) mean optimal number of bots. Bottom row: comparison between the height of the tree and (c) mean optimal influence and (d) mean optimal number of nodes. The two horizontal red lines show the maximum and minimum values of the measure, while the ribbon around the curves represents a standard deviation from the mean.

In such a framework, let's denote with m_{11} (m_{10}) the number of directed edges between 1 and 1 (0). To better understand how rare the optimal placement is when compared to the set of all the labellings, we computed the phase diagram relative to m_{11} and m_{10} [38].

More in detail, we generate a random directed tree of $n = 25$ nodes and compute its optimal influence, obtaining $I^* = 14, k^* = 7$. Then, we generated all the $\binom{25}{7}$ possible placements, storing for each of them the corresponding values of m_{11} and m_{10} . We show a $2d$ -histogram of the results in Figure 6.




Fig. 6. Phase diagram of possible values of (m_{10}, m_{11}) . The intersection of red (green) lines highlights (m_{10}, m_{11}) for the optimal (greedy) placement. The colours that fill the bins use a logarithmic scale.

We observe that both the optimal and greedy placements are located in low-frequency areas at the boundary of the diagrams, obtaining high values of m_{10} . This provides results related to the statistical significance of the obtained labellings and suggests that they are somewhat rare with respect to the whole sets of labels. In general, a placement without a specific strategy is less likely to obtain good results.

4.3 Results of the algorithm on real cascades

In this section we consider a dataset of Twitter’s cascades (modelled as directed trees) in which nodes are labelled as either coordinated or non-coordinated as explained in section 3.1. In each cascade, we aim to detect the influence exerted compared to the optimum placement provided by Algorithm 1. In particular, the *size* of a cascade is the number of its nodes (i.e. users).

For a given cascade c , we denote as $I(c)$ the influence obtained by them and as $k(c)$ the number of coordinated accounts acting in c . The optimal influence and number of coordinated accounts are denoted accordingly as $I^*(c)$ and $k^*(c)$.

For our analysis, we only consider cascades having at least 15 nodes and at least 1 coordinated account. Such a restriction allows us to consider more complex properties and structures at the cost of losing some of the data. After this procedure, we obtain 4119 trees to which we apply Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 to compute $I^*(c)$ and $k^*(c)$.

In each cascade we measure how close $I(c)$ is to $I^*(c)$ using

$$\rho(c) = \frac{I(c)}{I^*(c)}. \quad (7)$$

Note that $0 \leq \rho(c) \leq 1$, where a value close to one indicates that the influence obtained by the detected coordinated accounts is close to the optimal value.




Fig. 7. Results of the algorithm on real cascades. (a) and (b) show the 2-dimensional density of the number of nodes and (a) $I(c)$ or (b) $k(c)$. In (a) we add 1 to the influence of each tree for graphical reason. (c) 2-dimensional density of the number of nodes and $\rho(c)$. (d) 2-dimensional density of $k(c)$ and $k^*(c)$. The colours that fill the bins use a logarithmic scale.

As reported in Figure 7, the majority of the cascades have a limited size and, in general, the influence obtained from the coordinated accounts is low, as depicted in (a). In fact, in the biggest trees, $I(c)$ is approximately 10% of the number of nodes, much lower than the expected 60% suggested by Figure 5(a). A somewhat similar result is observed in (b), which indicates the majority of the cascades contain a very low number of coordinated accounts. Also in this case, approximately 1% of the nodes is coordinated in the biggest cascades, while Figure 5(b) suggests that 30% of the number of nodes is needed to obtain the optimal results. Accordingly, Figure 7(c) shows that only small cascades succeed in

obtaining influence values close to the optimal one. For larger cascades, we observe a dramatic collapse in $\rho(c)$, probably due also to the much more complex structures arising with a higher number of nodes. Finally, (d) shows that, apart from the smallest trees in which the two measures are approximately similar, $k(c)$ largely differ from $k^*(c)$, yielding a possible explanation of the low values of $\rho(c)$.

Summarising, we conclude that coordinated accounts exert an influence much lower than the upper bound provided by our algorithm. Moreover, there is evidence that this may be due to a limited number of coordinated accounts placed in each cascade.

4.4 Comparison with optimum using a fixed number of coordinated accounts

In the previous section we compared the behaviour of coordinated accounts with an optimal strategy that considers having, at prior, an undefined number of coordinated accounts to place. As highlighted before, the scarce results obtained by them could be due to a limited number of resources employed to influence other nodes.

Therefore, here we are interested in unveiling if the observed non-optimal behaviour changes if we compare it to the greedy strategy proposed in Algorithm 4, using exactly $k(c)$ coordinated accounts. Observing poor results in this case could suggest that they are due also to a bad placement strategy of coordinated accounts.

We denote as $I_k(c)$ the influence computed by Algorithm 4. Similarly as before, we measure how close $I(c)$ and $I_k(c)$ are using

$$\rho_k(c) = \frac{I(c)}{I_k(c)}. \quad (8)$$

In Figure 8 we show a 2-dimensional histogram of $\rho_k(c)$ versus the number of nodes in the cascade. Notably, the figure looks very similar to Figure 5(c): only small cascades get comparable results with the greedy algorithm but, when the size of the cascade increases, the placement of coordinated accounts in real cascades hardly reach the influence obtained through the greedy strategy.

Taking into account all the previous results, it seems that, in real cascades, coordinated accounts may be placed randomly, without a specific rationale. To validate this observation, for each cascade we generate $N = 10$ random labellings and we compute the mean influence obtained by those random placements. This results in a new distribution of influence values, denoted as q_{random} . We also denote as p_{real}, q_{greedy} the real and greedy influence distributions.

We then compute Kullback-Leibler divergence [39] to compare p_{real} with the other two distributions, adding a small correction of 10^{-4} to handle the cases in which q_{greedy} and q_{random} distributions have 0 probability. The results are shown in Table 2.

$D_{KL}(p_{real} q_{greedy})$	4.278
$D_{KL}(p_{real} q_{random})$	0.097

Table 2. Kullback-Leibler divergence values.

The values suggest that, as expected, p_{real} is much more similar to q_{random} than q_{greedy} , thus confirming that, according to our model, coordinated nodes are placed quite randomly.

Joining these results with the previous ones, we can conclude the results observed in real cascades are scarce for two reasons: a scarcity of resources and also a bad placement strategy.




Fig. 8. 2–dimensional density of the number of nodes and $\rho(c)_k(c)$. The colours used to fill the bins use a logarithmic scale.

5 CONCLUSION

In this work we have proposed a general framework that allows to evaluate the influence of coordinated accounts in real cascades, providing an upper bound to its value.

First, we show (using synthetic data) that it is possible to exert the maximum influence with a low number of coordinated accounts. Moreover, the majority of node labelling gives far-from-optimum results, confirming that random placement is not likely to obtain good results.

As a case of study, we consider $\approx 4K$ information cascades on Twitter about 2019 UK political elections. We show that observed coordinated accounts exert a very low influence on the tree, compared to both greedy and optimal strategies. Our results suggest that this is due to a double reason: a scarcity of resources (i.e. used coordinated accounts) and an absence of a strategy in how coordinated accounts act.

Despite the possible limitations of our model and the limitations of the detection procedure and the reconstruction of Twitter cascades, our results overall suggest that CIB may play a less pivotal role than expected in information diffusion. Nonetheless, as often reported in social media studies [23], different methodological settings and case studies may lead to different results thus future work may employ the proposed framework to consider the impact of CIB and other similar actors in a wider range of scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work is supported by IRIS Infodemic Coalition (UK government, grant no. SCH-00001-3391), SERICS (PE00000014) under the NRRP MUR program funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU, project CRESPE from the Italian

Ministry of Health under the program CCM 2022, PON project “Ricerca e Innovazione” 2014-2020 and project SEED n. SP122184858BEDB3.

We would like to thank Maurizio Tesconi for providing the dataset employed for the case study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Eytan Bakshy, Itamar Rosenn, Cameron Marlow, and Lada Adamic. The role of social networks in information diffusion. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 519–528, 2012.
- [2] Seth Flaxman, Sharad Goel, and Justin M Rao. Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public opinion quarterly*, 80(S1):298–320, 2016.
- [3] Ana Lucia Schmidt, Fabiana Zollo, Michela Del Vicario, Alessandro Bessi, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, H Eugene Stanley, and Walter Quattrociocchi. Anatomy of news consumption on facebook. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(12):3035–3039, 2017.
- [4] Elizaveta Zinovyeva, Wolfgang Karl Härdle, and Stefan Lessmann. Antisocial online behavior detection using deep learning. *Decision Support Systems*, 138:113362, 2020.
- [5] Amaury Trujillo and Stefano Cresci. Make reddit great again: assessing community effects of moderation interventions on r/the_donald. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2):1–28, 2022.
- [6] R Kelly Garrett. Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective exposure among internet news users. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 14(2):265–285, 2009.
- [7] Christopher A Bail, Lisa P Argyle, Taylor W Brown, John P Bumpus, Haohan Chen, MB Fallin Hunzaker, Jaemin Lee, Marcus Mann, Friedolin Merhout, and Alexander Volfovsky. Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37):9216–9221, 2018.
- [8] Joshua A Tucker, Andrew Guess, Pablo Barberá, Cristian Vaccari, Alexandra Siegel, Sergey Sanovich, Denis Stukal, and Brendan Nyhan. Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political polarization, and political disinformation: a review of the scientific literature (March 19, 2018)*, 2018.
- [9] Matteo Cinelli, Gianmarco De Francisci Morales, Alessandro Galeazzi, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Michele Starnini. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9):e2023301118, 2021.
- [10] Max Falkenberg, Alessandro Galeazzi, Maddalena Torricelli, Niccolò Di Marco, Francesca Larosa, Madalina Sas, Amin Mekacher, Warren Pearce, Fabiana Zollo, Walter Quattrociocchi, et al. Growing polarization around climate change on social media. *Nature Climate Change*, 12(12):1114–1121, 2022.
- [11] 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.
- [12] David MJ Lazer, Matthew A Baum, Yochai Benkler, Adam J Berinsky, Kelly M Greenhill, Filippo Menczer, Miriam J Metzger, Brendan Nyhan, Gordon Pennycook, David Rothschild, et al. The science of fake news. *Science*, 359(6380):1094–1096, 2018.
- [13] Alexandre Bovet and Hernán A Makse. Influence of fake news in twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Nature communications*, 10(1):7, 2019.
- [14] Fernando P Santos, Yphtach Lelkes, and Simon A Levin. Link recommendation algorithms and dynamics of polarization in online social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50):e2102141118, 2021.
- [15] Kristina Hristakieva, Stefano Cresci, Giovanni Da San Martino, Mauro Conti, and Preslav Nakov. The spread of propaganda by coordinated communities on social media. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM Web Science Conference 2022*, pages 191–201, 2022.
- [16] Jonas L Juul and Johan Ugander. Comparing information diffusion mechanisms by matching on cascade size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(46):e2100786118, 2021.
- [17] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Nikhil Jindal, and Emilio Ferrara. Propaganda and misinformation on facebook and twitter during the russian invasion of ukraine. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Web Science Conference 2023*, pages 65–74, 2023.
- [18] Leonardo Nizzoli, Serena Tardelli, Marco Avvenuti, Stefano Cresci, and Maurizio Tesconi. Coordinated behavior on social media in 2019 uk general election. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 15, pages 443–454, 2021.
- [19] Carlene Lebeuf, Alexey Zagalsky, Matthieu Foucault, and Margaret-Anne Storey. Defining and classifying software bots: A faceted taxonomy. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 1st International Workshop on Bots in Software Engineering (BotSE)*. IEEE, May 2019.
- [20] Joseph Seering, Juan Pablo Flores, Saiph Savage, and Jessica Hammer. The social roles of bots: Evaluating impact of bots on discussions in online communities. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 2(CSCW):1–29, November 2018.
- [21] Lei (Nico) Zheng, Christopher M. Albano, Neev M. Vora, Feng Mai, and Jeffrey V. Nickerson. The roles bots play in wikipedia. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW):1–20, November 2019.
- [22] Lorenz Cuno Klopfenstein, Saverio Delpriori, Silvia Malatini, and Alessandro Bogliolo. The rise of bots: A survey of conversational interfaces, patterns, and paradigms. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Designing Interactive Systems, DIS '17*. ACM, June 2017.
- [23] Derek Ruths. The misinformation machine. *Science*, 363(6425):348–348, 2019.

- [24] Nir Grinberg, Kenneth Joseph, Lisa Friedland, Briony Swire-Thompson, and David Lazer. Fake news on twitter during the 2016 us presidential election. *Science*, 363(6425):374–378, 2019.
- [25] Matteo Cinelli, Stefano Cresci, Walter Quattrociocchi, Maurizio Tesconi, and Paola Zola. Coordinated inauthentic behavior and information spreading on twitter. *Decision Support Systems*, 160:113819, 2022.
- [26] Franziska B Keller, David Schoch, Sebastian Stier, and JungHwan Yang. Political astroturfing on twitter: How to coordinate a disinformation campaign. *Political communication*, 37(2):256–280, 2020.
- [27] Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature communications*, 9(1):1–9, 2018.
- [28] Marcelo Mendoza, Maurizio Tesconi, and Stefano Cresci. Bots in social and interaction networks: detection and impact estimation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 39(1):1–32, 2020.
- [29] Stefano Cresci. A decade of social bot detection. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(10):72–83, 2020.
- [30] Karishma Sharma, Yizhou Zhang, Emilio Ferrara, and Yan Liu. Identifying coordinated accounts on social media through hidden influence and group behaviours. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1441–1451, 2021.
- [31] Diogo Pacheco, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Unveiling coordinated groups behind white helmets disinformation. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020, WWW '20*. ACM, April 2020.
- [32] Diogo Pacheco, Pik-Mai Hui, Christopher Torres-Lugo, Bao Tran Truong, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Uncovering coordinated networks on social media: methods and case studies. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 15, pages 455–466, 2021.
- [33] Luca Luceri, Valeria Pantè, Keith Burghardt, and Emilio Ferrara. Unmasking the web of deceit: Uncovering coordinated activity to expose information operations on twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09884*, 2023.
- [34] Alexander C Nwala, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. A language framework for modeling social media account behavior. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1):33, 2023.
- [35] David Schoch, Franziska B Keller, Sebastian Stier, and JungHwan Yang. Coordination patterns reveal online political astroturfing across the world. *Scientific reports*, 12(1):4572, 2022.
- [36] Tom De Nies, Io Taxidou, Anastasia Dimou, Ruben Verborgh, Peter M Fischer, Erik Mannens, and Rik Van de Walle. Towards multi-level provenance reconstruction of information diffusion on social media. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM international on conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 1823–1826, 2015.
- [37] Matteo Cinelli, Leto Peel, Antonio Iovanella, and Jean-Charles Delvenne. Network constraints on the mixing patterns of binary node metadata. *Physical Review E*, 102(6):062310, 2020.
- [38] Juyong Park and Albert-László Barabási. Distribution of node characteristics in complex networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(46):17916–17920, 2007.
- [39] S Kullback and R Leibler. On information and sufficiencyannals of mathematical statistics, 22, 79–86. *MathSciNet MATH*, 3, 1951.