

How Do Social Bots Participate in Misinformation Spread? A Comprehensive Dataset and Analysis

Herun Wan¹ Minnan Luo¹ Zihan Ma¹
Guang Dai² Xiang Zhao³

¹Xi'an Jiaotong University ²SGIT AI ³National University of Defense Technology
wanherun@stu.xjtu.edu.cn

Abstract

Information spreads faster through social media platforms than traditional media, thus becoming an ideal medium to spread misinformation. Meanwhile, automated accounts, known as social bots, contribute more to the misinformation dissemination. In this paper, we explore the interplay between social bots and misinformation on the Sina Weibo platform. We propose a comprehensive and large-scale misinformation dataset, containing 11,393 misinformation and 16,416 unbiased real information with multiple modality information, with 952,955 related users. We propose a scalable weak-surprised method to annotate social bots, obtaining 68,040 social bots and 411,635 genuine accounts. To the best of our knowledge, this dataset is the largest dataset containing misinformation and social bots. We conduct comprehensive experiments and analysis on this dataset. Results show that social bots play a central role in misinformation dissemination, participating in news discussions to amplify echo chambers, manipulate public sentiment, and reverse public stances.

1 Introduction

Since the rise of social media, as of April 2024, there were 5.07 billion social media users around the world¹. Social media platforms, like X (Twitter) and Weibo, have become major information sources, where the information spread speed is much faster than traditional media. Due to the nature of such platforms, there have been attempts to disseminate misinformation, which could undermine public trust (Scheufele and Krause, 2019), polarize society (Choi et al., 2020; Azzimonti and Fernandes, 2023), influence public opinion (Maddock et al., 2015), and impact the economy (Zhou et al., 2024). Meanwhile, besides attracting genuine users, the straightforward operation of social

¹<https://datareportal.com/social-media-users>




Figure 1: An example of social bots amplifying misinformation spread. Bots would publish similar content to expand news spread and manipulate public emotion and stance, increasing its harmfulness.

media also makes it an ideal breeding ground for fully automatic programs. Such programs, also known as social bots, could help publish various news and provide emergency help. While social bots can be considered a mere technological instrument, their malicious misuse could seriously compromise online safety. They are proven behind many online perils, including election interference (Howard et al., 2016; Rossi et al., 2020; Ng et al., 2022), extremism spread (Ferrara et al., 2016), and hate speech propaganda (Stella et al., 2019). Social bots are natural message amplifiers (Caldarelli et al., 2020), increasing the risk of spreading misinformation (Huang et al., 2022). Namely, misinformation and social bots are two major factors endangering online security, and they would work together to amplify their impact as Figure 1 shows.

Researchers do their best to fight the never-ending plague of misinformation and malicious social bots. Misinformation detectors focus on news content such as text (Hartl and Kruschwitz, 2022), images (Liu et al., 2023a), or videos (Qi et al., 2023) as well as external information such as comments (Yang et al., 2023a), news environment (Sheng et al., 2022), or related evidence (Glover et al., 2022). Social bot detectors employ feature engineering (Yang et al., 2022), NLP techniques (Lei et al., 2023), and graph neural networks (Zhou

et al., 2023) to detect evolving social bots. Meanwhile, researchers also explore how different types of content (Nan et al., 2021), propagation patterns (Vosoughi et al., 2018), or temporal characteristics (Shin et al., 2018) influence misinformation spread. From a social bot perspective, bot communities (Tan et al., 2023b), how bots influence political propaganda (Caldarelli et al., 2020), and bots’ repost behaviors (Elmas et al., 2022) have been investigated. While these researches have provided valuable insights into investigating misinformation and social bots, relatively little attention has been paid to the interplay between them.

In this paper, we aim to bridge the gap of existing works, investigating the interplay between misinformation and social bots. We characterize and provide empirical evidence of the determinants of social bots participating in misinformation propagation, analyzing the difference between fake and real information based on a novel large-scale dataset. Our study makes three main contributions:

- We propose a comprehensive and large-scale dataset on the Sina Weibo platform, and to the best of our knowledge, it is the largest dataset simultaneously containing misinformation with multiple modalities and social bot annotations. This dataset includes 11,393 misinformation and 16,416 unbiased real information, where each instance contains multiple modalities including article content, comments, repost messages, images, and videos. From a user perspective, this dataset includes 952,955 users participating in the news discussion, covering 68,040 annotated social bots and 411,635 genuine accounts.
- We propose a scalable weak-surprised framework to annotate accounts in our dataset. We collect 48,536 active accounts and recruit 300 annotators to conduct crowd-sourced annotation. We then train bot detectors as multiple experts on the active accounts. We finally adopt a mixture-of-expert to obtain a well-calibrated automated annotator.
- We further conduct comprehensive experiments and analysis. The results illustrate that user interactions improve detection performance. However, the actions of social bots would enhance misinformation harmfulness by expanding news spread, amplifying echo

chambers, manipulating public sentiment, and reversing public stances.

2 Data Collection

This paper focuses on news articles and related users from the Sina Weibo platform. Our collection process consists of four steps: (i) **Data Structure**, which defines the dataset structure; (ii) **Fake News Collection**, which collects fake news and related data from the Weibo platform; (iii) **Unbiased Real News Collection**, which alleviates the entity biases; and (iv) **Weak Supervision User Annotation**, which automatically annotates accounts.

Data Structure We collect a large-scale multi-modality dataset from the Weibo platform, where the main language is Chinese. This dataset contains social bots and misinformation labels, contributing to the study of bots in misinformation spread. We define that if a user reposts, likes, or comments on a news article, it participates in the news spread.

Formally, an online news instance is represented as $A = \{s, I, V, \mathcal{G}_{repost}, \mathcal{G}_{comment}, \mathcal{U}, y\}$, where s denotes the news content, $I = \{I_i\}$ denotes the corresponding image set, $V = \{V_i\}$ denotes the video set, \mathcal{G}_{repost} and $\mathcal{G}_{comment}$ denote the comment and repost graph respectively, $\mathcal{U} = \{u_i\}$ denotes the set of users who participate in the news dissemination, and $y \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes whether this news is fake. The graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{T}\}$ is a dynamic text-attributed graph where nodes \mathcal{V} denotes a comment or repost text, \mathcal{E} denotes the relations, and $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the timestamp of each node. Each node in \mathcal{G} contains a user $u \in \mathcal{U}$ who publishes this text. For each user u , we collect its published texts $\{t_i\}$ in the timeline and metadata p such as follower count. We do not collect the neighbor information of users because we focus on news spread instead of user communities.

Fake News Collection We collect misinformation from Weibo ranging from April 2018 to April 2024. We collect news articles judged as misinformation officially by its management center². Besides, we collect judgment information, which provides evidence and helps to combat misinformation. We collect a total of 11,393 misinformation.

Unbiased Real News Collection Existing misinformation datasets generally suffer from potential data bias (Chen et al., 2023), especially entity

²<https://service.account.weibo.com/>

biases (Zhu et al., 2022), which would influence models’ generalization ability to unseen data. We design an entity debiasing method to mitigate entity biases. We first employ a keyphrase extractor (Liang et al., 2021) to obtain key entities from each misinformation. We then count the frequency of each entity and remove entities with a frequency less than 10 and a length of 1, obtaining 1,961 entities. To ensure the authenticity and diversity of real information, we collect real information from two sources: (i) verified news media, and (ii) trends on the platform, obtaining 8,317 and 8,099 real information respectively.

Weak Supervision User Annotation Manual annotation or crowd-sourcing is labor-intensive and, thus not feasible with our large-scale dataset. Meanwhile, to ensure the scalability of the dataset, we propose a weak supervision learning strategy, enabling annotating accounts automatically.

We first collected 99,774 accounts on Weibo and filtered out 48,536 active accounts, ensuring each active account contains no less than 5 posts with a length of no less than 5 characters. We then assign each account to 3 annotators to identify if it is a bot. Each annotator is familiar with Weibo and social bots and is responsible for annotating 1,000 accounts. Following Feng et al. (2021b), we set 20 standard accounts where the annotations are clear to evaluate an annotator’s performance. Annotations from an annotator who is more than 80% correct on standard accounts are adopted.

We then create an 8:2 split for this annotated dataset as training and evaluating sets for pseudo-label generation. We employ encoder-based language models such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and DeBERTa (He et al., 2021) to encode user-published text and MLPs to encode metadata, obtaining several experts. We then select experts with ideal performance for an ensemble to get the final prediction. We present the details in appendix A.

A conventional method to obtain the final annotated labels is to employ majority voting or train an MLP classifier on the evaluation set (Bach et al., 2017; Feng et al., 2022). Since the likelihood from classifiers may not accurately reflect true probabilities (Guo et al., 2017), also known as *miscalibrated*, we calibrate the likelihoods before the ensemble. We employ temperature scaling and select the best temperature on the validation set. We finally average the calibrated likelihoods to obtain the final annotations, ensuring annotation quality.




Figure 2: Overview of the baseline, which employs multiple modality encoders to encode variance modalities and employs an MLP layer to identify misinformation.

3 Experiment Settings

Baselines We propose a vanilla model as Figure 2 illustrates to evaluate which information is helpful for misinformation detection. This model first employs various feature extractors to extract multi-modality information: (i) **Content**, we employ pre-trained BERT to encode content; (ii) **Comment**, following Yang et al. (2023a), we consider each comment and corresponding replies as a graph and employ BERT and GCN (Kipf and Welling, 2017) to encode it; (iii) **Repost**, similar to comment, we employ BERT and GCN to encode each repost graph; (iv) **Image**, we employ pre-trained swin transformer (Liu et al., 2022) to extract static image features; (v) **Video**, we adopt pre-trained VideoMAE (Tong et al., 2022) to obtain video features. We then concatenate the multi-modality features to obtain news representation \mathbf{h} . Given a news instance A and corresponding label y , we calculate the probability of y being the correct prediction as $p(y | A) \propto \exp(\text{MLP}(\mathbf{h}))$, where $\text{MLP}(\cdot)$ denote an MLP classifier. We optimize this model using the cross-entropy loss and predict the most plausible label as $\arg \max_y p(y | A)$. We further design various variants, removing certain components to explore which ones are essential for detection. We first remove each component except **Content**. Then we design (i) *w/o Interaction* removing **Comment** and **Repost**; (ii) *w/o Vision* removing **Image** and **Video**; and (iii) *w/o extra* only containing **Content**.

Dataset Split We split the dataset according to the topics to avoid data leakage. We conduct ten-fold cross-validation to obtain a more robust conclusion. We present details in appendix B.

4 Dataset Analysis

We present the accuracy, f1-score, precision, and recall, of the baseline and variants in Table 2.

Dataset	Modalities						Statistics					
	Content	Comment	Repost	Image	Video	User	News	Image	Video	User	Bots	Human
<i>Datasets for misinformation detection.</i>												
(Shu et al., 2020)*	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	23,196	19,200	0	2,063,442	0	0
(Nan et al., 2021)*	✓						9,128	0	0	0	0	0
(Li et al., 2022)					✓		700	0	700	0	0	0
(Qi et al., 2023)*		✓			✓	✓	3,654	0	3,654	3,654	0	0
(Hu et al., 2023)	✓	✓		✓	✓		14,700	14,700	0	0	0	0
(Li et al., 2024b)*	✓	✓		✓		✓	23,789	10,178	0	803,779	0	0
<i>Datasets for social bot detection.</i>												
(Feng et al., 2021b)						✓	0	0	0	229,580	6,589	5,237
(Feng et al., 2022)		✓	✓			✓	0	0	0	1,000,000	139,943	860,057
(Shi et al., 2023)*		✓	✓			✓	0	0	0	410,199	2,748	7,451
<i>Datasets for the interplay between misinformation and social bots.</i>												
Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	27,809	61,714	7,328	952,955	68,040	411,635

Table 1: Summary of our dataset and recent datasets for misinformation and social bots. We first check each dataset’s modality and then report the related statistics. The \star denotes that the publisher does not provide the original data in the corresponding paper. Our dataset is the largest and the only one with misinformation and social bot annotations, containing 27,809 instances.

Models	Accuracy	F1-score	Precision	Recall
Vanilla	94.7 \pm 0.7	91.4 \pm 1.4	93.7 \pm 1.7	89.4 \pm 3.2
w/o Comment	93.0 \pm 0.9 1.8% \downarrow	89.3 \pm 1.5 2.4% \downarrow	86.8 \pm 3.0 7.4% \downarrow	92.0 \pm 2.4 2.9% \uparrow
w/o Repost	90.7 \pm 0.8 4.3% \downarrow	86.6 \pm 0.7 5.3% \downarrow	80.0 \pm 2.1 14.6% \downarrow	94.5 \pm 1.8 5.6% \uparrow
w/o Image	92.6 \pm 0.7 2.2% \downarrow	88.8 \pm 1.1 2.9% \downarrow	85.7 \pm 2.2 8.5% \downarrow	92.3 \pm 2.9 3.2% \uparrow
w/o Video	94.5 \pm 0.6 0.2% \downarrow	91.1 \pm 1.4 0.4% \downarrow	94.2 \pm 1.3 0.6% \uparrow	88.2 \pm 3.2 1.4% \downarrow
w/o Interaction	83.7 \pm 2.3 11.6% \downarrow	79.0 \pm 2.3 13.6% \downarrow	67.1 \pm 3.4 28.4% \downarrow	96.4 \pm 1.2 7.8% \uparrow
w/o Vision	93.0 \pm 0.7 1.8% \downarrow	89.3 \pm 1.2 2.4% \downarrow	87.1 \pm 1.9 7.0% \downarrow	91.7 \pm 2.9 2.5% \uparrow
w/o Extra	74.7 \pm 4.0 21.2% \downarrow	71.1 \pm 3.2 22.2% \downarrow	56.0 \pm 3.9 40.2% \downarrow	97.7 \pm 1.0 9.2% \uparrow

Table 2: Performance of baseline and variants. We report the mean and standard deviation of ten-fold cross-validation. We also report the performance changes and conduct the paired t-test with vanilla, where \star denotes the p-value is less than 0.0005 and \dagger denotes otherwise.

A straightforward baseline could achieve ideal detection performance, with multi-modalities contributing significantly. The Vanilla model, including all modalities, achieves the best performance, where the f1-score reaches 91.4%. The ideal performance proves its ability to verify misinformation, and the high precision ensures the credibility of found misinformation. Vanilla without *extra* modalities suffers a significant performance decline, with an accuracy drop of 21.2%. It is more radical, often identifying information as misinformation and achieving high recall.

News reactions enhance the model’s information verification capability. Vanilla without *interaction* drops to 79.0% on f1-score, illustrating the

effectiveness of news reaction including comments and reposts. We speculate that news interactions could provide extra evidence and signals (Grover et al., 2022) to verify the information. Meanwhile, reposts provide more evidence than comments. We assume it is related to the algorithm of social platforms, where reposted messages could be spread more widely. Thus users tend to publish verified information when reposting.

Vision modalities only slightly improve identifying misinformation. Vanilla w/o *Vision* only drops 2.4% on f1-score, where image and video information could not provide valuable evidence. Meanwhile, video information contributes the least, with the p-value of the t-test on accuracy being 0.07, which is not considered statistically significant. The text modalities dominate misinformation detection. We speculate that (i) annotators also consider text information when judging misinformation, introducing biases; and (ii) the pre-trained vision encoders struggle to capture signals related to identifying misinformation.

Our dataset is the largest with multi-modality information content and annotated social bots. We compare our dataset with the recent datasets for misinformation and social bots, illustrated in Table 1. Our dataset contains the most complete modality information and the richest visual modality data. Meanwhile, our dataset is the only misinformation dataset containing social bot annotations.

The multi-modality content of fake news is disparate from that of real news. We first check




Figure 3: Comparison of category and sentiment distribution of images in the news. Fake news contains more screenshots and displays more intense sentiment.

the categories of the images in news articles and divide them into (i) *Person*; (ii) *Emoji Pack*; (iii) *Landscape*; and (iv) *Screenshot*. We then investigate the sentiment, including neutral and non-neutral (angry, surprised, fearful, sad, and happy), of “Person” and “Emoji Pack”, where “Person” is realistic and “Emoji Pack” is virtual. We employ pre-trained CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) to obtain the category and sentiment in zero-shot format. Figure 3 presents the distribution of images in fake and real news. Images in real news tend to focus on people, while fake news prefers to publish screenshots. Regarding sentiment, most of the images related to people in both real and fake news are non-neutral, proving that news publishers tend to employ appealing pictures. For virtual images, emoji packs in real news are predominantly neutral, with a small partial being non-neutral. Although the majority of emoji packs in fake news are still neutral, significantly less than those in real news. Furthermore, we analyze the correlation between the sentiment of images and text content, where 78.2% of real news contains images with the same sentiment as the text while only 34.1% of fake news does. The text and images of real news present higher consistency in sentiment than fake news.

To explore the differences in multi-modal content consistency between real and fake news, we employ three metrics: (i) **Text**, the average BERT similarity with all other texts, where the higher value means the text is more consistent with the global text; (ii) **Similarity**, the similarity of text and image in an instance using CLIP to encode, where the higher value means better consistency; (iii) **Image**, similar to **Text**, using Vit (Dosovitskiy et al., 2020) to encode images. Figure 4 visualizes the joint distribution of these metrics. For **Text**, real news illustrates higher textual content consistency, where the majority lies at 0.6, while misinforma-




Figure 4: The joint distributions of the content consistency metrics for misinformation and real information. Misinformation and real news illustrate different distributions in **Text** and **Similarity**, but similar in **Image**.




Figure 5: Visualization of fake news articles within the top 10 topics. Each dot corresponds to an article colored according to its topic. The topic labels annotated by the rumor-busting information are plotted at each cluster center. The well-separated and cohesive clusters indicate news shared the same topics create echo chambers.

tion shows lower, where even some show negative values. We speculate that real news would follow a certain pattern, while misinformation would not. For **Similarity**, real news illustrates relatively more consistency than misinformation, where real news might publish text-related images. For **Image**, misinformation and real news share similar distribution, strengthening the assumption that visual information struggles to provide signals for misinformation detection.

5 Social Bots and Misinformation Interplay Analysis

Fake news articles shared with the same topics create echo chambers, while social bots amplify them. A total of 11,393 fake news articles are divided into clusters using the DBSCAN clustering method, based on BERT embeddings of their corresponding rumor-busting information. We finally obtained 2,270 topics, and each cluster represents a




Figure 6: Comparison of bot distribution between echo chamber members and non-members across various topics. The proportion of bots among echo chamber members is generally higher than that among non-members, illustrating that bots enhance the echo chamber.




Figure 7: Probability density distributions of bot percentage for comments and reposts in real and fake news. Comments generally exhibit a lower bot percentage, and the bot percentage is higher in real news.

specific topic, *e.g.*, Suicide or Typhoon, annotated according to corresponding rumor-busting information. We visualize the BERT embedding of news articles within the top 10 topics in Figure 5, using t-SNE. The clusters are well-separated and cohesive, indicating that each cluster shares similar content while different clusters exhibit significant differences. Namely, these clusters are independent and create echo chambers where the news environment is homogenous. It could lead to the reinforcement of existing biases and the polarization of opinions.

Inspired by existing works, we define a *echo chamber member* as a user who has participated in spreading at least two fake news articles in an echo chamber. Namely, we identify an echo chamber member based on the user’s activities, including liking, reposting, or commenting on a fake news article. Figure 6 displays the distribution of bot percentage among echo chamber members and non-members within various topics. Bots participate in discussions on all topics, around 18% non-members are bots. The echo chamber members do not contain bots in about half of the topics. However, in the other half, echo chamber members exhibit a higher bot percentage across most topics compared to non-members, reaching up to 50% in many topics. We speculate that bots reinforce the




Figure 8: Distribution of sentiments in different texts. Misinformation would publish emotional content while real news would publish more neutral content. Accounts would publish emotional content during news spread.

echo chamber effect by actively engaging with fake news on the same topics.

Social bots are deeply involved in news interaction.

Among the 5,750 users publishing misinformation, there are 3,799 active users, of which social bots account for 20.19%. Among the 217,896 users participating in the misinformation discussions, there are 88,102 active users, of which social bots account for 13.43%. Among the 747,823 users participating in the real news discussions, there are 300,318 active users, of which social bots account for 16.81%. We then analyze users who participate in news spread. Figure 7 presents the distribution of the bot percentage for users that repost and comment on fake and real news, where the mean values are 29.3%, 31.1%, 10.9%, and 14.7%, respectively. This is similar to the overall bot percentage, where slightly more bots in real news than fake news. Furthermore, comments and reposts in both real and fake news exhibit similar distributions, peaking around similar values. In both real and fake news, reposts tend to have a higher bot percentage compared to comments. Social bots are more likely to spread news by reposting.

Social bots would manipulate public opinions, making them more polarized as news spreads.

Online information consumers are reluctant to process information deliberately (Möller et al., 2020), becoming susceptible to cognitive biases (Pennycook et al., 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018). Here we explore how the public changes opinions and what leads to the changes. We first investigate public sentiment among fake and real news, where we




Figure 9: The distribution of neutral sentiment variation on misinformation and real news. The sentiment change for misinformation is more dramatic.




Figure 10: The proportion of comments with different stances as the comments increase. Public stances become increasingly polarized, where misinformation contains more comments with clear stances.

employ BERT trained on the EWECT dataset³ to obtain the sentiment, including *neutral*, *happy*, *angry*, *surprised*, *sad*, and *fearful*. Figure 8 illustrates the distribution of sentiments in different texts. An intuitive finding is that misinformation would publish more emotional content while real news would naturally report. However, whether in misinformation or real news, public reactions are always emotional. Comments in misinformation show more anger while real news shows more happiness, both of which are more emotional than reposts. We speculate that users are inclined to comment to express emotion. We explore the degree or extent to which public sentiment changes over the news spread, intruding variation measure:

$$v_{\Delta} = \sum_{k=1}^n |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})|,$$

where $f(x_k)$ denotes the proportion of neutral sentiment in the news comments at time x_k , and we set the time interval to 1 hour. Figure 9 visualizes the distribution of sentiment variation, where a larger value means a more drastic change. The comment sentiment for misinformation is more dramatic, achieving a mean value of 0.287.

Then we explore the public stance using BERT trained on the C-STANCE dataset (Zhao et al.,

³<https://smp2020ewect.github.io/>




Figure 11: Distribution of bots' and humans' semantic similarities, where bots present higher similarities.




Figure 12: The sentiments and stances of comments published by social bots. Social bots would publish polarized content, manipulating public opinions.

2023), including support, deny, and neutral of comments. Figure 10 illustrates the proportion of each stance with the comments increase over time. A striking finding is that few users (about 1%) explicitly expressed a supportive stance, while the majority are neutral or denied. Misinformation consistently presents higher denial and lower neutrality than real news. We speculate that users participating in misinformation discussions would tend to debunk. Meanwhile, the public stance becomes more polarized as the news spreads, where the neutral ratio suffers a drop of around 11%.

Therefore, we can conclude that as the news spreads, public opinions including sentiment and stance become polarized, especially regarding fake news. We then explore the traces of social bots' participation. The *bandwagon effect*, where online users adopt behaviors or actions simply because others are doing so, influences the news spread (Wang and Zhu, 2019). We first explore the semantic group characteristics of social bots as Figure 11 illustrates. We employ BERT to calculate the semantic similarities, where social bots present higher values. We speculated that social bots would publish similar content to influence news spread. We further explore the published content of bots. Figure 12 illustrates the stances and sentiments of comments published by bots. For sentiments, bots would publish far more emotional content than neutral ones. For stances, bots would publish content with clear stances. Thus we could conclude that social bots would manipulate public opinions by publishing similar and polarized content.

6 Related Work

Misinformation Detection An intuitive way to detect misinformation focuses on the information content, including text (Xiao et al., 2024; Gong et al., 2024), images (Qi et al., 2019; Cao et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2024b; Lao et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024d), and videos (Tan et al., 2023a; Bu et al., 2024). These studies extract features such as emotion (Zhang et al., 2021) and employ neural networks such as graph neural networks (Tao et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024f; Lu et al., 2024) or neurosymbolic reasoning (Dong et al., 2024) to characterize information. Besides information content, the context such as user interactions (Guo et al., 2018; Shu et al., 2019; Lu and Li, 2020), user profile (Dou et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024), and evidence (Chen et al., 2024) provide helpful signals to detect misinformation. These models would model propagation patterns (Cui and Jia, 2024), construct news environments (Yin et al., 2024), or extract multi-hop fact (Zhang et al., 2024a) to enhance detection performance. Recently, to combat LLM-generated misinformation (Cornelius et al., 2024; Su et al., 2024b; Zhang et al., 2024e; Venkatraman et al., 2024; Schmidt et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Koike et al., 2024; Hanley and Durumeric, 2024), models employing LLMs (Wan et al., 2024; Nan et al., 2024; Yue et al., 2024) through prompting (Guan et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024a; Hu et al., 2024) and in-context learning (Wang et al., 2024a) have been proposed.

Social Bot Detection Identifying social bots on social platforms has always been an arms race against evolving bots (Cresci et al., 2017). Existing social bot detectors mainly fall into three categories: feature-based, content-based, and graph-based. Feature-based models conduct feature engineering for accounts (Mazza et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2021a; Hayawi et al., 2022; Hays et al., 2023). Malicious operators would manipulate these features to evade detection (Cresci, 2020). Content-based models employ NLP techniques (Dukić et al., 2020; Lei et al., 2023; Cai et al., 2024) to characterize user-published content. Advanced bots would steal content from genuine accounts, diluting malicious content to be hidden (Cresci, 2020). Graph-based models model user interactions as graph structures and employ graph neural networks (Feng et al., 2021c; Dehghan et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023b; Lyu et al., 2023; Chang et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024b; Liu et al., 2024) in a semi-

supervised way to identify bots. These models are sensitive to graph perturbation, such as homophily or structure changes, making them vulnerable (Ye et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). With the rise of LLMs, many researchers are committed to exploring the risks and opportunities they bring to bot detection (Tan and Jiang, 2023; Feng et al., 2024).

Social Media Safety Social media has witnessed many social movements over the decades, and its safety has become more crucial (Mou et al., 2024). Misinformation and social bots are two main factors harming online safety. As datasets serve as the basis for research, many works have collected numerous datasets for misinformation (Yoo and KhudaBukhsh, 2023; Qi et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024b; Qazi et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024; Chen and Shu, 2024) and social bots (Feng et al., 2021b, 2022; Shi et al., 2023). Based on these datasets, the generalization of detectors (Karisani and Ji, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024c; Assenmacher et al., 2024), misinformation propagation pattern (Aghajari, 2023; Ashkinaze et al., 2024), how to mitigate misinformation spread (Singhal et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2023; Konstantinou and Karapanos, 2023; Su et al., 2024a; Ghosh et al., 2024), health-related misinformation (Tseng et al., 2022; Niu and Palm Reed, 2023; Yang et al., 2024; Shang et al., 2024), source credibility (Carragher et al., 2024; Mehta and Goldwasser, 2024), user profiling (Morales et al., 2023; Zeng et al., 2024), and bot communities (Liu et al., 2023b; Tan et al., 2023b) are investigated. However, relatively little attention has been paid to the interplay between misinformation and social bots, thus we bridge the gap in this paper.

7 Conclusion

We investigate the interplay between misinformation and social bots, bridging the gap of existing works. We propose a large-scale multi-modality misinformation dataset with accounts participating in news spread, including 11,393 misinformation, 16,416 real information, 952,955 related users, 68,040 social bots, and 411,635 genuine accounts. We propose a weak-supervised framework to annotate accounts, trained on 99,774 accounts with crowd-sourced annotations, providing a strong annotation tool for subsequent research. Based on this dataset, we explore how bots influence the spread of misinformation. Results illustrate that social bots would amplify the echo chambers, manipulate public sentiment, and reverse public stances.

Limitation

Our proposed dataset is the largest containing misinformation and social bot annotations simultaneously. Meanwhile, it contains multiple modalities of news including images and videos and interactions of users including comments and reposts. However, due to the focus on news spread, it does not contain interactions like the friend relationship, missing potential relations between social bots and genuine accounts. Meanwhile, we propose a weak-supervised framework to annotate social bots, whose accuracy is similar to crowd-sourcing. However, it struggles to achieve better recall and might miss several social bots. Finally, the experiments in this work focus primarily on the Sina Weibo platform. We expect to expand our experiments and analysis to other social media platforms such as X (Twitter) or Reddit, in future work.

Ethics Statement

The research of misinformation and social bots is essential in countering online malicious content. This research demonstrates that social bots would amplify the spread of misinformation, enhancing echo chambers and manipulating public opinions. However, this work may increase the risk of dual-use, where malicious actors may develop advanced social bots to spread misinformation. We will establish controlled access to ensure that the data and trained model checkpoint are only publicly available to researchers. Meanwhile, we will hide the privacy information in the dataset when publish it.

Our models are trained on crowd-sourced data, which might contain social biases, stereotypes, and spurious correlations. Thus our model would provide incorrect annotations. We argue that the predictions of our models should be interpreted as an initial screening, while content moderation decisions should be made with experts in the loop.

References

Zhila Aghajari. 2023. Adopting an ecological approach to misinformation: Understanding the broader impacts on online communities. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 417–420.

Joshua Ashkinaze, Eric Gilbert, and Ceren Budak. 2024. The dynamics of (not) unfollowing misinformation spreaders. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 1115–1125.

Dennis Assenmacher, Leon Fröhling, and Claudia Wagner. 2024. You are a bot!—studying the development of bot accusations on twitter. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 113–125.

Marina Azzimonti and Marcos Fernandes. 2023. Social media networks, fake news, and polarization. *European journal of political economy*, 76:102256.

Alexander Ratner Stephen H Bach, Henry Ehrenberg, Jason Fries, Sen Wu, and Christopher Ré. 2017. Snorkel: Rapid training data creation with weak supervision. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(3).

Yuyan Bu, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Peng Qi, Danding Wang, and Jintao Li. 2024. Fakingrecipe: Detecting fake news on short video platforms from the perspective of creative process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16670*.

Zijian Cai, Zhaoxuan Tan, Zhenyu Lei, Zifeng Zhu, Hongrui Wang, Qinghua Zheng, and Minnan Luo. 2024. Lmbot: distilling graph knowledge into language model for graph-less deployment in twitter bot detection. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 57–66.

Guido Caldarelli, Rocco De Nicola, Fabio Del Vigna, Marinella Petrocchi, and Fabio Saracco. 2020. The role of bot squads in the political propaganda on twitter. *Communications Physics*, 3(1):81.

Juan Cao, Peng Qi, Qiang Sheng, Tianyun Yang, Junbo Guo, and Jintao Li. 2020. Exploring the role of visual content in fake news detection. *Disinformation, Misinformation, and Fake News in Social Media: Emerging Research Challenges and Opportunities*, pages 141–161.

Peter Carragher, Evan M Williams, and Kathleen M Carley. 2024. Detection and discovery of misinformation sources using attributed webgraphs. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 214–226.

Ying-Ying Chang, Wei-Yao Wang, and Wen-Chih Peng. 2024. Sega: Preference-aware self-contrastive learning with prompts for anomalous user detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 30–37.

Canyu Chen and Kai Shu. 2024. Can llm-generated misinformation be detected? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Jifan Chen, Grace Kim, Aniruddh Sriram, Greg Durrett, and Eunsol Choi. 2024. Complex claim verification with evidence retrieved in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3569–3587.

- Ziwei Chen, Linmei Hu, Weixin Li, Yingxia Shao, and Liqiang Nie. 2023. Causal intervention and counterfactual reasoning for multi-modal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 627–638.
- Daejin Choi, Selin Chun, Hyunchul Oh, Jinyoung Han, and Ted Taekyoung Kwon. 2020. Rumor propagation is amplified by echo chambers in social media. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):310.
- Joseph Cornelius, Oscar Lithgow-Serrano, Sandra Mitrović, Ljiljana Dolamic, and Fabio Rinaldi. 2024. Bust: Benchmark for the evaluation of detectors of llm-generated text. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8022–8050.
- Stefano Cresci. 2020. A decade of social bot detection. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(10):72–83.
- Stefano Cresci, Roberto Di Pietro, Marinella Petrocchi, Angelo Spognardi, and Maurizio Tesconi. 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*, pages 963–972.
- Chaoqun Cui and Caiyan Jia. 2024. Propagation tree is not deep: Adaptive graph contrastive learning approach for rumor detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 73–81.
- Ashkan Dehghan, Kinga Siuta, Agata Skorupka, Akshat Dubey, Andrei Betlen, David Miller, Wei Xu, Bogumił Kamiński, and Paweł Prałat. 2023. Detecting bots in social-networks using node and structural embeddings. *Journal of Big Data*, 10(1):119.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Yiqi Dong, Dongxiao He, Xiaobao Wang, Youzhu Jin, Meng Ge, Carl Yang, and Di Jin. 2024. Unveiling implicit deceptive patterns in multi-modal fake news via neuro-symbolic reasoning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 8354–8362.
- Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yingtong Dou, Kai Shu, Congying Xia, Philip S Yu, and Lichao Sun. 2021. User preference-aware fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 2051–2055.
- David Dukić, Dominik Keča, and Dominik Stipić. 2020. Are you human? detecting bots on twitter using bert. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, pages 631–636. IEEE.
- Tuğrulcan Elmas, Rebekah Overdorf, and Karl Aberer. 2022. Characterizing retweet bots: The case of black market accounts. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 16, pages 171–182.
- Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Herun Wan, Ningnan Wang, Zilong Chen, Binchi Zhang, Qinghua Zheng, Wenqian Zhang, Zhenyu Lei, Shujie Yang, et al. 2022. Twibot-22: Towards graph-based twitter bot detection. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:35254–35269.
- Shangbin Feng, Herun Wan, Ningnan Wang, Jundong Li, and Minnan Luo. 2021a. Satar: A self-supervised approach to twitter account representation learning and its application in bot detection. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 3808–3817.
- Shangbin Feng, Herun Wan, Ningnan Wang, Jundong Li, and Minnan Luo. 2021b. Twibot-20: A comprehensive twitter bot detection benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 4485–4494.
- Shangbin Feng, Herun Wan, Ningnan Wang, and Minnan Luo. 2021c. Botrgcn: Twitter bot detection with relational graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/ACM international conference on advances in social networks analysis and mining*, pages 236–239.
- Shangbin Feng, Herun Wan, Ningnan Wang, Zhaoxuan Tan, Minnan Luo, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2024. What does the bot say? opportunities and risks of large language models in social media bot detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00371*.
- Emilio Ferrara, Wen-Qiang Wang, Onur Varol, Alessandro Flammini, and Aram Galstyan. 2016. Predicting online extremism, content adopters, and interaction reciprocity. In *Social Informatics: 8th International Conference, SocInfo 2016, Bellevue, WA, USA, November 11-14, 2016, Proceedings, Part II 8*, pages 22–39. Springer.
- Shreya Ghosh, Prasenjit Mitra, and Preslav Nakov. 2024. Clock against chaos: Dynamic assessment and temporal intervention in reducing misinformation propagation. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 462–473.

- Haisong Gong, Weizhi Xu, Shu Wu, Qiang Liu, and Liang Wang. 2024. Heterogeneous graph reasoning for fact checking over texts and tables. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 100–108.
- Karish Grover, SM Angara, Md Shad Akhtar, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. 2022. Public wisdom matters! discourse-aware hyperbolic fourier co-attention for social text classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9417–9431.
- Jian Guan, Jesse Dodge, David Wadden, Minlie Huang, and Hao Peng. 2024. Language models hallucinate, but may excel at fact verification. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1090–1111.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2017. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR.
- Han Guo, Juan Cao, Yazi Zhang, Junbo Guo, and Jintao Li. 2018. Rumor detection with hierarchical social attention network. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 943–951.
- Hans WA Hanley and Zakir Durumeric. 2024. Machine-made media: Monitoring the mobilization of machine-generated articles on misinformation and mainstream news websites. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 542–556.
- Philipp Hartl and Udo Kruschwitz. 2022. Applying automatic text summarization for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 2702–2713.
- Kadhim Hayawi, Sujith Mathew, Neethu Venugopal, Mohammad M Masud, and Pin-Han Ho. 2022. Deep-robot: a hybrid deep neural network model for social bot detection based on user profile data. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 12(1):43.
- Chris Hays, Zachary Schutzman, Manish Raghavan, Erin Walk, and Philipp Zimmer. 2023. Simplistic collection and labeling practices limit the utility of benchmark datasets for twitter bot detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM web conference 2023*, pages 3660–3669.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [Deberta: decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Philip N Howard, Bence Kollanyi, and Samuel Woolley. 2016. Bots and automation over twitter during the us election. *Computational propaganda project: Working paper series*, 21(8).
- Beizhe Hu, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Yuhui Shi, Yang Li, Danding Wang, and Peng Qi. 2024. Bad actor, good advisor: Exploring the role of large language models in fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 22105–22113.
- Xuming Hu, Zhijiang Guo, Junzhe Chen, Lijie Wen, and Philip S Yu. 2023. Mr2: A benchmark for multimodal retrieval-augmented rumor detection in social media. In *Proceedings of the 46th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 2901–2912.
- Yue Huang, Kai Shu, Philip S Yu, and Lichao Sun. 2024. From creation to clarification: Chatgpt’s journey through the fake news quagmire. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 513–516.
- Zhen Huang, Zhilong Lv, Xiaoyun Han, Binyang Li, Menglong Lu, and Dongsheng Li. 2022. Social bot-aware graph neural network for early rumor detection. In *proceedings of the 29th international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 6680–6690.
- Payam Karisani and Heng Ji. 2024. Fact checking beyond training set. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2247–2261.
- Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. [Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks](#). In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Ryuto Koike, Masahiro Kaneko, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2024. Outfox: Llm-generated essay detection through in-context learning with adversarially generated examples. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 21258–21266.
- Loukas Konstantinou and Evangelos Karapanos. 2023. Nudging for online misinformation: a design inquiry. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 69–75.
- An Lao, Qi Zhang, Chongyang Shi, Longbing Cao, Kun Yi, Liang Hu, and Duoqian Miao. 2024. Frequency spectrum is more effective for multimodal representation and fusion: A multimodal spectrum rumor detector. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18426–18434.
- Sian Lee, Haeseung Seo, Dongwon Lee, and Aiping Xiong. 2023. Associative inference can increase people’s susceptibility to misinformation. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 17, pages 530–541.

- Zhenyu Lei, Herun Wan, Wenqian Zhang, Shangbin Feng, Zilong Chen, Jundong Li, Qinghua Zheng, and Minnan Luo. 2023. Bic: Twitter bot detection with text-graph interaction and semantic consistency. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*.
- Miaoran Li, Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Jianfeng Gao, and Zhu Zhang. 2024a. Self-checker: Plug-and-play modules for fact-checking with large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 163–181.
- Shilong Li, Boyu Qiao, Kun Li, Qianqian Lu, Meng Lin, and Wei Zhou. 2023. Multi-modal social bot detection: Learning homophilic and heterophilic connections adaptively. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 3908–3916.
- Xiaojun Li, Xvhao Xiao, Jia Li, Changhua Hu, Junping Yao, and Shaochen Li. 2022. A cnn-based misleading video detection model. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):6092.
- Yupeng Li, Haorui He, Jin Bai, and Dacheng Wen. 2024b. Mcfend: a multi-source benchmark dataset for chinese fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 4018–4027.
- Xinnian Liang, Shuangzhi Wu, Mu Li, and Zhoujun Li. 2021. Unsupervised keyphrase extraction by jointly modeling local and global context. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 155–164.
- Ying-Jia Lin, Chun-Yi Lin, Chia-Jen Yeh, Yi-Ting Li, Yun-Yu Hu, Chih-Hao Hsu, Mei-Feng Lee, and Hung-Yu Kao. 2024. Cfever: A chinese fact extraction and verification dataset. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18626–18634.
- Feng Liu, Zhenyu Li, Chunfang Yang, Daofu Gong, Haoyu Lu, and Fenlin Liu. 2024. Segcn: a sub-graph encoding based graph convolutional network model for social bot detection. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):4122.
- Hui Liu, Wenya Wang, and Haoliang Li. 2023a. Interpretable multimodal misinformation detection with logic reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 9781–9796.
- Yuhan Liu, Zhaoxuan Tan, Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Qinghua Zheng, and Minnan Luo. 2023b. Botmoe: Twitter bot detection with community-aware mixtures of modal-specific experts. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 485–495.
- Ze Liu, Han Hu, Yutong Lin, Zhuliang Yao, Zhenda Xie, Yixuan Wei, Jia Ning, Yue Cao, Zheng Zhang, Li Dong, et al. 2022. Swin transformer v2: Scaling up capacity and resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12009–12019.
- Yen-Wen Lu, Chih-Yao Chen, and Cheng-Te Li. 2024. Dual graph networks with synthetic oversampling for imbalanced rumor detection on social media. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 750–753.
- Yi-Ju Lu and Cheng-Te Li. 2020. Gcan: Graph-aware co-attention networks for explainable fake news detection on social media. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 505–514.
- Nuoyan Lyu, Bingbing Xu, Fangda Guo, and Huawei Shen. 2023. Dcgnn: Dual-channel graph neural network for social bot detection. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 4155–4159.
- Jim Maddock, Kate Starbird, Haneen J Al-Hassani, Daniel E Sandoval, Mania Orand, and Robert M Mason. 2015. Characterizing online rumoring behavior using multi-dimensional signatures. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work & social computing*, pages 228–241.
- Michele Mazza, Stefano Cresci, Marco Avvenuti, Walter Quattrociocchi, and Maurizio Tesconi. 2019. Rt-bust: Exploiting temporal patterns for botnet detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on web science*, pages 183–192.
- Nikhil Mehta and Dan Goldwasser. 2024. An interactive framework for profiling news media sources. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 40–58.
- Judith Möller, Robbert Nicolai Van De Velde, Lisa Merten, and Cornelius Puschmann. 2020. Explaining online news engagement based on browsing behavior: Creatures of habit? *Social Science Computer Review*, 38(5):616–632.
- Pedro Ramaciotti Morales, Manon Berriche, and Jean-Philippe Cointet. 2023. The geometry of misinformation: embedding twitter networks of users who spread fake news in geometrical opinion spaces. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 17, pages 730–741.
- Xinyi Mou, Zhongyu Wei, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. Unveiling the truth and facilitating change: Towards agent-based large-scale social movement simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16333*.
- Qiong Nan, Juan Cao, Yongchun Zhu, Yanyan Wang, and Jintao Li. 2021. Mdfend: Multi-domain fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 3343–3347.

- Qiong Nan, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Beizhe Hu, Danding Wang, and Jintao Li. 2024. Let silence speak: Enhancing fake news detection with generated comments from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16631*.
- Lynnette Hui Xian Ng, Iain J Cruickshank, and Kathleen M Carley. 2022. Cross-platform information spread during the january 6th capitol riots. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 12(1):133.
- Shuo Niu and Kathleen Palm Reed. 2023. Towards understanding substance abuse misinformation in youtube videos. In *Companion Publication of the 2023 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 64–68.
- Gordon Pennycook, Tyrone D Cannon, and David G Rand. 2018. Prior exposure increases perceived accuracy of fake news. *Journal of experimental psychology: general*, 147(12):1865.
- Zubair Qazi, William Shiao, and Evangelos E Papalexakis. 2024. Gpt-generated text detection: Benchmark dataset and tensor-based detection method. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 842–846.
- Peng Qi, Yuyan Bu, Juan Cao, Wei Ji, Ruihao Shui, Junbin Xiao, Danding Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2023. Fakesv: A multimodal benchmark with rich social context for fake news detection on short video platforms. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 14444–14452.
- Peng Qi, Juan Cao, Tianyun Yang, Junbo Guo, and Jintao Li. 2019. Exploiting multi-domain visual information for fake news detection. In *2019 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*, pages 518–527. IEEE.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Sippo Rossi, Matti Rossi, Bikesh Raj Upreti, and Yong Liu. 2020. Detecting political bots on twitter during the 2019 finnish parliamentary election. In *Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pages 2430–2439. Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.
- Dietram A Scheufele and Nicole M Krause. 2019. Science audiences, misinformation, and fake news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16):7662–7669.
- Sebastian Schmidt, Ines Zelch, Janek Bevendorff, Benno Stein, Matthias Hagen, and Martin Potthast. 2024. Detecting generated native ads in conversational search. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 722–725.
- Lanyu Shang, Yang Zhang, Zhenrui Yue, YeonJung Choi, Huimin Zeng, and Dong Wang. 2024. A domain adaptive graph learning framework to early detection of emergent healthcare misinformation on social media. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 1408–1421.
- Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Xueyao Zhang, Rundong Li, Danding Wang, and Yongchun Zhu. 2022. Zoom out and observe: News environment perception for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4543–4556.
- Shuhao Shi, Kai Qiao, Jian Chen, Shuai Yang, Jie Yang, Baojie Song, Linyuan Wang, and Bin Yan. 2023. Mgtab: A multi-relational graph-based twitter account detection benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01123*.
- Jieun Shin, Lian Jian, Kevin Driscoll, and François Bar. 2018. The diffusion of misinformation on social media: Temporal pattern, message, and source. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 83:278–287.
- Kai Shu, Limeng Cui, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. 2019. defend: Explainable fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 395–405.
- Kai Shu, Deepak Mahudeswaran, Suhang Wang, Dongwon Lee, and Huan Liu. 2020. Fakenewsnet: A data repository with news content, social context, and spatiotemporal information for studying fake news on social media. *Big data*, 8(3):171–188.
- Mohit Singhal, Nihal Kumarswamy, Shreyasi Kinhekar, and Shirin Nilizadeh. 2023. Cybersecurity misinformation detection on social media: Case studies on phishing reports and zoom’s threat. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 17, pages 796–807.
- Massimo Stella, Marco Cristoforetti, and Manlio De Domenico. 2019. Influence of augmented humans in online interactions during voting events. *PloS one*, 14(5):e0214210.
- Hongyuan Su, Yu Zheng, Jingtao Ding, Depeng Jin, and Yong Li. 2024a. Rumor mitigation in social media platforms with deep reinforcement learning. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 814–817.
- Jinyan Su, Claire Cardie, and Preslav Nakov. 2024b. Adapting fake news detection to the era of large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 1473–1490.
- Ling Sun, Yuan Rao, Yuqian Lan, Bingcan Xia, and Yangyang Li. 2023. Hg-sl: Jointly learning of global and local user spreading behavior for fake news early detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 5248–5256.

- Lingfeng Tan, Yunhong Wang, Junfu Wang, Liang Yang, Xunxun Chen, and Yuanfang Guo. 2023a. Deepfake video detection via facial action dependencies estimation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 5276–5284.
- Zhaoxuan Tan, Shangbin Feng, Melanie Sclar, Herun Wan, Minnan Luo, Yejin Choi, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023b. Botpercent: Estimating bot populations in twitter communities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14295–14312.
- Zhaoxuan Tan and Meng Jiang. 2023. [User modeling in the era of large language models: Current research and future directions](#). *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.*, 46(4):57–96.
- Xiang Tao, Liang Wang, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, and Liang Wang. 2024. Semantic evolution enhanced graph autoencoder for rumor detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 4150–4159.
- Zhan Tong, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Limin Wang. 2022. Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:10078–10093.
- Yu-Chia Tseng, Nanyi Bi, Yung-Ju Chang, and Chien Wen Yuan. 2022. Investigating correction effects of different modalities for misinformation about covid-19. In *Companion Publication of the 2022 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, pages 54–58.
- Saranya Venkatraman, Adaku Uchendu, and Dongwon Lee. 2024. Gpt-who: An information density-based machine-generated text detector. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 103–115.
- Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. The spread of true and false news online. *science*, 359(6380):1146–1151.
- Herun Wan, Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Heng Wang, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Minnan Luo. 2024. Dell: Generating reactions and explanations for llm-based misinformation detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10426*.
- Bo Wang, Jing Ma, Hongzhan Lin, Zhiwei Yang, Ruichao Yang, Yuan Tian, and Yi Chang. 2024a. Explainable fake news detection with large language model via defense among competing wisdom. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 2452–2463.
- Cheng-Jun Wang and Jonathan JH Zhu. 2019. Jumping onto the bandwagon of collective gatekeepers: Testing the bandwagon effect of information diffusion on social news website. *Telematics and Informatics*, 41:34–45.
- Weiguang Wang, Qi Wang, Tianning Zang, Xiaoyu Zhang, Lu Liu, Taorui Yang, and Yijing Wang. 2024b. Botrga: Neighborhood-aware twitter bot detection with relational graph aggregation. In *International Conference on Computational Science*, pages 162–176. Springer.
- Liang Xiao, Qi Zhang, Chongyang Shi, Shoujin Wang, Usman Naseem, and Liang Hu. 2024. Msynfd: Multi-hop syntax aware fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 4128–4137.
- Xiaofei Xu, Ke Deng, Michael Dann, and Xiuzhen Zhang. 2024. Harnessing network effect for fake news mitigation: Selecting debunkers via self-imitation learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 22447–22456.
- Kai-Cheng Yang, Emilio Ferrara, and Filippo Menczer. 2022. Botometer 101: Social bot practicum for computational social scientists. *Journal of computational social science*, 5(2):1511–1528.
- Migyeong Yang, Chaewon Park, Jiwon Kang, Daeun Lee, Daejin Choi, and Jinyoung Han. 2024. Fighting against fake news on newly-emerging crisis: A case study of covid-19. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 718–721.
- Ruichao Yang, Wei Gao, Jing Ma, Hongzhan Lin, and Zhiwei Yang. 2023a. Wsdms: Debunk fake news via weakly supervised detection of misinforming sentences with contextualized social wisdom. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1525–1538.
- Yingguang Yang, Renyu Yang, Hao Peng, Yangyang Li, Tong Li, Yong Liao, and Pengyuan Zhou. 2023b. Fedack: Federated adversarial contrastive knowledge distillation for cross-lingual and cross-model social bot detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 1314–1323.
- Sen Ye, Zhaoxuan Tan, Zhenyu Lei, Ruijie He, Hongrui Wang, Qinghua Zheng, and Minnan Luo. 2023. Hofa: Twitter bot detection with homophily-oriented augmentation and frequency adaptive attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12870*.
- Shu Yin, Peican Zhu, Lianwei Wu, Chao Gao, and Zhen Wang. 2024. Gamc: an unsupervised method for fake news detection using graph autoencoder with masking. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 347–355.
- Clay H Yoo and Ashiqur R KhudaBukhsh. 2023. Auditing and robustifying covid-19 misinformation datasets via anticontent sampling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 15260–15268.
- Zhenrui Yue, Huimin Zeng, Yimeng Lu, Lanyu Shang, Yang Zhang, and Dong Wang. 2024. Evidence-driven

- retrieval augmented response generation for online misinformation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5628–5643.
- Xianghua Zeng, Hao Peng, and Angsheng Li. 2024. Adversarial socialbots modeling based on structural information principles. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 392–400.
- Congzhi Zhang, Linhai Zhang, and Deyu Zhou. 2024a. Causal walk: Debiasing multi-hop fact verification with front-door adjustment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19533–19541.
- Fanrui Zhang, Jiawei Liu, Jingyi Xie, Qiang Zhang, Yongchao Xu, and Zheng-Jun Zha. 2024b. Escnet: Entity-enhanced and stance checking network for multi-modal fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 2429–2440.
- Huaiwen Zhang, Xinxin Liu, Qing Yang, Yang Yang, Fan Qi, Shengsheng Qian, and Changsheng Xu. 2024c. T3rd: Test-time training for rumor detection on social media. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 2407–2416.
- Litian Zhang, Xiaoming Zhang, Ziyi Zhou, Feiran Huang, and Chaozhuo Li. 2024d. Reinforced adaptive knowledge learning for multimodal fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 16777–16785.
- Qihui Zhang, Chujie Gao, Dongping Chen, Yue Huang, Yixin Huang, Zhenyang Sun, Shilin Zhang, Weiye Li, Zhengyan Fu, Yao Wan, et al. 2024e. Llm-as-a-coauthor: Can mixed human-written and machine-generated text be detected? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 409–436.
- Xueyao Zhang, Juan Cao, Xirong Li, Qiang Sheng, Lei Zhong, and Kai Shu. 2021. Mining dual emotion for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2021*, pages 3465–3476.
- Yuchen Zhang, Xiaoxiao Ma, Jia Wu, Jian Yang, and Hao Fan. 2024f. Heterogeneous subgraph transformer for fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 1272–1282.
- Chenye Zhao, Yingjie Li, and Cornelia Caragea. 2023. C-stance: A large dataset for chinese zero-shot stance detection. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13369–13385.
- Ke Zhou, Sanja Šćepanović, and Daniele Quercia. 2024. Characterizing fake news targeting corporations. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, pages 1818–1832.
- Ming Zhou, Wenzheng Feng, Yifan Zhu, Dan Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. Semi-supervised social bot detection with initial residual relation attention networks. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 207–224. Springer.
- Yongchun Zhu, Qiang Sheng, Juan Cao, Shuokai Li, Danding Wang, and Fuzhen Zhuang. 2022. Generalizing to the future: Mitigating entity bias in fake news detection. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2120–2125.

A Annotation Details

In this section, we present detailed information on the annotations of social bots.

A.1 Crowdsourcing Annotations

We first summarize the general criteria to identify a social bot on Weibo for annotators, which are listed as follows:

- Forwarding or publishing numerous advertisements.
- Devoted fans of a star publishing numerous related content.
- Containing numerous forwarding content without pertinence and originality.
- Publishing numerous unverified and negative information.
- Containing numerous tweets with the “automatically” flags.
- Repeated tweets with identical content.
- Containing content that violates relevant laws and regulations.

Guided by these standards, we recruit 300 annotators who are active social media users and are required to read a guidelines document in which we explain the characteristics of social bots along with representative examples. Each annotator is responsible for annotating 1,000 accounts and each account is assigned to 3 annotators. We also set 20 standard questions where the user is clearly a social bot or human. Annotations from an annotator who is more than 80% correct on standard accounts are adopted. We obtained 99,774 accounts, where the crowdsourcing annotations take approximately 60 days.

A.2 Annotation Quality

We further analyze the annotation quality in this section. We calculate the mean accuracy on the standard questions, where the accuracy is 93.75%. We then conducted Fleiss’ Kappa to assess the reliability of agreement between annotators, where the mean value of each 1,000 accounts is 0.4281, showing moderate agreement among the annotators.

A.3 Weak-Supervised Expert Details

Here we employ the metadata from the user profile and the textual information including name, description, and tweets in the timeline to train annotation experts, namely, the models generating pseudo-labels.

Metadata We divide the metadata into two types: **numerical** and **categorical**. For **numerical** metadata, we employ *follower count*, *following count*, and *status count*. For **categorical** metadata, we employ *verified*, *svip*, *the type of account*, and *the level of svip*. After that, we employ MLP layers, random forests, and Adaboost to classify these features.

Textual information We employ *name*, *description*, and *tweets* on the timeline to characterize the textual information of an account. We employ encoder-based language models including BERT and DeBERTa to encode them and an MLP layer to classify accounts.

Ensemble We combine the metadata and textual information by concatenating them and put into an MLP layer to obtain more comprehensive experts.

Here, we do not employ the network structure information to train any experts. The neighbor information is hard to access on the Weibo platform and would cost a lot during the inference process.

After training, we filter out the experts achieving 80% accuracy, which is the same as the standard accuracy of standard questions when conducting crowdsourcing annotation. We finally obtained four experts: (i) ensemble model trained with BERT; (ii) ensemble model trained with DeBERTa; (iii) textual model trained on the tweets with BERT; and (iv) textual model trained on the tweets with DeBERTa. Then we employ temperature scaling to calibrate each selected expert. Finally, the best temperature of each expert is 1.057, 1.111, 1.265, and 0.877. Then, we employ the temperatures to calibrate the logits, obtaining well-calibrated annotation experts. We finally use weighted mean to

obtain the final annotation. The accuracy reaches 83.96%. In practice, we set the bot threshold as 0.75 to obtain an annotator with higher precision.

B Experiment Setting Details

B.1 Baseline Details

Here we present the details of the baseline.

Content We employ an encoder-based language model $\text{enc}(\cdot)$, namely, BERT to encode news content s :

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{content}} = \text{enc}(s).$$

Repost For the repost graph $\mathcal{G}_{\text{repost}}$, we first employ encoder-based LM to encode each text-attributed node v_i and obtain $\mathbf{h}_{v_i}^{(0)}$ and then employ L GNN layers to make each node interact, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{h}_{v_i}^{(\ell)} = \text{Aggr}_{\forall v_j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} (\{\text{Prop}(\mathbf{h}_{v_i}^{(\ell-1)}; \mathbf{h}_{v_j}^{(\ell-1)})\}),$$

where $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ denotes the set of neighbors of node v_i , $\text{Aggr}(\cdot)$ and $\text{Prop}(\cdot)$ are aggregation and propagation functions, where GCN is employed in practice. we finally employ the mean pooling operator as the $\text{Readout}(\cdot)$ function to obtain the graph-level representation:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{repost}} = \text{Readout}(\{\mathbf{h}_{v_i}^{(\ell)}\}_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}}).$$

Comment Follow Yang et al. (2023a), we first split $\mathcal{G}_{\text{comment}}$ into multiple sub-graph $\{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i=1}^m$, where the center node of each sub-graph is the comment directly commenting on the news article. We employ methods the same as **Comment** to process \mathcal{G}_i , and consider the meaning of representations as the final feature, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{comment}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{h}_i,$$

where \mathbf{h}_i is the representation of each graph \mathcal{G}_i .

Image We employ a pre-trained swin transformer to obtain the representations of each image and adopt mean pooling to obtain the final representation:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{image}} = \text{mean}(\text{SwinTr}(I_i)),$$

where mean denotes the meaning operator and SwinTr denotes the swin transformer.

Video We sample 256 frames from each video and resize each frame into 224×224 . We employ pre-trained VideoMAE to encode a video. For each timestep, we take 16 frames and set the interval to 12 frames. Then, we could obtain:

$$\mathbf{f}_{video} = \text{mean}(\text{VideoMAE}(V_i)).$$

Finally, we concatenate them to obtain the representation of each news article, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{h} = [\mathbf{f}_{content} \parallel \mathbf{f}_{repost} \parallel \mathbf{f}_{content} \parallel \mathbf{f}_{image} \parallel \mathbf{f}_{video}].$$

After that, for each variant of baseline, we set the remove features as $\mathbf{0}$. For example, if we remove the **Comment**, then we set $\mathbf{f}_{comment}$ as $\mathbf{0}$.

B.2 Dataset Setting Details

To obtain a more robust conclusion, we conducted ten-fold cross-validation on the dataset. Besides, to avoid data leakage, we split the dataset according to the news topic. To obtain the topic of each news article, we divide them into clusters using the DBSCAN clustering method, based on BERT embeddings of their corresponding rumor-busting information.

B.3 Parameters

The hyperparameter settings of the annotation expert models and the baseline are presented in Table 3 to facilitate reproduction.

Hyperparameter	Value
<i>The parameters of the baseline</i>	
optimizer	Adam
learning rate	10^{-4}
weight decay	10^{-5}
dropout	0.5
hidden dim	256
BERT embedding dim	768
GNN layers	2
GNN embedding dim	256
Video embedding dim	768
Image embedding dim	768
<i>The parameters of the annotators</i>	
optimizer	Adam
learning rate	10^{-3}
weight decay	10^{-5}
dropout	0.5
hidden dim	256

Table 3: Hyperparameter settings of the annotation expert models and the baseline.