

A Regret-Aware Framework for Effective Social Media Advertising

Poonam Sharma, Dildar Ali, Suman Banerjee

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Jammu, 181221, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): suman.banerjee@iitjammu.ac.in;
Contributing authors: poonam.sharma@iitjammu.ac.in;
2021rcs2009@iitjammu.ac.in;

Social Media Advertisement has emerged as an effective approach for promoting the brands of a commercial house. Hence, many of them have started using this medium to maximize the influence among the users and create a customer base. In recent times, several companies have emerged as Influence Provider who provides views of advertisement content depending on the budget provided by the commercial house. In this process, the influence provider tries to exploit the information diffusion phenomenon of a social network, and a limited number of highly influential users are chosen and activated initially. Due to diffusion phenomenon, the hope is that the advertisement content will reach a large number of people.

Now, consider that a group of advertisers is approaching an influence provider with their respective budget and influence demand. Now, for any advertiser, if the influence provider provides more or less influence, it will be a loss for the influence provider. It is an important problem from the influence provider's point of view, as it is important to allocate the seed nodes to the advertisers so that the loss is minimized. In this paper, we study this problem, which we formally referred to as **Regret Minimization in Social Media Advertisement Problem**. We propose a 'noble regret model' that captures the aggregated loss encountered by the influence provider while allocating the seed nodes. We have shown that this problem is a computationally hard problem to solve. We have proposed three efficient heuristic solutions to solve our problem. All proposed solution approaches have been analyzed to understand their time and space requirements. They have been implemented with real-world social network datasets, and several experiments have been conducted. From the experiments, we have observed

that the proposed solution approaches lead to the allocation of seed nodes among the advertisers, which results in much less regrets compared to many baseline methods.

1 Introduction

A social network is defined as an interconnected structure among a group of human beings created for social interactions [1]. Due to the advancement of wireless internet technologies and hand-holding mobile devices, the use of social media has become an integral part of human life. In recent times, several social network datasets have been publicly available. As per the reported recent statistics, every year, the number of active social media users is increasing ¹. Many problems have been studied in this domain, such as community detection [2–4], information diffusion [5, 6], influence maximization [7–9], opinion dynamics [10, 11], and many more. Commercial houses have exploited social media to promote their brands and make advertisements. In this case, the key phenomenon of social networks that have been exploited is the *diffusion of information* [6]. This phenomenon says that every user of an online social network tends to share information with their neighbor. This way, the information, innovation, ideas, etc., spreads through the network and goes viral. Commercial houses have exploited this phenomenon to promote their brands and create their customer base [12, 13]. The key question that arises in this context is how we can select a limited number of highly influential users from the network such that the influence in the network gets maximized. This question remains an active area of research in the domain of Social Network Analysis. An enormous amount of research on this problem leads to a significant amount of literature [7], [9], [14], [8], [15], [16], [17], [18].

In recent times, several media houses have emerged that conduct social media marketing. Technically, they are called *Influence Provider*. In this approach, a set of commercial houses approaches an influence provider with their respective influence demand and budget. Here, the payment rule is as follows. If the influence provider provides the required or more influence, the advertiser will give the mentioned budget; otherwise, a partial payment (on a pro-rata basis) will be made to the influence provider. Now, if the influence provider provides more or less influence than the influence demand, it is a loss for the influence provider. This happens due to the following reasons. Consider the influence provider provides less influence to an advertiser, and as per the payment rule, the influence provider will receive a partial payment, which is a loss.

On the other hand, if the influence provider provides more influence, then there is no additional payment for the extra influence. However, this extra influence can be provided to advertisers whose demand for influence has yet to be satisfied. Now, the task of the influence provider is to return respective seed sets to the advertisers so that this leads to the least regret. This is the key problem that we have studied in this paper. This process has been shown diagrammatically in Figure 1.

‘Regret’ in the context of billboard advertisement has been studied, and some studies are available. To the best of our knowledge, Zhang et al. [19] was the first to

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




Fig. 1: A schematic diagram showing the allocation of seed nodes to advertisers in a social network.

study the Regret Minimization Problem. They posed this problem as a discrete optimization problem and showed that this problem is NP-hard and had to approximate beyond any constant factor. They proposed two local search-based heuristic solutions for this problem. Later, Ali et al. [20, 21] proposed several heuristic solutions for this problem, and from the experimental evaluations, it can be observed that the proposed solutions by Ali et al. [20] lead to much less regret compared to the methods proposed by Zhang et al [19]. However, to the best of my knowledge, regret in the context of social media advertisements has yet to be defined. In this paper, we bridge this gap by defining the notion of regret in the context of social media advertisement and propose several seed selection strategies to minimize the regret. Mainly, we make the following contributions:

- We have formally defined ‘Regret’ in the context of social media advertisements.
- We introduce and study the noble problem of **Regret Minimization in Social Media Advertisement**, and formally, we call it RMSMA Problem.
- We formulate this problem as a discrete optimization problem and show that the problem is NP-hard and hard to approximate beyond any constant factor.
- We propose two solution approaches for this problem with their detailed analysis and complexity calculation.
- The proposed solution approaches have been experimentally evaluated to show their effectiveness and efficiency.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes relevant studies from the literature. Section 3 describes the relevant concepts and defines our problem formally. Section 4 describes the proposed solution approaches. The experimental

evaluation has been described in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes our study and reports a few future research directions.

2 Related Work

In this section, we describe some relevant studies from the literature. Our study comes under the two broad domains, namely, influence and its analysis in social network and regret analysis in advertisement. In the following two subsections, we describe the relevant studies on both of this topics.

2.1 Influence and its Analysis in Social Networks

In past two decades, there has been significant amount of study on the information diffusion in social networks and its applications. Several diffusion models have been introduced and among many the most well studied problem in the context of information diffusion is the Problem of Influence Maximization. Given a social network, a diffusion model, and a positive integer k , this problem aims at identifying k many highly influential users in the network such that their initial activation leads to the maximum influence in the network. Due to the direct application of this problem in the domain of viral marketing, this problem has been studied in different variants and a plethora of solution methodologies have been proposed in the literature.

To the best of our knowledge, Domingos and Reichardson were the first to introduce the problem of influence maximization in the context of viral marketing. Though, Kempe et al. [22–24] were the first to study this problem as a discrete optimization problem. They showed that if the underlying diffusion model is linear threshold or independent cascade, the influence function becomes non-negative, monotone, and submodular. Also they showed that the iterative greedy algorithm which works based on marginal gain computation, leads to $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -factor approximation guarantee. Subsequently there are several studies and the proposed solution methodologies have been classified into many categories such as approximation algorithms, heuristic solution approaches, community-based solution approaches, reverse reachable set computation-based approaches, and many more. The solution methodologies that belongs to the approximation algorithm category, provides a seed set of a given cardinality whose expected influence is a constant factor approximation with respect to an optimal seed set of same cardinality. The first approximation algorithm was proposed by Kempe et al. [22]. Subsequently, Leskovic et al. [25] proposed an approximation algorithm having approximation ratio same as one proposed by Kempe et al. [22]. However, the number of function evaluation performed by their method is much less. Hence, the method proposed by Leskovic et al. [25]. Subsequently, there are many studies in this directions.

Subsequently, a different class of approximation algorithm has been proposed whose initial study was done by Brogs et al. [26] which works based on the computation of reverse reachable sets. The basic idea of this approach is as follows. For every node, a set is constructed which contains the set of other nodes which can influence this node. This set is called as the reverse reachable set or RR set. For all the nodes of the network, once the reverse reachable sets are computed, a small subset of nodes are find

out using some coverage algorithm such that the intersection of these nodes with RR sets of the nodes becomes non empty. Following the study by Brogs et al. [26], several approaches have been proposed in this direction such as TIM [27], TIM+ [27], IMM [28], and many more. The other category of solution approaches can process a million scale social network in couple of seconds. However, solution methodologies of this kind does not give any guarantee on the quality of solution. Solution methodology of this kind includes IRIE [29], Staticgreedy [30], IMRANK [31] and many more. Another kind of solution methodologies exist where the community structure of the network has been exploited. We call such methodologies as community-based solution approaches. There are many solution approaches which belongs to this category [32–35]. There are another class of solution approaches that uses optimization tools from soft computing and nature inspired techniques. We call such approaches as soft computing-based approaches. Plenty of approaches have been proposed which belongs to this category [36–38].

In past one decade, the problem of influence maximization has been studied in different variants. Nugyan et al. introduced the Budgeted Influence Maximization Problem where every node of the network is assigned with a selection cost and a fixed amount of budget has been allocated. This problem asks to choose a seed set such that the total selection cost of the seed set is less than or equal to the allocated budget. At the same time, the influence spread by the seed set is maximum among all the seed sets of the same budget. They proposed a $(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{e}})$ -factor approximation algorithm and a heuristic solution for this problem. Later, there are a few studies on this problem which includes a community-based solution approach proposed by Banerjee et al. [39], a bunch of heuristic solution proposed by Han et al. [40] and many more. Another kind of influence diffusion problem that has been studied is the Target Set Selection Problem and its different variants. In this problem, every node of the network is assigned with a positive number which we call as threshold and this value signifies that this node will be influenced once that many nodes among its neighbors are already influenced. There are many studies on this problem [41–44].

2.2 Regret Analysis in Computational Advertisement

To the best of our knowledge, there has been limited amount of literature available on the regret analysis in ‘computational advertisement’. The first study on this topic was done by Zhang et al. [19] who formulated the regret minimization problem in the context of billboard advertisement. They posed this problem as a discrete optimization problem and showed that this problem is NP-hard and hard to approximate beyond any constant factor. They also proposed several heuristic solution and experimented with benchmark datasets. Later on there are several studies on this problem by Ali et al. [45–47]. In [47], Ali et al. proposed a local search-based approach. In [45], Ali et al. studied the regret minimization problem in billboard advertisement under zonal influence constraint. They proposed a sampling-based approach to solve this problem.

However, to the best of our knowledge, the regret minimization problem has not been studied in the context of social media advertisement context. In this paper, we bridge this gap by studying the regret minimization problem in the context of social networks. Next, we proceed to describe the problem statement subsequently.

3 Background and Problem Definition

In this section, we describe the background information and defines our problem formally. Initially, we start by describing the notion of social network.

3.1 Social Network and Its Diffusion Phenomena

A *social network* is defined as an interconnected structure among a group of users and often represented by a simple, weighted, undirected graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$ where the set of users $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m\}$ constitute the vertex set \mathcal{V} . There is an edge between the user u_i and u_j , if u_i and u_j has social relationship. \mathcal{P} is the edge weight function that maps each edge to its corresponding influence probability, i.e, $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow (0, 1]$. For any edge $(u_i u_j)$, its influence probability is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(u_i, u_j)$ and defined as the probability by which the user u_i will be able to influence u_j . For any user u_i , the set of neighbors is denoted as $N(u_i)$ and defined as the set of users with which u_i is directly linked, i.e., $N(u_i) = \{u_j : (u_i u_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

One of the important phenomenon of social network is the diffusion of information which says that the users of a social network tend to share the information and in this way information propagates through the network and become viral. This phenomenon has been adopted by the commercial houses for promoting their brands and creating influence among its prospective customers. Several models have been introduced in the literature to study the diffusion process in a social network. One of the widely studied is the Independent Cascade Model which has been stated in Definition 1.

Definition 1 (Independent Cascade Model). [48] *In Independent Cascade Model, the rules for the diffusion are as follows:*

1. *The diffusion process starts from a set of initially active nodes (called seed nodes) information is diffused in discrete time stamps.*
2. *A node can be in either of two states: active (influenced) or inactive (non-influenced).*
3. *A node can change its state from inactive to active, but not vice versa.*
4. *The diffusion process stops when no more node activation is possible.*

3.2 Influence Maximization Problem

In general, the users of a social network is formed by rational and self interested human beings, and hence, they need to incentivize if they are chosen as seed nodes. This has been formalized as the cost function $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. For any user $u \in \mathcal{V}$, the selection cost of u is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(u)$. A fixed amount of budget \mathcal{B} is available. Now, given this information, the social influence maximization problem (cost version) is stated in Definition 2

Definition 2 (Influence Maximization Problem (cost version)). *Given a social network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, a cost function $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, and a budget \mathcal{B} , this problem asks to choose a subset of the users such that the total selection cost is less than the budget and the influence in the network is maximized. Mathematically, this problem can be expressed as a discrete optimization problem and written in Equation 1.*

$$S^{OPT} \leftarrow \underset{S \subseteq \mathcal{V} \text{ and } \mathcal{C}(S) \leq \mathcal{B}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \sigma(S) \quad (1)$$

Here, $\mathcal{C}(S)$ denotes the total selection cost of all the nodes in S , i.e., $\mathcal{C}(S) = \sum_{u \in S} \mathcal{C}(u)$. As mentioned in [22], this has been reported that this is a computationally hard problem to solve. The main result is reported in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Given a social network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, and two positive integers \mathcal{B} and ℓ , even if the selection cost of all the users is 1, still it is NP-complete to decide whether \mathcal{G} has an influence at least ℓ .*

3.3 Social Media Advertisement through External Agent

In recent times, several influence providers have emerged who conducts social media advertisement on a payment basis and the process goes in the following way. A commercial house approaches to an influence provider to obtain certain number of views of an advertisement content (e.g., video, animation etc.) on a payment basis. The payment rule is as follows: If the required or more influence is provided then the full payment will be made else a partial payment. Now, from the influence provider's point of view whether it provides more or less influence it is loss for them. Because, if it provides less influence then it will have the partial payment. On the other hand, if it provides more influence then the influence provider does not get any extra incentive for it. This loss has been mathematically formalized as regret. Depending upon the mentioned two cases, two different kinds of regret is possible:

- **Revenue Regret:** This kind of regret happens when the influence provider provides less influence compared to the influence demand. For any seed set S , the revenue regret associated with the seed set S is denoted by \mathcal{R}_r and can be defined using Equation 2.

$$\mathcal{R}_r(S_i) = \mathcal{B}_i \cdot (1 - \gamma \cdot \frac{I(S_i)}{\sigma_i}) + \delta \cdot |S_i| \quad (2)$$

- **Excessive Regret:** This kind of regret happens when the influence provider provides more influence than the required.

$$\mathcal{R}_e(S_i) = \mathcal{B}_i \cdot \frac{I(S_i) - I_i}{I_i} + \delta \cdot |S_i| \quad (3)$$

Regret Model.

Following the above, we formulate the regret model for the influence provider perspective to assign seed set S_i to the advertisers a_i and it is stated in Definition 3.

Definition 3 (The Regret Model). *Let, for the advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$, the allocated seed set is S_i and the regret associated with this allocation is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(S_i)$. This quantity can be defined by the following conditional equation:*

$$\mathcal{R}(S_i) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_i \cdot (1 - \gamma \cdot \frac{I(S_i)}{I_i}) + \delta \cdot |S_i|, & \text{if } a_i \cdot I_i > I(S_i) \\ \mathcal{B}_i \cdot \frac{I(S_i) - I_i}{I_i} + \delta \cdot |S_i|, & \text{if } a_i \cdot I_i < I(S_i) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Here, the fraction $\frac{I(S_i)}{I_i}$ is part of the satisfied influence for the advertiser a_i and γ is a parameter which is called as the penalty ratio due to the unsatisfied demand.

Note that in the regret model definition, we discriminate between small and large seed sets S_1 and S_2 with the same influence value with $|S_1| \ll |S_2|$ or $|S_1| \gg |S_2|$. In practice, achieving lower regret with fewer seed sets is desirable. We discourage using a larger seed set because it consumes a higher cost than the smaller one while both return the same amount of influence value. Hence, the parameter δ is there as cardinality penalty ratio.

3.4 Problem Definition

Now, we define our problem formally. Consider a set of ℓ advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\ell\}$ are approaching to an influence provider \mathcal{X} with their respective influence demand and corresponding budget. For the i -th advertiser a_i , we denote its corresponding influence demand and budget by σ_i and \mathcal{B}_i , respectively. This has been diagrammatically represented in Figure 1. The influence provider has the access of the social network \mathcal{G} and it returns the seed sets and their corresponding influence value to the respective advertiser. Here, the constraint is that for any pair of advertisers $a_i, a_j \in \mathcal{A}$, $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$. Consider, $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell\}$ is a selection of ℓ seed sets. Here, we define the notion of feasible selection in Definition 4.

Definition 4 (Feasible Selection). *Given a set of ℓ advertisers with their respective influence demand and budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^\ell$, an influence provider \mathcal{X} , a social network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, a selection $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell\}$ is said to be a feasible selection when for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, $\mathcal{C}(S_i) \leq \mathcal{B}_i$.*

For any problem instance, the set of all possible feasible selection is denoted by Σ . Now, for any selection Π , the regret associated with this is denoted by $\mathbb{Q}(\Pi)$ and stated in Definition 5.

Definition 5 (Regret Associated with a Selection). *Given a set of ℓ advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\ell\}$ with their respective influence demand and corresponding budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^\ell$, a social network \mathcal{G} , and a feasible selection $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell\} \in \Sigma$, the regret associated with the selection Π is denoted by $\mathbb{Q}(\Pi)$ and defined as the sum of the regret for each of the seed sets which has been written in Equation 4.*

$$\mathbb{Q}(\Pi) = \sum_{S \in \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell\}} \mathcal{R}(S) \quad (4)$$

Now, we formally define the Regret Minimization in Social Media Advertisement Problem in Definition 6.

Definition 6 (Regret Minimization in Social Media Advertisement Problem). *Given a set of ℓ advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\ell\}$ with their respective influence demand and corresponding budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^\ell$, and a social network \mathcal{G} , the Regret Minimization in*

Social Media Advertisement Problem (RMSMA Problem) asks to find out a selection that leads to the least regret for the influence provider. Mathematically, this problem can be posed as a discrete optimization problem and expressed in Equation 5.

$$\Pi^* \leftarrow \underset{\Pi \in \Sigma}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{R}(\Pi) \quad (5)$$

Here, Π^* denotes the optimal selection. From the computational point of view, this problem can be posed as follows:

RMSMA Problem

Input: Advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_\ell\}$, The Social Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, Influence Demand and Budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^\ell$.

Problem: Find out the seed sets and the expected influence $(S_i, I(S_i))_{i=1}^n$ such that for any $a_i, a_j \in \mathcal{A}$, $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$ and the regret as defined in Equation 4 is minimized.

Output: For all $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$, the corresponding Seed Set S_i and its expected influence $I(S_i)$.

The symbols and notations used in this paper has been mentioned in Table 1. Next, we proceed to describe the hardness result of the problem.

Table 1: Symbols and Notations with Their Interpretations

Notation	Description
$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$	The social network
\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}	Nodes and edges of \mathcal{G}
n, m	Number of nodes and edges of \mathcal{G}
\mathcal{P}	Edge weight function of \mathcal{G}
(u_i, u_j)	An arbitrary edge of \mathcal{G}
$Pr(u_i, u_j)$	Influence probability between users u_i and u_j
$N(u_i)$	Neighbor set of user u_i
\mathcal{A}	Set of advertisers
ℓ	Number of advertisers
S_i	Seed set for advertiser a_i
$I(S_i)$	Influence of seed set S_i
$\mathcal{R}(S_i)$	Regret for advertiser a_i with seed set S_i
$\mathcal{R}(u S_i)$	Marginal regret decrease for user u wrt S_i
σ_i	Influence demand of advertiser a_i
\mathcal{B}_i	Budget of advertiser a_i
$\mathcal{C}(u_i)$	Selection cost of user u_i
γ	Influence penalty ratio
δ	Cardinality penalty ratio
λ	Demand-supply ratio
ω	Average individual demand ratio
Π	Allocation of seed set to advertiser
k	Regret tolerance parameter
\mathbb{R}_0^+	Set of non-negative real numbers

4 Proposed Solution Approaches

In this section we describe the proposed solution approaches. Initially, we start by defining the notion of marginal decrease in regret which has been stated in Definition 7.

Definition 7 (Marginal Decrease in Regret). *Given a Social Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, for any advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ the corresponding seed set is S_i . The marginal decrease in regret for the user u with respect to the seed set S_i is denoted by $\mathcal{R}(u|S_i)$ and defined as the difference between the regret values when the user u has not been included and when not. Mathematically, this can be expressed in Equation*

$$\mathcal{R}(u|S_i) = \mathcal{R}(S_i) - \mathcal{R}(S_i \cup \{u\}) \quad (6)$$

4.1 Budget Effective Greedy (BG) Approach

On the basis of Definition 7 first we describe budget effective greedy approach. The idea for this approach is to select the nodes which are within the budget and also gives us the minimum regret. Hence, it is named Budget Effective Greedy Approach. Here we explain how this approach actually works and it is as follows.

Algorithm 1 is a heuristic greedy approach. In Line No. 1, we order all the advertisers based on the budget effectiveness i.e., budget over influence demand. We also initialize empty set \mathcal{Q} of seed sets for each advertiser (Line No. 2). Next, in Line No. 3 to 8 a greedy heuristic is employed to select seed nodes that can reduce the regret (i.e., maximizing $(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{Q}_i) - \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{Q}_i \cup \{u\})/\mathcal{I}(\{u\}))$) best to the advertisers. After all the advertisers are satisfied or influence provider runs out of seed nodes, Algorithm 1 will return seed nodes set \mathcal{Q} (Line No. 9).

Now, we analyze Algorithm 1 to understand its time and space requirement. For all the advertisers, computing their budget per unit influence will take $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Then sorting the advertisers based on this value will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. Hence, Line No. 1 will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time to execute. Line No. 2 is an assignment statement and it will take $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. The for loop at Line No. 3, will execute $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times. However, it is important to infer how many times the **while** loop in Line No. 4 will execute. We have inferred this in the following way. Consider \mathcal{C}_{min} denotes the minimum selection cost among all the users, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{min} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{C}(u)$. So, for the i -th advertiser in the worst case, the **while** loop can execute at most $\lceil \frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\mathcal{C}_{min}} \rceil$ times. Now, it can be observed that for any advertiser $a_j \in \mathcal{A}$, maximum number of times the **while** loop is executed is $\max_{a_j \in \mathcal{A}} \lceil \frac{\mathcal{B}_j}{\mathcal{C}_{min}} \rceil$. We call this quantity as x . Now, considering the fact that the diffusion is happening based on the IC Model, computing the element which reduces the regret the most can be found in $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \cdot (m + n))$ time. All the statements in Line No. 6, 7, and 8 will take $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time to execute where $x = \max_{a_j \in \mathcal{A}} \lceil \frac{\mathcal{B}_j}{\mathcal{C}_{min}} \rceil$. Hence, the total time requirement by Algorithm 1 will be of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n + x \cdot n^3 \cdot (m + n))$ and this reduces to $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^3 \cdot (m + n))$. The extra space consumed by Algorithm 1 to store the marginal gain of the users which will take $\mathcal{O}(n)$ in the worst case. Hence, Theorem 2 holds.

Theorem 2. *The running time and space requirement of Algorithm 1 will be of $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^3 \cdot (m + n))$ and $\mathcal{O}(n)$, respectively.*

Algorithm 1: Budget Effective Greedy Approach for the RMSMA Problem

Input : The Social Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, The Set of Advertisers
 $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l\}$, Their Influence Demand and Corresponding
Budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^l$
Result: An allocation Π

- 1 Order each advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ based on descending order of $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$;
- 2 Initialize $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_l\}$;
- 3 **for** $i = 1$ **to** l **do**
- 4 **while** $\mathcal{I}(S_i) < \sigma_i$ **and** $\mathcal{B}_i > 0$ **and** $|\mathcal{V}| \neq 0$ **do**
- 5 $u^* \leftarrow \underset{u \in \mathcal{V}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{\mathcal{R}(S_i) - \mathcal{R}(S_i \cup \{u\})}{\mathcal{I}(\{u\})}$; $S_i \leftarrow S_i \cup \{u^*\}$;
- 6 $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus \{u^*\}$; $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_i - \mathcal{C}(u^*)$;
- 7 **return** Π ;

4.2 Advertiser Elimination Approach (AEA)

Our second proposed approach is the Advertiser Elimination Approach for the RMSMA Problem which is a two step strategy. This approach is an improvised version of the Algorithm 1. In first step, The idea of this approach is that it allocates resources in a social network to meet advertisers' influence demands while respecting their budget constraints. After that if multiple advertisers remain undersatisfied, the algorithm strategically eliminates the least promising candidate based on a secondary budget-to-demand sorting, ensuring computational efficiency and a more focused allocation. That's why we call it Advertiser Elimination Approach. Ultimately, this approach balances influence maximization with cost constraints, yielding an allocation that strives to satisfy maximum advertisers within the available network resources. Technically, in this approach, first the advertisers are sorted in descending order based on the budget per unit influence demand value. Next, we initialize the seed set for all the advertisers. Now, for each advertiser, we perform the following task. Until the influence demand is satisfied, budget and non seed node is available, we keep on finding the node that leads to the maximum decrease in regret within the available budget. The node is added to the seed set of the corresponding advertiser and the selection cost of the node is subtracted from the available budget. Next, we count the number of advertiser and the set of advertisers whose influence demand has not been satisfied. If this number of unsatisfied advertisers is more than k (where k is the input parameter called regret tolerance) then the unsatisfied advertisers are sorted in ascending order based on the budget per unit influence demand value. In this sorted list, the first advertiser is one who expects more influence by spending less budget, and of course, making such advertisers satisfied does not make much sense. Hence, we remove the first advertiser

in the sorted list and the same process is repeated. Algorithm 2 describes the process in the form of pseudocode.

Algorithm 2: Advertiser Elimination Approach for the RMSMA Problem

Input : The Social Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, The Set of Advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l\}$, Their Influence Demand and Corresponding Budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^l$, Regret Tolerance parameter k

Result: An allocation Π

- 1 Order each advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ based on descending order of $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$;
- 2 Initialize $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_l\}, k$;
- 3 **while** *TRUE* **do**
- 4 **for** each $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**
- 5 **while** $\mathcal{I}(S_i) < \sigma_i$ and $\mathcal{B}_i > 0$ and $|\mathcal{V}| \neq 0$ **do**
- 6 $u^* \leftarrow \underset{u \in \mathcal{V}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \frac{\mathcal{R}(S_i) - \mathcal{R}(S_i \cup \{u\})}{\mathcal{I}(\{u\})}$; $S_i \leftarrow S_i \cup \{u^*\}$;
- 7 $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus \{u^*\}$; $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_i - \mathcal{C}(u^*)$;
- 8 $\text{count} = 0, \mathcal{A}_u = []$;
- 9 **for** each $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**
- 10 **if** $\mathcal{I}(S_i) < \sigma_i$ **then**
- 11 $\text{count} = \text{count} + 1$; $\mathcal{A}_u[\text{count}] \leftarrow a_i$;
- 12 **if** $\text{count} \geq k$ **then**
- 13 $\mathcal{A}_u \leftarrow$ sort each advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_u$ in ascending order of $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$;
- 14 $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_u[1]$
- 15 **return** Π ;

We analyze Algorithm 2 to understand its time and space requirement. As mentioned previously, execution of Line No. 1 will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. It is easy to observe that in the worst case, the **while** loop at Line No. 3 will execute $\mathcal{O}(n - k + 1)$ times. In worst case scenario when $k \ll n$ then it will run in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. As mentioned previously, similar to the Algorithm 1 Line No. 4 to 8 in the Algorithm 2 will take $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^3 \cdot (m + n))$ time. Next, in Line No. 9 initializing $\text{count}, \mathcal{A}_u$ will take time $\mathcal{O}(n)$ each and in Line No. 11 to 15 will take $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time to execute. Line No. 16 the **if** condition can be satisfies closer to n times in the worst case and in Line No. 17 sorting advertisers will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. So, Line No. 16 to 19 will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. Therefore, the total time taken by Algorithm 2 will be of $\mathcal{O}(n((x \cdot n^3 \cdot (m + n)) + n + (n \log n)))$ and this will be reduced to $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^4(m + n))$. The additional space requirement for Algorithm 2 will be of $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Hence, the following theorem statement holds.

Theorem 3. *The running time and space requirement of Algorithm 2 will be of $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^4(m + n))$ and $\mathcal{O}(n)$, respectively.*

4.3 Advertiser Driven Local Search (ADLS) Approach

Our third approach, the Advertiser Driven Local Search Approach for the RMSMA Problem is again a two step heuristic designed to efficiently allocate social network nodes to multiple advertisers while balancing their influence demands and budget constraints. In the initial step, advertisers are prioritized by their budget to influence demand ratios, and a greedy strategy is used to iteratively assign nodes each chosen to maximize the reduction in overall regret relative to the influence it provides until the advertiser’s influence requirement is met or budget exhausted. After this initial allocation, in second step the algorithm calculates a threshold based on the average regret and identifies advertisers whose regret exceeds this level. For these under satisfied advertisers, a localized reallocation is triggered, where the greedy process is reapplied using the remaining network nodes and updated budgets to further improve the allocation. This local search refinement helps enhance overall satisfaction, ensuring a more balanced and cost effective resource distribution across all advertisers. Hence, we call it an Advertiser Driven Local Search Approach.

Here we understand our third approach line by line as written in Algorithm 3. The first step will be to sort advertisers in decreasing order of their budget to demand ratio $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$ as done in our previous algorithms, Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2. This prioritizes advertisers with a higher “value for money” ensuring more efficient budget usage. Next, we will initialize allocation set for each advertiser as empty set and initialize the regret for all advertiser with the initial regret value. After all the initialization we will do the further exploration by iterating over each advertiser a_i . For each advertiser, repeatedly allocate nodes until the total influence $\mathcal{I}(S_i)$ of the nodes in S_i meets or exceeds the influence demand σ_i or the budget \mathcal{B}_i of the advertiser is exhausted or there are no remaining nodes in \mathcal{V} . Identify the node u^* from the remaining set \mathcal{V} that provides the highest marginal gain per unit of influence when added to S_i . The marginal gain is measured by the decrease in regret $\mathcal{R}(S_i)$ when u is added, divided by the influence $\mathcal{I}(u)$ provided by u . Once all the advertisers are processed we will have their allocated seed set, influence and regret. Thereafter, we compute the threshold τ as the average of all advertisers’ regret values. This threshold identifies advertisers with significantly higher regret. So, we identify advertisers whose regret exceeds the threshold τ . These advertisers are considered underperforming and require further attention. If there are any high-regret advertisers then we rerun the greedy allocation (Lines 5–11) for these advertisers. For allocating the seed set for these advertisers we will allocate the seed nodes from the remaining nodes of the previous run and the allocated nodes of the advertisers having regret higher than the threshold. The outcome of this will be the Π with the new allocations and hence, the final allocation Π for all advertisers.

We analyze Algorithm 3 to understand its time and space complexity. In Line No. 1, ordering all advertisers in decreasing manner on the basis of the ratio $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$ will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ time. The Line No. 2 will take $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time to execute. The Line No. 3 will execute $\mathcal{O}(n)$ times. The while loop in this algorithm will execute in $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^2(m+n))$ times which is same as discussed in Algorithm 1. In while loop $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time will be taken to execute Lines 6, 7 and 8 each. Hence, this part of the Algorithm 3 from Line No. 3 to 10 will take $\mathcal{O}(x \cdot n^3(m+n))$ time to execute. The mean calculation at the Line No. 11 will be in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. The time taken to identify the advertisers with the high regret

Algorithm 3: Advertiser Driven Local Search Approach for the RMSMA Problem

Input : The Social Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, The Set of Advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l\}$, Their Influence Demand and Corresponding Budget $(\sigma_i, \mathcal{B}_i)_{i=1}^l$

Output: An Allocation Π

- 1 Order each advertiser $a_i \in \mathcal{A}$ based on descending order of $\frac{\mathcal{B}_i}{\sigma_i}$;
- 2 Initialize $\Pi = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_l\}$;
- 3 **for** $i = 1$ **to** l **do**
- 4 **while** $\mathcal{I}(S_i) < \sigma_i$ **and** $\mathcal{B}_i > 0$ **and** $|\mathcal{V}| \neq 0$ **do**
- 5 $u^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\mathcal{R}(S_i) - \mathcal{R}(S_i \cup \{u\})}{\mathcal{I}(\{u\})}$;
- 6 $S_i \leftarrow S_i \cup \{u^*\}$;
- 7 $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus \{u^*\}$;
- 8 $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_i - \mathcal{C}(u^*)$;
- 9 Calculate the threshold τ as a function of average regret: $\tau \leftarrow \text{mean}(\mathcal{R})$;
- 10 Identify advertisers with high regret: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{high}} = \{a_i \in \mathcal{A} \mid r_i > \tau\}$;
- 11 **if** $\mathcal{A}_{\text{high}} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 12 **for** $i = 1$ **to** $|\mathcal{A}_{\text{high}}|$ **do**
- 13 Re-run the greedy algorithm (from Line 4 - 9) with the remaining nodes in \mathcal{V} and their allocated budgets \mathcal{B} respectively;
- 14 Update Π accordingly;
- 15 **return** Π ;

in Line No. 12 will be $O(n)$. The Line No. 13 will take $O(1)$ time for comparison. And afterwards, again we run the greedy method, so the same time $O(x \cdot n^2(m+n))$ will be taken from Line No. 15. Overall, from Line No. 13 to 18, it takes $O(x \cdot n^3(m+n))$. Hence, the total time requirement is $O(n \log n + x \cdot n^3(m+n) + x \cdot n^3(m+n))$ which finally reduces to $O(x \cdot n^3(m+n))$ time. The additional space requirement for Algorithm 3 will be of $O(n)$. Hence, Theorem 4 holds.

Theorem 4. *The running time and space requirement of Algorithm 3 will be of $O(x \cdot n^3(m+n))$ and $O(n)$, respectively.*

An Illustrative Example.

Consider an influence provider with a social network \mathcal{G} , contains 12 nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{12}\}$ with corresponding individual influence value and six advertisers $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_6\}$ with individual influence demands reported in Table 2a and 2b, respectively. So, the order of budget effective advertisers is $\langle a_2, a_1, a_4, a_3, a_5, a_6 \rangle$. In the seed node allotment of Algorithm 1 advertiser a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are fully satisfied with no excessive regret (ER) or unsatisfied regret (UR) however advertiser a_5 and a_6 not satisfied due to the seed node runs out i.e., $|\mathcal{S}| = \emptyset$ as shown in Table 2c. Next, when the social network and advertiser information shown in Table 2a and 2b used in Algorithm 2 by setting the regret tolerance parameter $k = 1$, advertiser a_6 is removed

from the advertiser set. The allocation of nodes is presented in Table 2d. The “ADLS” approach extends the “AEA” approach to minimize the regret further. Table 2e shows that the allocation from the “AEA” approach advertiser a_3, a_4, a_5 and a_6 are reallocated because these advertiser generate regrets. After reallocation, advertiser a_6 only generates regret, i.e., unsatisfied regret as presented in Table 2e. Hence, the “ADLS” approach minimize the regret better.

Table (2) Illustrative Example

\mathcal{V}	u_1	u_2	u_3	u_4	u_5	u_6	u_7	u_8	u_9	u_{10}	u_{11}	u_{12}
$\sigma(u_i)$	4	6	5	4	5	2	3	2	3	2	2	5
$Cost(u_i)$	\$6	\$9	\$7.5	\$6	\$7.5	\$3	\$4.5	\$3	\$4.5	\$3	\$3	\$7.5

(a) Nodes information.

\mathcal{A}	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6
σ_i	10	8	6	10	9	5
B_i	\$18	\$17	\$10	\$17	\$11	\$5

(b) Advertisers information.

\mathcal{A}	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6
\mathcal{S}	$\{u_3, u_{12}\}$	$\{u_2, u_6\}$	$\{u_4, u_7\}$	$\{u_1, u_5, u_8\}$	$\{u_9, u_{10}, u_{11}\}$	$\{\}$
Satisfied	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Regret	-	-	ER	ER	UR	UR

(c) Allotment after the “BG” approach.

\mathcal{A}	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5
\mathcal{S}	$\{u_3, u_{12}\}$	$\{u_2, u_6\}$	$\{u_4, u_7\}$	$\{u_1, u_5, u_8\}$	$\{u_9, u_{10}, u_{11}\}$
Satisfied	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Regret	-	-	ER	ER	UR

(d) Allotment after the “AEA” approach.

\mathcal{A}	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6
\mathcal{S}	$\{u_3, u_{12}\}$	$\{u_2, u_6\}$	$\{u_1, u_8\}$	$\{u_5, u_9, u_{10}\}$	$\{u_4, u_7, u_{11}\}$	$\{\}$
Satisfied	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Regret	-	-	-	-	-	UR

(e) Allotment after the “ADLS” approach.

5 Experimental Details

In this section, we describe the experimental evaluation of the proposed solution approach. Initially, we start by describing the datasets.

5.1 Dataset Description

Now, we describe the datasets that we have used in our experiments.

- **Congress-Twitter Dataset** [49]: This network represents the Twitter interaction network for the 117th United States Congress, both House of Representatives and Senate. The base data was collected via the Twitter’s API, then the empirical transmission probabilities were quantified according to the fraction of times one member retweeted, quote tweeted, replied to, or mentioned another member’s tweet.
- **Email-Eu-Core Dataset** [50] The network was generated using email data from a large European research institution. The information about all incoming and outgoing email between members of the research institution is anonymized by them. There is an edge (u, v) in the network if person u sent person v at least one email. The e-mails only represent communication between institution members (the core), and the dataset does not contain incoming messages from or outgoing messages to the rest of the world.
- **Facebook Dataset** [51]: This dataset consists of ‘circles’ (or ‘friends lists’) from Facebook. Facebook data was collected from survey participants using this Facebook app. The dataset includes node features (profiles), circles, and ego networks. However, in this study, we have not considered any node feature.
- **Wikipote Dataset** [52] The network contains all the Wikipedia voting data from the inception of Wikipedia till January 2008. Nodes in the network represent wikipedia users and a directed edge from node i to node j represents that user i voted on user j .

The basic statistics of the datasets has been mentioned in Table 3.

Dataset	Type	Number of Nodes $ \mathcal{V} $	Number of Edges $ \mathcal{E} $	Average Degree d_{avg}	Maximum Degree d_{max}
Congress-Twitter	Directed	475	13289	55.95	284
Email-Eu-Core	Directed	1005	25571	50.88	546
Facebook	Undirected	4039	88234	43.69	1045
Wikipote	Directed	7115	103689	29.15	1167

Table 3: Description of Graph Datasets

5.2 Experimental Setup

In our study, there are following parameters whose value need to be set up.

Influence Probability

In our experiments, we have used the following two influence probability set up: (i) Uniform and (ii) Trivalency. In Uniform probability setting, all the edges of the network will have the same probability value, i.e., for all $(u_i u_j) \in \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{P}(u_i, u_j) = p_c$. In this study, we have considered value of $p_c = 0.1$. In the Trivalency setting, the influence probability of each edge is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$.

Selection Cost of the Users

In this study, we have considered the *degree proportional cost setting*. This setting has also been considered [53]. This means that more the degree of an user, more costly the user is to select as seed node. The selection cost of any user u is defined as $\mathcal{C}(u) = h \cdot (|\mathcal{V}| / \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{deg}(v)) \cdot \text{deg}(u)$. Here, h is a constant and in our study we have considered the value of h is 1000.

The Number of Advertisers

We have considered the following values as the number of advertisers: 5, 10, 20, 50, and 100.

5.2.1 Key Parameters

All the key parameters are summarized in Table 4. This table includes the demand-supply ratio (λ), average individual demand ratio (ω), influence penalty ratio (γ), and cardinality penalty ratio (δ). In each experiment, we vary only one parameter and set the remaining parameter in the default setting (highlighted in bold).

Table 4: Key Parameters

Parameter	Values
λ	40%, 60%, 80%, 100% , 120%
ω	1%, 2%, 5% , 10%, 20%
γ	0, 0.25, 0.5 , 0.75, 1
δ	0.01 , 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05

Demand Supply Ratio λ

It refers to the ratio of global influence demand of the advertisers over the influence provider influence supply, i.e., $\lambda = \mathcal{I}^d / \mathcal{I}^s$, where $\mathcal{I}^d = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I}_i$ represent the global influence demand and $\mathcal{I}^s = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{I}(\{s\})$ is the influence provider supply. We have considered five values of λ , i.e., 40%, 60%, 80%, 100%, 120%, which denotes low, medium, high full, and excessive, respectively.

Average Individual Demand Ratio ω

It is the percentage of average individual demand of the advertisers over the influence provider supply i.e., $\omega = \mathcal{I}^{avg} / \mathcal{I}^s$, where $\mathcal{I}^{avg} = \mathcal{I}^d / |\mathcal{A}|$ is the average individual demand of the advertisers. This parameter is useful for simulating the individual demands of the advertiser.

Advertisers Demand \mathcal{I}

Once the \mathcal{I}^d is fixed, \mathcal{I}^{avg} can be easily computed i.e., $\mathcal{I}^{avg} = \omega \cdot \mathcal{I}^s$. Also, we can generate the influence demand of each advertiser using $\mathcal{I}^a = \lfloor \alpha \cdot \mathcal{I}^s \cdot \omega \rfloor$, where α is a factor randomly generated to simulate different demand setting.

Advertiser Payment \mathcal{B}

We set the payment of an advertiser as proportional to his influence demand, $\mathcal{B}^a = \lfloor \beta \cdot \mathcal{I}^a \rfloor$, where β is a parameter to simulate different payment.

Influence Penalty Ratio γ

This parameter decides the penalty imposed on the influence provider due to the influence supply to the advertisers. We vary γ from 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, where two extreme cases when $\gamma = 0$, the influence provider cannot receive any payment if the advertisers required influence is satisfied and when $\gamma = 1$, the influence provider can receive the same fraction of payment the fraction of influence he provides to the advertisers.

Cardinality Penalty Ratio δ

This parameter imposes a penalty if the influence provider provides less or more amount of influence to the advertiser based on the cardinality of the allocated seed set to the advertisers. We vary δ from 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05 to simulate different penalties imposed on the advertiser.

5.2.2 Other Setups

Environment Setup

All the codes are implemented in Python and executed on HPC cluster run under CentOS-7.8 (a specific version of Red Hat Enterprise Linux). The processor architecture of HPC cluster is for CPU node is Intel Xeon Gold 6248 with 32 GB memory.

Performance Metrics

The effectiveness metrics measure total regret, including unsatisfied and excessive regret. The efficiency metrics include the running time of the proposed approaches.

5.3 Baseline Methods

We compared our proposed approaches with the following baseline methods.

Random

In this baseline method we randomly select the nodes of the graph within the assigned payment \mathcal{B} .

Top-K

The top influential users are selected within the assigned payment \mathcal{B} .

5.4 Goals of the Experimentation

In this study, we have fixed the following research questions (RQ) and through our experimental study we have found out the explanations of these questions.

- RQ1: What will happen if we increase the global influence demand (\mathcal{I}^d) of the advertisers to low, normal, high, full and excessive.
- RQ2: Which kind of advertisers are more beneficial for the influence providers perspective. A small number of advertisers with high individual influence demand or large number of advertisers with small individual influence demand.
- RQ3: How the computational time varies when we vary λ, ω and γ for the proposed and baseline methods.

5.5 Experimental Results and Discussion

Now, we report the obtained results from our experiments and describe them in order to get the answers of the research questions.

5.5.1 Effectiveness Study

At first we evaluate how varying λ and ω impacts the total regret. This total regret includes unsatisfied and excessive regret and we report each of them separately in our experiments. The experiments for each datasets are conducted for two different probability settings, Uniform (0.1) and Trivalency. Now, to ease our discussion we consider four different cases for each dataset. We examine four distinct cases that represent different combinations of global (λ) and individual (ω) influence demands. In Case 1, both the global and individual influence demands are low, meaning the influence provider serves a large number of advertisers with modest requirements. Case 2 features low global but high individual influence demand, leading to fewer advertisers with significantly larger influence requirements and a unique interplay between excessive and unsatisfied regret. In Case 3, high global influence demand coupled with low individual influence demand creates a scenario where most advertisers receive sufficient influence, though the overall allocation efficiency varies. Finally, Case 4 considers the situation where both global and individual influence demands are high, resulting in a dynamic interplay: while increased individual influence demand can reduce excessive regret, it may also raise unsatisfied regret if advertiser requirements are not fully met. These cases provide a comprehensive framework for analyzing and comparing the performance of different allocation algorithms under diverse demand conditions.

Case 1: low λ , low ω

In Case 1, we consider scenarios where $\lambda \leq 60\%$ and $\omega \leq 30\%$, indicating that both the global and individual influence demands from advertisers are low. This implies that the influence provider serves a large number of advertisers with relatively low influence requirements. Since λ is small, the global influence demand remains significantly lower than the available supply. In both probability settings, we observe that as global influence demand increases, excessive regret also rises.

Now, firstly we analyse Uniform (0.1) probability setting results. In Email-Eu-Core dataset (Figures 2 (a) & (b) and 3 (a) & (b)), the best performing algorithm is “ADLS” with an average total regret of 2061.31. The “Top- K ” algorithm performs the worst, with 4695.14% higher regret than “ADLS”. “BG” and “AEA” perform relatively well but still show 16.01% and 25.04% higher regret than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset

(Figures 12 (a) & (b) and 13 (a) & (b)), the best performing algorithm is “ADLS” with an average total regret of 3563.17. The highest regret is from “Top- K ”, which is 15806.38% worse than “ADLS”. “BG” and “AEA” perform moderately but still show 24.20% and 24.20% higher regret than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 22 (a) & (b) and 23 (a) & (b)), “ADLS” achieved the lowest total regret across multiple instances. For example, in one instance (Figure 22 (a)), “ADLS” had a total regret of 2294.16, whereas “Random” and “Top- K ” had significantly higher values (222618.28 and 367158.72, respectively). This represents an improvement of over 98% compared to “Random”, proving “ADLS”’s effectiveness in minimizing regret. In Table 5, we observe Congress-Twitter dataset. In it “Random” and “Top- K ” algorithms consistently yield the highest regret across all scenarios. For instance, at $\lambda = 60\%$, $\omega = 10\%$, the regret for “Top- K ” is 29737.52, whereas “BG” achieves a significantly lower regret of 19828.20. The “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” algorithms consistently outperform “Random” and “Top- K ”, reducing regret by 20 – 75% in most cases.

Now we analyse Trivalency probability setting results of all datasets for this case. In Email-Eu-Core dataset (Figures 7 (a) & (b) and 8 (a) & (b)), the best performing algorithm is “ADLS” with an average total regret of 1920.50. The highest regret is from “Top- K ”, which is 779.16% worse than “ADLS”. “BG” and “AEA” perform moderately but still show approximately 65.16% higher regret than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 17 (a) & (b) and 18 (a) & (b)), the best performing algorithm is “ADLS” with an average total regret of 1998.71. The highest regret is from “Top- K ”, which is 10391.13% worse than “ADLS”. “BG” and “AEA” perform moderately but still show 38.53% and 38.53% higher regret than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset, in this case, the total regret is analyzed across different algorithms and shown in Figures 27 (a) & (b) and 28 (a) & (b). From the dataset results, the “ADLS” algorithm consistently achieves the lowest total regret compared to others. For example, in the Wikivote dataset, in percentage terms, “ADLS” achieves an improvement of approximately 10 – 25% compared to “BG” and “AEA”, making it the best performing algorithm in this case. In Table 6 for Congress-Twitter dataset, “BG” algorithm consistently achieves the lowest regret, followed closely by “AEA” and “ADLS”. In contrast, “Random” and “Top- K ” exhibit significantly higher regret, making them less effective choices. As λ increases, regret increases across all methods, but “BG” maintains its advantage, demonstrating superior optimization.

Case 2: Low λ , High ω

In Case 2, we consider scenarios where $\lambda \leq 60\%$ and $\omega \geq 50\%$. Here, the global demand remains low, but the individual influence demand is significantly higher. This implies that the influence provider serves a smaller number of advertisers with larger influence requirements. In both probability settings, we observe that as individual influence demand increases, the overall regret decreases. While global demand remains constant, the increasing individual demand leads to a reduction in excessive regret, thereby lowering total regret. However, we also notice the emergence of unsatisfied regret, indicating that some advertiser demands are not being fully met. Our algorithms—“BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS”—consistently outperform the baseline methods. Our observations under Uniform probability setting is as follows. In Email-Eu-Core

dataset (Figures 4 (a) & (b), 5 (a) & (b) and 6 (a) & (b)), “ADLS” remains the best with an average regret of 691.83. “BG” performs better than “Random” and “Top- K ” but is 0.06% worse than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm has the highest regret, performing 2347.09% worse than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 14 (a) & (b), 15 (a) & (b) and 16 (a) & (b)), “ADLS” is the best with an average regret of 1340.51. “BG” performs better than “Random” and “Top- K ” but is 5.26% worse than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm has significantly high regret, performing “5580.58%” worse than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 24 (a) & (b), 25 (a) & (b) and 26 (a) & (b)), for higher individual advertiser demand, “ADLS” still performed the best, with minimal regret values. For example, in one instance in Figure 24 (a), “ADLS” had a total regret of 15212.98, whereas “Random” had 37012.21, showing a decrease of approximately 58.9%. This consistent reduction highlights “ADLS”’s ability to manage higher advertiser demands effectively. In Congress dataset, from Table 5, we observe that “Random” and “Top- K ” continue to yield significantly higher regret compared to “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” in most instances. Among all methods, “BG” consistently achieves the lowest regret, making it the best-performing algorithm in this setting. At $\omega = 90\%$, regret is negligible across all methods, indicating efficient allocation at high influence demand.

These performance trends are consistent across all datasets under Trivalency probability settings. In Email-Eu-Core (Figures 9 (a) & (b), 10 (a) & (b) and 11 (a) & (b)), “ADLS” is the best with an average regret of 5741.57. “BG” performs better than “Random” and “Top- K ” but is 31.42% worse than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm has significantly high regret, performing 41.99% worse than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 19 (a) & (b), 20 (a) & (b) and 21 (a) & (b)), “ADLS” is the best with an average regret of 6485.85. “BG” performs better than “Random” and “Top- K ”. The “Random” algorithm has significantly high regret, performing 334.91% worse than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 29 (a) & (b), 30 (a) & (b) and 31 (a) & (b)), for advertisers with low global demand but high individual demand, the “ADLS” algorithm again reports the lowest regret. For Congress-Twitter dataset in Table 6, algorithms “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” perform better than “Random” and “Top- K ” in this setting. At $\omega = 90\%$, regret is minimal across all methods, indicating that higher individual influence demand leads to efficient allocation. Despite this, “Top- K ” and “Random” remain the worst-performing methods.

Case 3: High λ , Low ω

In Case 3, we consider scenarios where $\lambda \geq 80\%$ and $\omega \leq 30\%$. Here, the global demand is high, but the individual influence demand from advertisers remains low. As λ increases, the influence provider has access to the maximum or entire supply available to distribute among advertisers. Since ω is still low, it is expected that most or all advertisers can be provided with sufficient influence. Our observations indicate that as individual influence demand increases, regret decreases when the global influence demand remains constant. Conversely, when individual demand is held constant, increasing the global influence demand does not significantly impact regret, either positively or negatively. We will firstly understand the results from the Uniform probability setting. In Email-Eu-Core dataset (Figures 2 (c)-(e) and 3 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” continues

to outperform with the lowest regret of 1803.08. “BG” and “AEA” show moderate results but still have 13.33% and 12.83% higher regret than “ADLS”. “Top- K ” has the worst performance, with regret being 5667.82% higher than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 12 (c)-(e) and 13 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” continues to be the best with the lowest regret of 4537.30. “BG” and “AEA” show higher regret by 34.12% and 34.12% compared to “ADLS”. “Top- K ” has the worst performance, with regret being 11147.15% higher than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 22 (c)-(e) and 23 (c)-(e)), when global influence demand is high but individual demand is low, “ADLS” remained the best performing algorithm. A notable instance in Figure 22 (c) showed “ADLS” achieving a total regret of 3716.52, whereas “Random” and “Top- K ” had much higher values of 234796.95 and 314244.96, respectively. This represents a reduction of over 98% compared to “Random”, emphasizing “ADLS”’s efficiency. Both “Random” and “Top- K ” exhibit extremely high regret across all scenarios, making them unsuitable choices in Congress-Twitter dataset as listed in Table 5. For example, at $\lambda = 80\%$, $\omega = 10\%$, with $|A| = 100$, the regret for “Top- K ” is 49987.67, while “AEA” achieves a significantly lower regret of 29574.21. In most cases, “AEA” and “ADLS” outperform “BG” by 10 – 30%, demonstrating superior regret minimization.

Under the Trivalency probability setting, our proposed algorithms continue to perform better across all datasets, further validating their robustness in minimizing regret. To support our statement we see in Figures 7 (c)-(e) and 8 (c)-(e) of Email-Eu-Core dataset that “ADLS” continues to be the best with the lowest regret. “BG” and “AEA” show higher regret by maximum 85.22% compared to “ADLS”. “Top- K ” has the worst performance, with regret being 204.37% higher than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 17 (c)-(e) and 18 (c)-(e)), ADLS continues to be the best with the lowest average regret of 2237.80. “BG” and “AEA” show higher regret by 79.02% and 79.02% compared to “ADLS”. “Top- K ” has the worst performance, with regret being 7868.41% higher than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 27 (c)-(e) and 28 (c)-(e)) for advertisers with high global demand but low individual demand, “ADLS” remains the best performer. “Regret” values are the highest across all methods in Table 6 for Congress-Twitter dataset, suggesting that low individual influence demand (ω) results in inefficient allocation. The “BG” algorithm performs better than “Top- K ” and “Random”, but at $\lambda = 120\%$, regret reaches its peak across all methods, confirming that high global influence demand with low individual demand is problematic.

Case 4: High λ , High ω

In Case 4, we consider scenarios where $\lambda \geq 80\%$ and $\omega \geq 50\%$. Here, both global demand and individual influence demand are high. As the global demand λ increases, excessive regret decreases, but unsatisfied regret increases. Consequently, each unsatisfied advertiser contributes to a higher total regret. When individual demand increases while keeping the global influence demand constant, regret decreases. However, when global influence demand increases, regret also increases. This is because a higher global influence demand results in a proportional increase in individual influence demand, thereby contributing to higher regret. The results of Uniform probability setting are as follows. In Email-Eu-Core dataset (Figures 4 (c)-(e), 5 (c)-(e) and 6 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” achieves the lowest average regret at 7949.21. “BG” and “AEA” are significantly worse,

with regrets maximum to 4.43% higher than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm performs the worst again, with a regret 61.48% higher than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 14 (c)-(e), 15 (c)-(e) and 16 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” achieves the lowest average regret at 10556.87. “BG” and “AEA” perform significantly worse, with regrets 1.46% and 1.60% higher than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm is again the worst, with a regret that is 417.71% higher than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 24 (c)-(e), 25 (c)-(e) and 26 (c)-(e)), in the scenario where both global and individual influence demands are high, “ADLS” continued to outperform the other algorithms. In one case (Figure 26 (e)), it achieved a total regret of 210489.62, whereas “Random” had 210875.27, indicating an overall improvement. While the percentage difference is lower here, “ADLS” still maintains its superiority in regret minimization. In Congress-Twitter dataset, from the Table 5 we see that as ω increases from 50% to 70%, regret values drop significantly across all methods, indicating that higher individual influence demand leads to better optimization. For example, at $\omega = 50\%$, $\lambda = 80\%$, the regret values are as follows. “BG” has lowest regret of 612.18, “AEA” has 544.19, and “ADLS” has 183.18. While “ADLS” is not always the best, it achieves the lowest regret in certain instances, particularly when $\lambda = 80\%$, $\omega = 70\%$. “Top- K ” should be avoided, as it consistently exhibits the highest regret across all scenarios.

Our observation for Trivalency probability setting is as follows. For Email-Eu-Core dataset (Figures 9 (c)-(e), 10 (c)-(e) and 11 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” achieves the lowest average regret at 20015.18. “BG” and “AEA” perform significantly worse, with regrets 12.25% and 8.49% higher than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm is again the worst, with a regret that is 6.05% higher than “ADLS”. In Facebook dataset (Figures 19 (c)-(e), 20 (c)-(e) and 21 (c)-(e)), “ADLS” achieves the lowest average regret at 45297.33. “BG” and “AEA” perform significantly worse, with regrets 1.51% and 0.02% higher than “ADLS”. The “Random” algorithm is again the worst, with a regret that is 19.59% higher than “ADLS”. In Wikivote dataset (Figures 29 (c)-(e), 30 (c)-(e) and 31 (c)-(e)), when both global and individual demand are high, the results indicate that “ADLS” continues to be the optimal algorithm. For instance, in the Wikivote dataset, “ADLS” records a total regret of around 1294, while “BG” and “AEA” exceed 1500. The percentage difference highlights a 20 – 25% improvement, reinforcing the robustness of “ADLS” across different demand scenarios. In Trivalency probability setting, for Congress-Twitter dataset, regret values drop significantly as observed in Table 6, reinforcing the idea that higher ω leads to better optimization. The algorithms “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” perform similarly, with minimal differences in regret values. At $\omega = 70\%$, all methods converge to similar regret values, indicating diminishing returns of increasing individual demand. Despite the improvement in regret, “Top- K ” and “Random” remain the least effective choices.

Comprehensive Observation

In conclusion, our analysis across all four cases reveals that the performance of the evaluated algorithms is highly sensitive to the variations in global (λ) and individual (ω) influence demands. In scenarios with low λ and ω (Case 1), where the overall demand is modest, the “ADLS” algorithm consistently minimizes regret significantly better than alternatives such as “Top- K ” and “Random”, while “BG” and “AEA”

perform moderately well. When individual influence demand is high despite low global demand (Case 2), the overall regret decreases, yet unsatisfied advertiser demands emerge, with “ADLS” maintaining strong performance and “BG” often leading in specific instances. In cases where global demand is high but individual demand remains low (Case 3), the abundance of available influence results in lower regret levels, again favoring “ADLS”, while “BG” and “AEA” show competitive performance. Finally, when both global and individual demands are high (Case 4), although excessive regret decreases and unsatisfied regret becomes a concern, “ADLS” consistently achieves the lowest regret, and the performance gap between “ADLS” and the other methods narrows, with “BG” and “AEA” trailing only slightly in some settings. Overall, these findings underscore the robustness of the “ADLS” algorithm in efficiently allocating influence across diverse demand scenarios, while simpler approaches such as “Top- K ” and “Random” prove to be considerably less effective.




Fig. 2: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 3: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 4: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 5: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 6: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)

Excessive Regret █ Unsatisfied Regret █




Fig. 7: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100$, $p_c : Trivalency$)




Fig. 8: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50$, $p_c : Trivalency$)




Fig. 9: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$, $p_c : Trivalency$)




Fig. 10: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, $p_c : Trivalency$)




Fig. 11: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Email-Eu-Core, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5$, $p_c : Trivalency$)

Excessive Regret █ Unsatisfied Regret █




Fig. 12: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 13: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 14: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 15: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 16: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5$, $p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)

Excessive Regret █ Unsatisfied Regret █




Fig. 17: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 18: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 19: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 20: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 21: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Facebook, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)

Excessive Regret █ Unsatisfied Regret █




Fig. 22: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100, p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 23: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50, p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 24: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20, p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 25: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10, p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)




Fig. 26: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5, p_c : Uniform(0.1)$)

Excessive Regret █ Unsatisfied Regret █




Fig. 27: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 10\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 100$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 28: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 30\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 50$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 29: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 50\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 20$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 30: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 70\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 10$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 31: Regret of varying the demand-supply ratio λ when $\omega = 90\%$ (Wikivote, $|\mathcal{A}| = 5$, $p_c : \text{Trivalency}$)




Fig. 32: Efficiency Study Uniform (0.1) Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)




Fig. 33: Efficiency Study for Trivalency Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)




Fig. 34: Efficiency Study Uniform (0.1) Probability Setting (Facebook)




Fig. 35: Efficiency Study for Trivalency Probability Setting (Facebook)





Fig. 36: Efficiency Study Uniform (0.1) Probability Setting (Wikivote)




Fig. 37: Efficiency Study for Trivalency Probability Setting (Wikivote)




Fig. 38: Parameter Study for γ ($|\mathcal{A}| = 20$) Uniform(0.1) Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)




Fig. 39: Parameter Study for γ ($|\mathcal{A}| = 20$) Trivalency Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)




Fig. 40: Parameter Study for δ ($|\mathcal{A}| = 20$) Uniform(0.1) Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)




Fig. 41: Parameter Study for δ ($|\mathcal{A}| = 20$) Trivalency Probability Setting (Email-Eu-Core)

Table 5: Congress-Twitter dataset Regret Values for Uniform (0.1) probability setting

Parameters			Total Regret [Uniform(0.1)]				
λ (%)	ω (%)	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	10	100	13376.81	13291.20	12585.92	12233.51	12385.94
60	10	100	25391.24	29737.52	19828.20	20616.84	20321.09
80	10	100	40645.32	49987.67	29950.00	29574.21	30191.59
100	10	100	48480.66	62314.09	34377.04	32877.58	32745.78
120	10	100	48100.90	62781.68	32706.01	33093.89	32975.50
40	30	50	29930.27	35879.33	14809.39	15269.76	15060.02
60	30	50	30837.08	36511.97	11417.71	11343.79	11059.94
80	30	50	31338.21	34550.39	7838.85	7446.80	8054.58
100	30	50	31674.46	33847.93	6234.60	5960.76	5731.31
120	30	50	26419.24	28204.20	2351.29	2242.49	2311.27
40	50	20	13943.05	15392.76	3104.46	2228.51	2130.25
60	50	20	12498.76	13435.49	1231.86	871.70	1299.96
80	50	20	9665.56	9815.74	612.18	544.19	183.18
100	50	20	5763.34	5944.84	292.41	391.36	330.03
120	50	20	6850.75	7004.29	2485.93	2550.49	2366.90
40	70	10	7420.95	7627.62	615.99	349.83	424.97
60	70	10	4478.94	4479.50	264.57	388.92	102.01
80	70	10	3349.17	3428.69	109.65	544.19	86.99
100	70	10	2486.22	2469.15	1143.57	1179.31	1209.06
120	70	10	4553.62	4552.75	3451.22	3453.11	3464.08
40	90	5	103.92	2270.01	103.92	205.75	140.66
60	90	5	1459.10	1437.23	76.28	95.48	80.89
80	90	5	1249.21	1271.37	113.75	30.89	18.53
100	90	5	4517.31	4519.45	4202.07	4215.36	4158.72
120	90	5	4280.22	4297.56	4256.82	4258.16	4252.55

Table 6: Congress-Twitter dataset Regret Values for Trivalency probability setting

Parameters			Total Regret [Trivalency]				
λ (%)	ω (%)	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	10	100	5408.10	5392.73	5341.50	5212.88	5333.35
60	10	100	7625.98	7505.07	7529.86	7348.92	7533.65
80	10	100	10822.32	10296.99	10307.54	10187.87	10360.18
100	10	100	13672.16	13205.79	13174.69	13180.11	13144.07
120	10	100	14720.62	13965.16	14134.05	14074.29	14085.10
40	30	50	7627.89	7202.01	7366.88	7272.52	7244.92
60	30	50	11601.32	11078.86	11139.29	11223.31	11166.68
80	30	50	16490.07	16026.52	15949.91	16035.33	15907.54
100	30	50	19289.97	18549.26	18655.92	18655.25	18786.29
120	30	50	24352.64	23760.72	23720.73	23646.37	23630.90

Parameters			Total Regret [Trivalency]				
λ (%)	ω (%)	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	50	20	5370.53	5108.19	5142.21	5111.93	5205.76
60	50	20	7517.58	7244.32	7336.24	7354.96	7388.99
80	50	20	11010.57	10853.53	10830.52	10751.62	10696.79
100	50	20	13254.92	13146.44	13100.62	13170.93	13053.65
120	50	20	15965.48	15828.96	15746.81	15611.16	15652.43
40	70	10	3601.80	3385.32	3504.88	3518.55	3569.36
60	70	10	6456.80	6325.75	6274.40	6361.20	6385.23
80	70	10	6772.42	6674.18	6675.38	6657.01	6643.59
100	70	10	8989.62	8774.30	8790.65	8757.08	8729.84
120	70	10	9706.76	9535.63	9524.20	9490.06	9555.73
40	90	5	2106.98	1998.88	2063.29	2027.96	2052.88
60	90	5	3427.91	3362.02	3427.96	3396.55	3398.36
80	90	5	3075.56	3022.17	3010.51	3013.27	2994.31
100	90	5	7639.66	7565.15	7497.26	7565.56	7507.93
120	90	5	6199.22	6132.95	6061.32	6127.57	6086.78

Table 7: Congress-Twitter dataset Execution Time for Uniform (0.1) probability setting

Parameters			Execution Time (in seconds) [Uniform(0.1)]				
λ (%)	ω (%)	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	10	100	56.700	58.294	21.560	617.561	42.581
60	10	100	59.154	57.799	27.865	410.538	50.779
80	10	100	59.630	59.489	36.364	217.782	65.914
100	10	100	60.598	55.892	41.825	120.250	79.034
120	10	100	59.907	60.782	43.828	96.583	73.505
40	30	50	28.110	28.026	26.351	26.746	48.043
60	30	50	29.416	28.035	36.856	37.348	67.160
80	30	50	30.369	28.308	46.156	46.348	73.318
100	30	50	30.636	30.306	52.008	49.424	81.446
120	30	50	28.198	28.068	54.379	53.014	84.192
40	50	20	12.615	11.962	18.744	18.006	32.183
60	50	20	11.947	11.520	21.731	21.294	37.474
80	50	20	11.387	11.236	23.005	23.528	37.381
100	50	20	11.577	11.266	24.025	24.708	45.604
120	50	20	12.357	11.694	40.065	61.440	66.244
40	70	10	5.920	5.541	11.663	11.136	20.477
60	70	10	6.059	5.343	12.429	13.122	21.577
80	70	10	6.124	5.913	12.646	23.528	21.289
100	70	10	5.974	5.929	21.483	22.676	36.107
120	70	10	5.945	5.798	33.944	61.832	61.117

Parameters			Execution Time (in seconds) [Uniform(0.1)]				
$\lambda(\%)$	$\omega(\%)$	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	90	5	6.076	2.894	6.076	6.377	11.728
60	90	5	3.307	2.853	6.843	7.212	11.962
80	90	5	3.012	2.800	6.304	8.973	11.807
100	90	5	3.082	2.634	28.086	26.290	61.309
120	90	5	2.985	2.862	35.007	83.346	71.825

Table 8: Congress-Twitter dataset Execution Time for Trivalency probability setting

Parameters			Execution Time (in seconds) [Trivalency]				
$\lambda(\%)$	$\omega(\%)$	$ A $	Random	Top-K	BG	AEA	ADLC
40	10	100	53.777	54.330	20.077	1138.233	42.125
60	10	100	55.575	53.374	24.601	1589.903	43.460
80	10	100	56.355	54.696	28.813	2028.303	56.383
100	10	100	56.469	52.144	36.997	2276.420	75.952
120	10	100	55.759	55.878	38.417	2375.799	77.629
40	30	50	26.555	26.205	23.594	737.068	46.575
60	30	50	27.850	26.171	37.201	1115.152	74.822
80	30	50	28.025	26.693	53.038	1558.651	100.934
100	30	50	27.678	28.107	60.515	1820.305	126.381
120	30	50	26.191	26.370	70.493	2206.092	144.770
40	50	20	11.496	11.051	20.936	236.706	40.878
60	50	20	10.717	11.020	27.708	334.341	57.799
80	50	20	10.750	10.504	38.430	482.269	79.048
100	50	20	10.784	10.693	45.404	570.981	97.108
120	50	20	11.047	11.111	53.045	637.845	110.611
40	70	10	5.418	5.334	15.222	90.399	31.693
60	70	10	5.601	5.076	27.653	152.869	54.503
80	70	10	5.453	5.482	26.960	159.808	54.537
100	70	10	5.253	5.587	33.953	197.508	68.735
120	70	10	5.408	5.305	41.818	215.469	68.627
40	90	5	2.911	3.116	8.624	23.895	20.076
60	90	5	2.992	2.877	16.033	36.620	30.203
80	90	5	2.995	4.058	12.650	37.197	28.992
100	90	5	3.002	3.007	31.186	76.602	67.955
120	90	5	3.147	2.914	25.742	66.259	48.551

5.5.2 Efficiency Study

This section analyzes the execution time performance of various algorithms, “Top- K ”, “Random”, “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS”— across multiple datasets under both Uniform and Trivalency influence probability settings. The evaluation considers the effects of parameters ω (individual influence demand) and λ (global influence demand) on

computational efficiency. The execution time under Uniform (0.1) probability setting is observed as follows. In Figures 32, for the Email-Eu-Core dataset, as ω increases, execution times decrease for all methods. The “Top- K ” algorithm is the fastest across all settings, followed closely by “Random”. The algorithms “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” exhibit significantly higher execution times, particularly at low ω values. Among these, “ADLS” is generally the slowest algorithm, with execution times up to 292% longer than “Random” at $\omega = 10\%$. The “BG” algorithm is also slower than “Random”, with execution times ranging from 50% to 150% higher. Both “AEA” and “ADLS” show extreme delays, particularly under high λ and low ω conditions. For instance, at $\omega = 50\%$ and $\lambda = 100\%$, the execution time of “AEA” reaches 1002 seconds, exceeding that of “Random” by more than 1000%. Similarly, “ADLS” is over 500% slower than “Random” in several cases. In Figures 34, for the Facebook dataset, across all methods, execution times decrease as ω increases, indicating that as individual influence demand grows, computations become less intensive. The “Top- K ” algorithm consistently achieves the lowest execution times, followed closely by “Random”. Conversely, “ADLS” consistently exhibits the highest execution times, particularly at low ω values, where it is up to 292% slower than “Random”. The “BG” algorithm is generally 50% to 150% slower than “Random”. Both “AEA” and “ADLS” experience extreme delays, especially when λ is high and ω is low. The “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” algorithms incur significantly higher computation times, with “ADLS” reaching 17753 seconds at $\lambda = 120\%$, which is over 57 times slower than “Random” (310.67 seconds). For the Wikivote dataset, in Figure 36, the “Top- K ” and “Random” algorithms are the fastest across all settings. In contrast, “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” exhibit significant increases in execution time, particularly at low ω values. Among all methods, “AEA” is the slowest overall, especially when λ is high. Execution times decrease as ω increases, indicating that higher ω leads to more efficient computations. At low values of $\omega = 10\%$ and $\omega = 30\%$, execution times remain significantly high across all algorithms. For instance, at $\omega = 10\%$ and $\lambda = 120\%$, the execution times are “BG”: ~ 11288 seconds, “AEA”: ~ 11288 seconds, and “ADLS”: ~ 14600 seconds (extremely slow). At $\omega = 30\%$ and $\lambda = 120\%$, “AEA” reaches an enormous execution time of 712164 seconds. Conversely, at high values of $\omega = 70\%$ and $\omega = 90\%$, execution times drop significantly. At $\omega = 90\%$ and $\lambda = 120\%$, the execution times are “Random”: ~ 21 seconds, “Top- K ”: ~ 18 seconds, “BG”: ~ 9993 seconds, “AEA”: ~ 21387 seconds, and “ADLS”: ~ 17351 seconds. These results suggest that higher values of ω significantly reduce computational overhead. From Table 7, for Congress-Twitter dataset we analyze that “ADLS” performs better than “AEA” but worse than “BG”, “Top- K ”, and “Random”. The “Top- K ” algorithm is slightly faster than “Random” at high ω values.

We also observe the performance of all algorithms for all datasets under the Trivalency probability setting. From Figures 33, our observations for the Email-Eu-Core dataset are as follows. The “Random” and “Top- K ” algorithms perform best. In contrast, “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” scale poorly as λ increases. “AEA” exhibits extremely high execution times for large λ values, making it highly inefficient. From Figures 35, for the Facebook dataset, we observe that the algorithms “BG”, “AEA”, and “ADLS” experience significant increases in execution time for high λ . Among

them, “AEA” has the worst performance, particularly at low ω . Execution times are higher across all algorithms compared to other datasets in the Wikivote dataset, as shown in Figure 37. “AEA” incurs extreme computation times, rendering it highly inefficient. “ADLS” also suffers from large execution times, although it performs slightly better than “AEA”. From Table 8, for the Congress-Twitter dataset, our observations indicate that “ADLS” is slower than “BG”, “Random”, and “Top- K ”, but much faster than “AEA”. “Random” and “Top- K ” have similar performance, with “Random” being slightly faster at high ω .

In general, “Top- K ” and “Random” are the fastest methods, while “AEA” and “ADLS” exhibit significantly higher execution times, especially under low ω and high λ conditions. The results highlight the computational challenges faced by more sophisticated algorithms like “AEA” and “ADLS”, particularly in large-scale or high-demand scenarios.

5.5.3 Other Parameter Study

The additional parameters we have used in our experiments are γ and δ . First we discuss the effect of γ in our experiment. We have taken five different values of this parameter. From the Figures 38 and 39, we see that as γ increases, the total regret for all algorithms decreases. In the Figure 38 (a), when $\gamma = 0$, that means there is no penalty on the provided influence. In this situation the regret is highest as the full budget contribute to the regret. On the other hand, when $\gamma = 1$, the total regret is lowest, which means that the influence provider receives a payment proportional to the ratio of the influence it provided. The other parameter we have considered is δ , for its five different values. In the Figures 40 and 41, the effect of increasing the value of δ is nearly same. There is no significant increase or decrease with these values of δ . Another parameter which is already discussed is the influence probability setting. We have used Uniform (0.1) and Trivalency influence probability settings for our experiments on all datasets. Our approach “ADLS” dominates across all cases in both probability settings giving lower regrets. The only difference is between the two probability settings is that under Uniform, the regret values are generally higher than that of Trivalency.

6 Concluding Remarks and Future Research Directions

In this paper we have studied the Regret Minimization in Social Media Advertisement Problem and posed this problem as a discrete optimization problem. We have shown that this problem is computationally hard and also hard to approximate within a constant factor. We have proposed three efficient heuristic solution approaches with a detailed complexity analysis. The proposed methodologies have been elaborated on with an example. A number of experiments have been conducted to show the effectiveness and efficiency of all the algorithms. From the reported results, it has been observed that the proposed solution approaches lead to much less regret compared to the baseline methods. “ADLS” consistently performs best in minimizing regret, making it the optimal choice for advertiser allocation under different probability settings.

“BG” and “AEA” are competitive but fail in high demand scenarios where “ADLS” excels. “Random” and “Top- K ” methods are ineffective, leading to significantly higher total regret. Now, this study can be extended in the following directions. More efficient solution methodologies are of thrust. Also, a new regret model may be proposed, which will capture the loss in a much better way. The scalable algorithms for regret minimization in large-scale online social networks are to be designed.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Jammu, India, with grant number SG100047, for providing the funds required for the project.

References

- [1] Wasserman, S.: Social network analysis: Methods and applications. Cambridge University Press google schola **2**, 131–134 (1994)
- [2] Chunaev, P.: Community detection in node-attributed social networks: a survey. Computer Science Review **37**, 100286 (2020)
- [3] Papadopoulos, S., Kompatsiaris, Y., Vakali, A., Spyridonos, P.: Community detection in social media: Performance and application considerations. Data mining and knowledge discovery **24**, 515–554 (2012)
- [4] Javed, M.A., Younis, M.S., Latif, S., Qadir, J., Baig, A.: Community detection in networks: A multidisciplinary review. Journal of Network and Computer Applications **108**, 87–111 (2018)
- [5] Kimura, M., Saito, K.: Tractable models for information diffusion in social networks. In: European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, pp. 259–271 (2006). Springer
- [6] Bakshy, E., Rosenn, I., Marlow, C., Adamic, L.: The role of social networks in information diffusion. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on World Wide Web, pp. 519–528 (2012)
- [7] Li, Y., Fan, J., Wang, Y., Tan, K.-L.: Influence maximization on social graphs: A survey. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering **30**(10), 1852–1872 (2018)
- [8] Azaouzi, M., Mnasri, W., Romdhane, L.B.: New trends in influence maximization models. Computer Science Review **40**, 100393 (2021)
- [9] Banerjee, S., Jenamani, M., Pratihar, D.K.: A survey on influence maximization in a social network. Knowledge and Information Systems **62**, 3417–3455 (2020)

- [10] Das, A., Gollapudi, S., Munagala, K.: Modeling opinion dynamics in social networks. In: Proceedings of the 7th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pp. 403–412 (2014)
- [11] De, A., Valera, I., Ganguly, N., Bhattacharya, S., Gomez Rodriguez, M.: Learning and forecasting opinion dynamics in social networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **29** (2016)
- [12] Richardson, M., Domingos, P.: Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In: Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pp. 61–70 (2002)
- [13] Domingos, P., Richardson, M.: Mining the network value of customers. In: Proceedings of the Seventh ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pp. 57–66 (2001)
- [14] Liang, Z., He, Q., Du, H., Xu, W.: Targeted influence maximization in competitive social networks. *Information Sciences* **619**, 390–405 (2023)
- [15] Chen, W., Lin, T., Tan, Z., Zhao, M., Zhou, X.: Robust influence maximization. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pp. 795–804 (2016)
- [16] Chen, W., Collins, A., Cummings, R., Ke, T., Liu, Z., Rincon, D., Sun, X., Wang, Y., Wei, W., Yuan, Y.: Influence maximization in social networks when negative opinions may emerge and propagate. In: Proceedings of the 2011 Siam International Conference on Data Mining, pp. 379–390 (2011). SIAM
- [17] Peng, B.: Dynamic influence maximization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34**, 10718–10731 (2021)
- [18] Cautis, B., Maniu, S., Tziortziotis, N.: Adaptive influence maximization. In: Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, pp. 3185–3186 (2019)
- [19] Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Bao, Z., Zheng, B., Jagadish, H.: Minimizing the regret of an influence provider. In: Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data, pp. 2115–2127 (2021)
- [20] Ali, D., Bhagat, A.K., Banerjee, S., Prasad, Y.: Efficient algorithms for regret minimization in billboard advertisement (student abstract). In: Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, vol. 37, pp. 16148–16149 (2023)
- [21] Ali, D., Banerjee, S., Prasad, Y.: Toward regret-free slot allocation in billboard advertisement. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 1–25 (2024)
- [22] Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., Tardos, E.: Maximizing the spread of influence through

- a social network. In: Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '03, pp. 137–146. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1145/956750.956769> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/956750.956769>
- [23] Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., Tardos, É.: Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks. In: Caires, L., Italiano, G.F., Monteiro, L., Palamidessi, C., Yung, M. (eds.) Automata, Languages and Programming, pp. 1127–1138. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2005)
- [24] Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J.M., Tardos, É.: Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. *Theory Comput.* **11**, 105–147 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.4086/TOC.2015.V011A004>
- [25] Leskovec, J., Krause, A., Guestrin, C., Faloutsos, C., VanBriesen, J., Glance, N.: Cost-effective outbreak detection in networks. In: Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '07, pp. 420–429. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1281192.1281239> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/1281192.1281239>
- [26] Borgs, C., Brautbar, M., Chayes, J., Lucier, B.: Maximizing Social Influence in Nearly Optimal Time, pp. 946–957. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973402.70> . <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9781611973402.70>
- [27] Tang, Y., Xiao, X., Shi, Y.: Influence maximization: near-optimal time complexity meets practical efficiency. In: Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data. SIGMOD '14, pp. 75–86. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2588555.2593670> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/2588555.2593670>
- [28] Tang, Y., Shi, Y., Xiao, X.: Influence maximization in near-linear time: A martingale approach. In: Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data. SIGMOD '15, pp. 1539–1554. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2723372.2723734> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/2723372.2723734>
- [29] Jung, K., Heo, W., Chen, W.: Irie: Scalable and robust influence maximization in social networks. In: 2012 IEEE 12th International Conference on Data Mining, pp. 918–923 (2012). IEEE
- [30] Cheng, S., Shen, H., Huang, J., Zhang, G., Cheng, X.: Staticgreedy: solving the scalability-accuracy dilemma in influence maximization. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management, pp. 509–518 (2013)

- [31] Cheng, S., Shen, H., Huang, J., Chen, W., Cheng, X.: Imrank: influence maximization via finding self-consistent ranking. In: Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, pp. 475–484 (2014)
- [32] Chen, Y.-C., Zhu, W.-Y., Peng, W.-C., Lee, W.-C., Lee, S.-Y.: Cim: Community-based influence maximization in social networks. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* **5**(2), 1–31 (2014)
- [33] Bozorgi, A., Haghighi, H., Zahedi, M.S., Rezvani, M.: Incim: A community-based algorithm for influence maximization problem under the linear threshold model. *Information Processing & Management* **52**(6), 1188–1199 (2016)
- [34] Shang, J., Zhou, S., Li, X., Liu, L., Wu, H.: Cofim: A community-based framework for influence maximization on large-scale networks. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **117**, 88–100 (2017)
- [35] Bozorgi, A., Samet, S., Kwisthout, J., Wareham, T.: Community-based influence maximization in social networks under a competitive linear threshold model. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **134**, 149–158 (2017)
- [36] Gong, M., Yan, J., Shen, B., Ma, L., Cai, Q.: Influence maximization in social networks based on discrete particle swarm optimization. *Information Sciences* **367**, 600–614 (2016)
- [37] ŞİMŞEK, A., Resul, K.: Using swarm intelligence algorithms to detect influential individuals for influence maximization in social networks. *Expert Systems with Applications* **114**, 224–236 (2018)
- [38] Bucur, D., Iacca, G.: Influence maximization in social networks with genetic algorithms. In: Applications of Evolutionary Computation: 19th European Conference, EvoApplications 2016, Porto, Portugal, March 30–April 1, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 19, pp. 379–392 (2016). Springer
- [39] Banerjee, S., Jenamani, M., Pratihari, D.K.: Combim: A community-based solution approach for the budgeted influence maximization problem. *Expert Systems with Applications* **125**, 1–13 (2019)
- [40] Han, S., Zhuang, F., He, Q., Shi, Z.: Balanced seed selection for budgeted influence maximization in social networks. In: Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining: 18th Pacific-Asia Conference, PAKDD 2014, Tainan, Taiwan, May 13–16, 2014. Proceedings, Part I 18, pp. 65–77 (2014). Springer
- [41] Raghavan, S., Zhang, R.: A branch-and-cut approach for the weighted target set selection problem on social networks. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization* **1**(4), 304–322 (2019)

- [42] Cicalese, F., Cordasco, G., Gargano, L., Milanič, M., Vaccaro, U.: Latency-bounded target set selection in social networks. *Theoretical Computer Science* **535**, 1–15 (2014)
- [43] Chu, H., Lin, B.: Fpt approximation using treewidth: Capacitated vertex cover, target set selection and vector dominating set. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11944 (2023)
- [44] Hartmann, T.A.: Target set selection parameterized by clique-width and maximum threshold. In: *SOFSEM 2018: Theory and Practice of Computer Science: 44th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science, Krems, Austria, January 29-February 2, 2018, Proceedings 44*, pp. 137–149 (2018). Springer
- [45] Ali, D., Banerjee, S., Prasad, Y.: Regret minimization in billboard advertisement under zonal influence constraint. In: *Proceedings of the 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing. SAC '24*, pp. 329–336. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636052> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636052>
- [46] Ali, D., Banerjee, S., Prasad, Y.: Towards regret free slot allocation in billboard advertisement. *CoRR* **abs/2401.16464** (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.16464> [2401.16464](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.16464)
- [47] Ali, D., Bhagat, A.K., Banerjee, S., Prasad, Y.: Efficient algorithms for regret minimization in billboard advertisement (student abstract). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* **37**(13), 16148–16149 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i13.26934>
- [48] Wang, C., Chen, W., Wang, Y.: Scalable influence maximization for independent cascade model in large-scale social networks. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **25**, 545–576 (2012)
- [49] Fink, C.G., Omodt, N., Zinnecker, S., Sprint, G.: A congressional twitter network dataset quantifying pairwise probability of influence. *Data in Brief* (2023)
- [50] Yin, H., Benson, A.R., Leskovec, J., Gleich, D.F.: Local higher-order graph clustering. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. KDD '17*, pp. 555–564. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097983.3098069> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097983.3098069>
- [51] Leskovec, J., Mcauley, J.: Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **25** (2012)
- [52] Leskovec, J., Huttenlocher, D., Kleinberg, J.: Predicting positive and negative links in online social networks. In: *Proceedings of the 19th International*

Conference on World Wide Web. WWW '10, pp. 641–650. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772756> . <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772756>

- [53] Nguyen, H.T., Thai, M.T., Dinh, T.N.: A billion-scale approximation algorithm for maximizing benefit in viral marketing. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* **25**(4), 2419–2429 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2017.2691544>