Social and Information Networks Tutorial #8: Influence Spread

University of Toronto CSC303 Winter/Spring 2021 lan Berlot-Attwell

Week 9: Mar 15-19 (2021)

Today's agenda

In lecture we've covered Influence maximization under the linear threshold and independent cascade influence models

Today:

- Questions from Lecture
- A more general model of influence spread
- Non-progressive influence maximization
- Quercus Quiz

Questions?



Influence Models: Linear Threshold

- Each node $v \in V$ has a random threshold $t_v \sim \mathsf{Unif}([0,1])$
- Each directed edge (u, v) ∈ E has some fixed weight w_{uv} ∈ [0, 1] such that:

$$\forall v \in V : \sum_{u \in V: u \to v} w_{uv} \leq 1$$

• At time step *t*, node *v* is infected if the sum of incident edges from infected nodes exceeds the threshold

Influence Models: Linear Threshold

- Each node $v \in V$ has a random threshold $t_v \sim \mathsf{Unif}([0,1])$
- Each directed edge (u, v) ∈ E has some fixed weight w_{uv} ∈ [0, 1] such that:

$$\forall v \in V : \sum_{u \in V: u \to v} w_{uv} \leq 1$$

• At time step *t*, node *v* is infected if the sum of incident edges from infected nodes exceeds the threshold



 Example where a and b are infected at t = 0, and v is or is not infected depending on the random variable t_v

• Question: What are the key parts of the linear threshold model? How may we generalize them?

- Question: What are the key parts of the linear threshold model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain our random threshold $t_v \sim \text{Unif}([0,1])$
- Instead of weighted edges, for each node v we defined a *threshold* function $f_v : \mathcal{P}(V) \to [0, 1]$
- Let *I_t(v)* : V → *P(V)* is the function that maps v to v's infected neighbours at time time
- An uninfected node v now becomes infected if

 $f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$

- Question: What are the key parts of the linear threshold model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain our random threshold $t_v \sim \text{Unif}([0,1])$
- Instead of weighted edges, for each node v we defined a *threshold* function $f_v : \mathcal{P}(V) \to [0, 1]$
- Let *I_t(v)* : V → *P(V)* is the function that maps v to v's infected neighbours at time time
- An uninfected node v now becomes infected if

$$f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$$

• Question: How do we represent Linear Threshold model as a General Threshold Model

- Question: What are the key parts of the linear threshold model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain our random threshold $t_v \sim \text{Unif}([0,1])$
- Instead of weighted edges, for each node v we defined a *threshold* function $f_v : \mathcal{P}(V) \to [0, 1]$
- Let *I_t(v)* : V → *P(V)* is the function that maps v to v's infected neighbours at time time
- An uninfected node v now becomes infected if

$$f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$$

• Question: How do we represent Linear Threshold model as a General Threshold Model

•
$$f_v(S) := \sum_{u \in S} w_{uv}$$

• Question: Is the expected number of eventual adopters, f(S), submodular? Is it monotone?

- Question: What are the key parts of the linear threshold model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain our random threshold $t_v \sim \text{Unif}([0,1])$
- Instead of weighted edges, for each node v we defined a *threshold* function $f_v : \mathcal{P}(V) \to [0, 1]$
- Let *I_t(v)* : V → *P(V)* is the function that maps v to v's infected neighbours at time time
- An uninfected node v now becomes infected if

$$f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$$

• Question: How do we represent Linear Threshold model as a General Threshold Model

•
$$f_v(S) := \sum_{u \in S} w_{uv}$$

- Question: Is the expected number of eventual adopters, f(S), submodular? Is it monotone?
 - No, consider that on a clique we could define f_v so that all nodes are infected for a specific initial set S ⊂ V, and otherwise no new nodes are infected
 5/14

- Each edge (u, v) has an associated probability p_{uv} .
- In each step t, nodes that adopted technology at step t 1 "infect" each of their uninfected neighbors independently with probability p_{uv}.



- Each edge (u, v) has an associated probability p_{uv} .
- In each step t, nodes that adopted technology at step t 1 "infect" each of their uninfected neighbors independently with probability p_{uv}.



- Each edge (u, v) has an associated probability p_{uv} .
- In each step t, nodes that adopted technology at step t 1 "infect" each of their uninfected neighbors independently with probability p_{uv}.



- Each edge (u, v) has an associated probability p_{uv} .
- In each step t, nodes that adopted technology at step t 1 "infect" each of their uninfected neighbors independently with probability p_{uv}.



• Question: What are the key parts of the general cascade model? How may we generalize them?

- Question: What are the key parts of the general cascade model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain the idea that nodes infected at time t 1 attempt to infect their neighbours with some probability at time t
- We let the probability that some node v is infected by a node u as p_v(u, F) where F ⊂ V is the set of nodes that have already tried and failed to infect v
- $p_{v}: V \times \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow [0,1]$
- Question Is there a problem with this model?
 - As written thusfar, it could depend on the order in which nodes attempt to infect v. For this reason, p_v is restricted to be order independent
 - ► For any set of infected neighbours u₁, u₂, ... u_l the order in which they infect v the overall probability of infection must be the same

- Question: What are the key parts of the general cascade model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain the idea that nodes infected at time t 1 attempt to infect their neighbours with some probability at time t
- We let the probability that some node v is infected by a node u as p_v(u, F) where F ⊂ V is the set of nodes that have already tried and failed to infect v
- $p_{v}: V \times \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow [0,1]$
- Question Is there a problem with this model?
 - As written thusfar, it could depend on the order in which nodes attempt to infect v. For this reason, p_v is restricted to be order independent
 - ► For any set of infected neighbours u₁, u₂, ... u_l the order in which they infect v the overall probability of infection must be the same
- Question: How do we represent Independent Cascade model as a General Cascade Model

- Question: What are the key parts of the general cascade model? How may we generalize them?
- We retain the idea that nodes infected at time t 1 attempt to infect their neighbours with some probability at time t
- We let the probability that some node v is infected by a node u as p_v(u, F) where F ⊂ V is the set of nodes that have already tried and failed to infect v
- $p_{v}: V \times \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow [0,1]$
- Question Is there a problem with this model?
 - As written thusfar, it could depend on the order in which nodes attempt to infect v. For this reason, p_v is restricted to be order independent
 - ► For any set of infected neighbours u₁, u₂, ... u_l the order in which they infect v the overall probability of infection must be the same
- Question: How do we represent Independent Cascade model as a General Cascade Model

•
$$p_v(u,F) := p(u,v)$$

- General Threshold Model: Node v is infected at time t + 1 if $f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$
- General Cascade Model: Node *u*, infected at time *t*, infects node *v* with probability p(u, S) where *S* is the set of nodes that have failed to infect *u* thusfar
- Question: Can we represent a general threshold model as a general cascade model?

- General Threshold Model: Node v is infected at time t + 1 if $f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$
- General Cascade Model: Node u, infected at time t, infects node v with probability p(u, S) where S is the set of nodes that have failed to infect u thusfar
- Question: Can we represent a general threshold model as a general cascade model?

$$p_{v}(u, S) = P(u \text{ infects } v|S \text{ didn't infect } v)$$

$$= \frac{P(u \text{ infects } v \land S \text{ didn't infect } v)}{P(S \text{ didn't infect } v)}$$

$$= \frac{P(f_{v}(S \cup \{u\}) > t_{v} \ge f_{v}(S))}{P(t_{v} \ge f_{v}(S))}$$

$$= \frac{f_{v}(S \cup \{u\}) - f_{v}(S)}{P(1 - f_{v}(S))}$$

- General Threshold Model: Node v is infected at time t + 1 if $f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$
- General Cascade Model: Node u, infected at time t, infects node v with probability p(u, S) where S is the set of nodes that have failed to infect u thusfar
- Question: Can we represent a general cascade model as a general threshold model?

- General Threshold Model: Node v is infected at time t + 1 if $f_v(\mathcal{I}_t(v)) > t_v$
- General Cascade Model: Node *u*, infected at time *t*, infects node *v* with probability p(u, S) where *S* is the set of nodes that have failed to infect *u* thusfar
- Question: Can we represent a general cascade model as a general threshold model?

• Let
$$S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots s_k\}$$
, and $S_i := \{s_1 \dots s_i\}$
 $f_v(S) = P(S \text{ infects } v)$
 $= 1 - P(S \text{ doesn't infect } v)$
 $= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^k P(u_i \text{ doesn't infect } v|S_{i-1} \text{ doesn't infect } v)$
 $= 1 - \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - p(u_i, S_{i-1}))$

Non-Progressive Influence

- Thusfar, all the influence models we've seen are *progressive*, nodes that become infected never cease being infected
- Suppose we're modeling something like the use of a subscription service
 - Users can start or stop any any time
 - We assume users are more likely to subscribe if people they know are also subscribed
 - We want to maximize our revenue, or rather the sum of the number of people subscribed at each timestep
 - We can create an initial set of adopters, but these initial adopters can be at different points in time
- How can we model this? How can we pick our initial adopters?

Reducing Non-Progressive Influence to Progressive Influence

- We can model non-progressive influence as progressive influence using a layered graph
- For our original graph G = (V, E), and a time horizon of τ timesteps, we create G^τ by creating τ duplicates of the nodes and edges of G (e.g. v becomes v_t for t = 1, 2, ... τ)
- We add directed edges from u_t to v_{t+1} for all u_t such that $(u, v) \in E$
- This is the same approach as we saw in class that allowed us to model a special case of SIS as SIR
- We can now analyze this problem or choose initial adopters on G^{τ} as if it were a progressive influence problem

Reducing Non-Progressive Influence to Progressive Influence

G



[Modified from E&K Fig 21.5] $_{12/14}$

Reducing Non-Progressive Influence to Progressive Influence

 G^5



[Modified from E&K Fig 21.6a]

Quercus Quiz