

MONSTOR: An Inductive Approach for Estimating and Maximizing Influence over Unseen Social Networks

Jihoon Ko
KAIST AI
jihoonko@kaist.ac.kr

Kyuhan Lee
KAIST AI
kyuhan.lee@kaist.ac.kr

Kijung Shin
KAIST AI & EE
kijungs@kaist.ac.kr

Noseng Park
Department of AI
Yonsei University
noseong@yonsei.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Influence maximization (IM) is one of the most important problems in social network analysis. Its objective is to find a given number of seed nodes that maximize the spread of information through a social network. Since it is an NP-hard problem, many approximate/heuristic methods have been developed, and a number of them repeat Monte Carlo (MC) simulations over and over to reliably estimate the influence (i.e., the number of infected nodes) of a seed set. In this work, we present an inductive machine learning method, called Monte Carlo Simulator (MONSTOR), for estimating the influence of given seed nodes in social networks unseen during training. MONSTOR can greatly accelerate existing IM algorithms by replacing repeated MC simulations. In our experiments, MONSTOR provided highly accurate estimates, achieving 0.998 or higher Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients in unseen real-world social networks. Moreover, IM algorithms equipped with MONSTOR are more accurate than state-of-the-art competitors in 67% of IM use cases.

1 INTRODUCTION

Influence maximization (IM) [5] is to find a certain number of seed nodes who maximize the spread of information through a social network. It is an NP-hard problem, and many IM algorithms (e.g., Greedy [5], CELF [3] and UBLF [13]), depend on repeated Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of information cascade processes. An MC simulation takes $O(|\mathcal{E}|)$ time, where $|\mathcal{E}|$ is the number of edges, and estimating the influence of a seed set via d simulations takes $O(d|\mathcal{E}|)$ time. In [5, 13], d is set to 10, 000.

In this work, we propose a neural network-based method, called Monte Carlo Simulator (MONSTOR), for estimating MC simulation results under the seminal independent cascade (IC) model — we leave estimation for other cascade models as our future work. MONSTOR is inductive, i.e., it is capable of estimating MC simulation results in social networks unseen during training. After being trained, it can significantly speed up existing IM methods by replacing the computational bottleneck, i.e., repeated MC simulations.

We conduct experiments with three real-world social networks.

One strong point in our experiments is that we use real activation probabilities of edges, which are calculated from retweet logs. That

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

Woodstock '18, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2020 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

is, we weight each directed edge (u, v) with the real probability that user u influences v . Note that most previous studies on influence maximization simply used random, uniform, and degree-based probabilities [3, 4, 8, 11, 13], which are different from real ones.

In our experiments, MONSTOR yielded near-perfect estimations in terms of the Pearson's correlation coefficients and the Spearman's Rank correlation coefficients. In addition, simulation-based IM algorithms [3, 5, 13] equipped with MONSTOR yielded almost the same influence maximization results as those of the original algorithms based on MC simulations. Moreover, they were more accurate than state-of-the-art non-simulation-based IM algorithms [4, 8, 11] in 18 out of the 27 cases in our experiments.

2 CONCEPTS AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this work, we focus on the *independent cascade* (IC) model [5], where an infected node u attempts **once** to activate (i.e., directly infect) each neighbor v and the probability of success is $p_{(u,v)}$ (see Definition 2.1). This process is repeated for each newly infected node until there are no newly infected nodes.

Definition 2.1 (Activation Probability). The activation probability $p_{(u,v)}$ from u to v is the success probability that the node u activates (i.e., directly infects) its neighbor v when u is infected.

If we weight each directional edge $e = (u, v)$ with $p_{(u,v)}$, the weighted adjacency matrix becomes the activation probability matrix \mathbf{P} (see Definition 2.2).

Definition 2.2 (Activation Probability Matrix). Given a social network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, each (u, v) -th entry of the activation probability matrix $\mathbf{P} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$ is the activation probability $p_{(u,v)}$.

We use interaction logs such as retweets among users to construct a social network $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, and there are several ways of measuring the activation probability [2, 5], including:

- (1) Bernoulli Trial (BT): $p_{(u,v)} = \frac{|\text{actions}(u) \cap \text{actions}(v)|}{|\text{actions}(u)|}$,
- (2) Jaccard Index (JI): $p_{(u,v)} = \frac{|\text{actions}(u) \cap \text{actions}(v)|}{|\text{actions}(u) \cup \text{actions}(v)|}$,
- (3) Linear Probability (LP): $p_{(u,v)} = \frac{|\text{actions}(u) \cap \text{actions}(v)|}{|\text{actions}(v)|}$,

where $\text{actions}(x)$ denotes the set of actions done by node x , e.g., the set of online postings retweeted or replied by node x . We consider all the three definitions, and thus we define three different activation probability matrices, \mathbf{P}_{BT} , \mathbf{P}_{JI} , and \mathbf{P}_{LP} , from a social network.

Based on \mathbf{P} , we define the infection probability of each node given a set of *seed nodes* (i.e., initially infected nodes) as follows:

Definition 2.3 (Infection Probability). Given a seed set S , the infection probability $\rho(x)$ is the probability that the node x is infected under the IC model with S .

In this work, we consider the following two problems:




Figure 1: How to build training data. Given a network \mathcal{G} (whose activation probability matrix is P) and a seed set, we perform many simulations and collect π_0, \dots, π_h , where $\pi_h = \pi_{h+1}$. We repeat these steps with many seed sets. Note that the inner product $\langle \mathbf{1}, \pi_h \rangle$ is the influence, i.e., the number of infected nodes under the IC model.

- **Influence Estimation (IE):** Given a seed set S , to estimate its influence $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \rho(x)$, i.e., the expected number of infected nodes,
- **Influence Maximization (IM)** [5]: Given k , to find the set S of k seed nodes that maximizes the influence $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{V}} \rho(x)$.

3 PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we propose a general inductive model MONSTOR for estimating the infection probability $\rho(x)$ of every node $x \in \mathcal{V}$ in a network that is not necessarily a part of training data (i.e., in a network unseen during training). Note that we can answer the IE problem by summing the estimates and answer the IM problem by replacing MC simulations in simulation-based algorithms (e.g., [3, 5, 13]) with MONSTOR.

We first define two concepts for describing MONSTOR. Note that seed nodes are infected in 0-th step of the IC model, and those infected directly by seed nodes are infected in 1-st step. Therefore, a step means one-hop cascade process from newly infected nodes. From Definitions 3.1 and 3.2, Proposition 3.3 follows.

Definition 3.1 (Infection Probability within Limited Steps). Given a seed set $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, $\rho_i(x)$ denotes the infection probability during the first i steps of the the IC model. Note that $\rho_i(x) \approx \rho(x)$ if i is sufficiently large, and $\rho_i(x) = \rho(x)$ if i is greater than or equal to the longest path length in the input network.

Definition 3.2 (Infection Probability Vector). Let $\boldsymbol{\pi} := [\rho(x)] \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ be the vector of $\rho(x)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{V}$. We also let $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i := [\rho_i(x)]$.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *The infection probability monotonically increases w.r.t. i . That is, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i \leq \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i+1}$.*

3.1 Overall Workflow

The overall workflow in our method MONSTOR is as follows:

- (1) We collect one or more social networks $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \dots\}$.
- (2) From each \mathcal{G}_j , we collect the tuple $(\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-e}, \mathbf{P}_j)$, where $e > 1$ is a hyperparameter, after choosing a seed set S randomly so that $1 \leq |S| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{V}|}{50}$. \mathbf{P}_j can be in BT, JI, or LP. We repeat this multiple times with different seed sets, as shown in Fig. 1.
- (3) We train our graph convolutional network (GCN)-based model M with the training data. The model has l graph convolutional layers, and it estimates $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ given $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-e}$. That is, M estimates a single step of the IC model.
- (4) We stack s times the pre-trained model M , and this stacked GCN estimates $\boldsymbol{\pi}_s$ from $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0$. That is, it estimates end-to-end simulations under the IC model. Hereinafter, MONSTOR means the stacked GCN, described in Fig. 2, unless otherwise stated.




Figure 2: The overall workflow in our approach, where we pre-train a GCN and stack it s times (e.g., $s = 3$ in this figure) for testing. MONSTOR estimates $\boldsymbol{\pi}_s$ from $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0$.

- (5) For the IE problem, we compute $\langle \mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{\pi}_s \rangle$ using the estimated $\boldsymbol{\pi}_s$. For the IM problem, we replace the MC simulation subroutine of existing IM algorithms (e.g., [3, 5, 13]) with MONSTOR.

Note that, in the training phase, we use MC simulations of the IC model to obtain $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-e}$, while in the testing phase, MC simulations in (potentially unseen) target networks are not needed.

3.2 Detailed Design

We describe our GCN model M and the training method for it. As stated earlier, M estimates $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ given $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-e}$. Specifically, M initializes the feature vector of each node v as $\mathbf{h}_v^0 := (\rho_{i-e+1}(v) - \rho_{i-e}(v), \dots, \rho_{i-1}(v) - \rho_{i-2}(v), \rho_{i-1}(v))$, and it repeatedly computes new feature vectors of each node as follows for $1 \leq i \leq l$:

$$\mathbf{a}_v^i := \text{MAX}(\{p_{(u,v)} \cdot (\mathbf{h}_u^{i-1} \mathbf{W}_1^i + \mathbf{b}_1^i) : u \in \text{NEI}(v)\}), \forall v \in V, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_v^i := \text{ReLU}(\text{CONCAT}(\mathbf{h}_v^{i-1}, \mathbf{a}_v^i) \mathbf{W}_2^i + \mathbf{b}_2^i), \forall v \in V, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_u^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ is the feature vector of the node u at the i -th layer; $\text{NEI}(v)$ is the set of neighbors of v ; MAX is the element-wise max function; CONCAT is the concatenation function; and $\mathbf{W}_1^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1} \times d_{i-1}}$, $\mathbf{W}_2^i \in \mathbb{R}^{2d_{i-1} \times d_i}$, $\mathbf{b}_1^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{i-1}}$ and $\mathbf{b}_2^i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ are learnable parameters. The idea of multiplying $p_{(u,v)}$ and \mathbf{h}_u^{i-1} is inspired by the fact that activation probabilities in the IC model are multiplied following a cascade route. For instance, the probability that u_1 activates u_2 and u_2 activates u_3 is $p_{(u_1, u_2)} \cdot p_{(u_2, u_3)}$.

Instead of directly estimating the raw values in $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$, our model M uses the following more effective estimation method, which is inspired by the monotonicity (see Proposition 3.3):

$$M(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-e}, \mathbf{P}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \min\{\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1} + \mathbf{h}^l, \mathbf{u}_i\}, \quad (3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is the learnable parameters of M ; $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ is a theoretical upper bound of $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ (see Eq. (5) below); and $\mathbf{h}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}|}$ is the vector concatenating $\mathbf{h}_v^l \in \mathbb{R}$ (i.e., $d_l = 1$) for all $v \in V$. By Eq. (3), $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ always lies between $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i-1}$ and \mathbf{u}_i , which are lower and upper bounds of $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$. By adding these bounds, we relieve the difficulty of the estimation task. In our preliminary studies, directly estimating the raw values in $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$ was not as successful as the proposed way.

Of many possible loss functions, we train our model M using the following loss function:

Table 1: Statistics of each social network

	V	E	$\frac{\sum P(u,v)}{ \mathcal{E} }$ in BT		$\frac{\sum P(u,v)}{ \mathcal{E} }$ in JI		$\frac{\sum P(u,v)}{ \mathcal{E} }$ in LP	
			Train	Test	Train	Test	Train	Test
Extended	11,409	58,972	0.07974	0.09194	0.03345	0.04095	0.16138	0.18371
WannaCry	35,627	169,419	0.07255	0.09466	0.02977	0.04494	0.19785	0.16297
Celebrity	15,184	56,538	0.03206	0.02787	0.00163	0.00159	0.26142	0.256

$$\mathcal{L} := \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} \left(\frac{\|M(t; \theta) - \pi_i\|_1}{|\mathcal{V}|} + \lambda \frac{|1 \cdot M(t; \theta) - \langle \mathbf{1}, \pi_i \rangle|}{\langle \mathbf{1}, \pi_i \rangle} \right), \quad (4)$$

where T is a training set; $t = (\pi_i, \pi_{i-1}, \dots, \pi_{i-e}, \mathbf{P}) \in T$ is a training sample, and λ is a hyperparameter. That is, we aim to fit both individual infection probabilities and overall influence.

Upper Bound of Infection Probabilities. We prove the upper bound \mathbf{u}_i of π_i , which our estimation (see Eq. (3)) relies on.

THEOREM 3.4. *For all $i \geq 2$, the vector \mathbf{u}_i , which is defined as below, is an upper bound of π_i , i.e., $\pi_i \leq \mathbf{u}_i$:*

$$\mathbf{u}_i := \pi_{i-1} + (\pi_{i-1} - \pi_{i-2})\mathbf{P}. \quad (5)$$

PROOF. For each node $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we let t_v be the step at which v gets infected under the IC model. If v does not get infected until the end, $t_v = \infty$. For each node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and its neighbor u , let $X_{u \rightarrow v}^i$ be the event that v is infected by u at step i . Then, Eq. (6) holds.

$$\mathbb{P}(t_v = i) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{u \in \text{NEI}(v)} X_{u \rightarrow v}^i\right) \leq \sum_{u \in \text{NEI}(v)} \mathbb{P}(X_{u \rightarrow v}^i). \quad (6)$$

In Eq. (6), $\mathbb{P}(X_{u \rightarrow v}^i) = \mathbb{P}(t_u = i-1) \cdot p(u,v)$ and $\mathbb{P}(t_u = i-1) = \rho_{i-1}(u) - \rho_{i-2}(u)$. Therefore, the following inequality holds for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(t_v \leq i) &= \mathbb{P}(t_v \leq i-1) + \mathbb{P}(t_v = i) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(t_v \leq i-1) + \sum_{u \in \text{NEI}(v)} (\rho_{i-1}(u) - \rho_{i-2}(u)) \cdot p(u,v) \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of the infection probability, $\mathbb{P}(t_v \leq i) = \rho_i(v)$ and $\mathbb{P}(t_v \leq i-1) = \rho_{i-1}(v)$, which implies $\pi_i \leq \mathbf{u}_i$. \square

Complexity and Runtime Analysis. Once MONSTOR is trained, estimating π_i in $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ for a seed set S takes $\mathcal{O}(l|s|\mathcal{E}|)$ time. Recall that s is the number of stacks, and l is the number of graph convolutional layers per stack. In our experiments, the runtime of the estimation by MONSTOR amounts to the runtime of performing MC simulations only 100 times. According to the standard configurations [5, 13], Greedy and UBLF perform MC simulations 10,000 times for a seed set S .

4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we review our empirical evaluation of MONSTOR on both IE and IM tasks.

4.1 Experimental Settings

Datasets. We used three real-world social networks: Extended, WannaCry, and Celebrity (see Table 1). For Extended, we crawled more tweets and retweets in addition to those used in [9]. In each dataset, we used the cascades during the first 80% of time for training/validation and those during the remaining 20% for testing. Specifically, we computed \mathbf{P}_{BT} , \mathbf{P}_{JI} , and \mathbf{P}_{LP} for each of the training/validation and testing periods. Then, we collected 1,600 training tuples, 400 validation tuples and 2,000 testing tuples, as described in Sec. 3.1.

We trained MONSTOR with training data consisting of two out of the three networks (e.g., Extended and WannaCry) and tested it




Figure 3: An example of the train-test split in our experiments. Note that MONSTOR can be applied to unseen social networks (i.e., the test data highlighted in blue), while existing learning approaches [6, 12] cannot be applied.

with each of the three networks (i.e., each of Extended, WannaCry, and Celebrity), as shown in Fig. 3.

Competitors. We consider the following IM algorithms as competitors: (i) Greedy [5], UBLF [13], and CELF [3] among simulation-based algorithms; (ii) SSA [8], D-SSA [8], PMIA [11], and IRIE [4] among non-simulation-based algorithms; and (iii) U-MON and C-MON, where UBLF and CELF equipped with MONSTOR which replaces MC simulations. We note that Greedy, UBLF, and CELF theoretically find same seed users, but UBLF is the fastest and CELF and Greedy follows. U-MON and C-MON also find same seed users. However, UBLF and U-MON can be used only when activation probabilities satisfy a certain property [13].

Hyperparameters. For MONSTOR, we set $e=4, l=3, \lambda=0.1, d_1=\dots=d_{l-1}=16$ after some preliminary studies. At each t -th epoch, we set the learning rate to $10^{-4} \cdot t$ if $t \leq 10$, and $10^{-2}/t$ otherwise. We chose the best s among $\{2, 3, 5\}$, using validation data, and $s = 2, 3, 5$ were best for JI, BT, and LP, respectively. For SSA and D-SSA, we set $\epsilon=0.1$ and $\delta=1/|\mathcal{V}|$ as in [8]. For IRIE and PMIA, we followed the settings in [4, 11]. For SSA and D-SSA, we used the influence averaged over 100 independent runs.

4.2 Experimental Results

Influence Estimation (IE). As there are no inductive methods for estimating influence in unseen social networks, we compared the estimates of MONSTOR with ground truth influences. We used the mean influence of 10,000 MC simulation results as the ground-truth influence of each test seed set. To measure the similarity between true and estimated influences, we used the Pearson’s correlation coefficients and the Spearman’s Rank correlation coefficients. As seen in Table 2, both coefficients were close to 1.0. That is, MONSTOR yielded near perfect estimates.

Influence Maximization (IM). We summarize the accuracies of different IM algorithms in Table 3. Greedy, UBLF, and CELF were most accurate in most cases, while they relied on 10,000 MC simulations per seed set and thus took the longest time to finish.

For BT, U-MON was most accurate in most cases. Its accuracy was very close to that of UBLF. IRIE was most accurate in one case.

For JI, while U-MON and IRIE were most accurate in many cases, there was no clear winner. Each algorithm (except SSA and D-SSA) was most accurate in at least one case. One possible reason for this is that activation probabilities are relatively small compared to BT and LP, as shown in Table 1.

Table 2: The accuracy of MONSTOR on the influence estimation problem. The training social networks are stated inside the parentheses, where E, W, and C stand for Extended, WannaCry, and Celebrity, respectively. Note that in the rows in blue, the test social network is not included the training social networks.

Extended	Pearson Correlation			Spearman's Rank			WannaCry	Pearson Correlation			Spearman's Rank			Celebrity	Pearson Correlation			Spearman's Rank		
	BT	Jl	LP	BT	Jl	LP		BT	Jl	LP	BT	Jl	LP		BT	Jl	LP	BT	Jl	LP
MON. (E+W)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (E+W)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (E+W)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998
MON. (E+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (E+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (E+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	0.999
MON. (W+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (W+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	MON. (W+C)	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	0.999

Table 3: The performance of various IM methods. We consider all combinations of the train-test splits and the activation probabilities. Greedy, UBLF, and CELF are most accurate but heavy methods. Therefore, we highlight the best results except them in boldface, and we highlight the estimations in unseen social networks in blue.

Test with BT	Extended			WannaCry			Celebrity		
	k=10	50	100	10	50	100	10	50	100
UBLF (Greedy)	481.5	968.3	1222.9	991.6	2123.5	2752.3	52.8	105.3	155.2
U-MON (E+W)	480.6	965.2	1221.9	990.4	2123.2	2742.3	51.0	104.4	155.0
U-MON (E+C)	480.6	967.6	1221.2	990.9	2123.2	2744.5	52.0	104.7	155.2
U-MON (W+C)	481.2	967.6	1222.4	991.0	2123.1	2745.1	52.3	104.8	155.2
D-SSA	467.5	949.0	1189.8	984.2	2071.9	2687.1	49.8	102.0	152.4
SSA	467.5	949.1	1189.8	984.3	2071.9	2687.2	49.8	102.0	152.4
IRIE	479.6	966.0	1221.7	986.6	2118.4	2751.8	51.7	103.0	153.0
PMIA	473.5	960.0	1199.5	989.0	2106.8	2739.9	51.7	100.0	152.1

Test with JI	Extended			WannaCry			Celebrity		
	k=10	50	100	10	50	100	10	50	100
UBLF (Greedy)	244.4	529.3	706.6	533.9	1238.5	1648.0	43.7	90.3	140.2
U-MON (E+W)	244.4	528.7	706.1	534.1	1239.1	1647.6	43.7	90.4	140.4
U-MON (E+C)	244.5	529.3	706.5	534.1	1239.1	1647.6	43.7	90.4	140.4
U-MON (W+C)	244.5	529.2	705.8	534.1	1239.1	1647.9	43.7	90.4	140.4
D-SSA	244.5	521.2	682.8	532.3	1213.6	1589.7	43.6	89.9	139.9
SSA	244.5	521.2	682.8	532.3	1213.7	1589.8	43.6	89.9	139.9
IRIE	244.3	529.2	707.3	534.2	1239.0	1647.8	43.8	90.4	140.3
PMIA	244.6	529.1	705.4	534.1	1239.0	1646.8	42.7	90.4	140.3

Test with LP	Extended			WannaCry			Celebrity		
	k=10	50	100	10	50	100	10	50	100
CELF (Greedy)	1852.4	2876.5	3264.9	5271.6	7880.0	9098.3	5508.4	5616.7	5657.7
C-MON (E+W)	1846.8	2872.0	3257.8	5250.4	7869.5	9086.0	5508.9	5615.1	5665.0
C-MON (E+C)	1852.1	2869.8	3258.4	5252.0	7870.3	9087.5	5508.9	5615.7	5665.7
C-MON (W+C)	1841.4	2860.6	3250.3	5258.7	7854.7	9069.5	5508.8	5616.6	5666.5
D-SSA	1844.3	2858.7	3236.1	5256.7	7783.4	8977.3	5509.0	5606.2	5633.8
SSA	1843.8	2858.6	3236.1	5257.2	7783.6	8977.0	5508.8	5606.3	5633.9
IRIE	1816.2	2829.8	3201.2	5109.1	7714.1	8840.1	5509.1	5617.4	5667.4
PMIA	1830.0	2828.9	3243.2	5196.7	7807.6	8981.8	5508.5	5604.2	5630.2

For LP, C-MON was most accurate in most cases, and its accuracy was very close to that of CELF.¹ Note that the activation probabilities are largest in LP (see Table 1), and thus even small changes in the seed set can decrease its influence significantly. Interestingly, IRIE was outperformed by D-SSA and SSA in most cases, while the results were the opposite in BT and JI.

In summary, only U-MON and C-MON were accurate consistently regardless of the activation probabilities. In most cases and even in unseen social networks, their accuracies were close to the original algorithms (i.e., UBLF or CELF) with 10,000 MC simulations. The other algorithms (i.e., D-SSA, SSA, IRIE, and PMIA) were not accurate for at least one among BT, JI and LP.

Additional Experiments. In Table 4, we show the runtime of 1,000 influence estimations by MONSTOR in graphs of different sizes. Consistently with the theoretical analysis in Section 3, the runtime of influence estimations by MONSTOR was near linear in the number of edges in the input graph. We provide the detailed experimental settings and experimental results regarding the empirical submodularity of MONSTOR in the appendix.

5 RELATED WORK

We refer to a recent survey [7] and references therein for detailed information about diffusion models, IM algorithms, and theoretical results. Below, we focus on recent studies most relevant to ours.

¹UBLF and U-MON cannot be used for LP. A condition required by UBLF is not met.

Table 4: The runtime of 1,000 estimations by MONSTOR in graphs with different numbers of edges.

$ E $	2^{20}	2^{21}	2^{22}	2^{23}	2^{24}	2^{25}	2^{26}
Estimation time (sec)	11.5	17.7	31.0	56.3	108.9	411.0	819.7

There exist two on-going studies [6, 12] relevant to ours. Most importantly, their machine-learning models are *transductive*. That is, they are not capable of estimating influence in social networks unseen during training. They can estimate influence only in a training network potentially with different activation probabilities.

We aim at designing an *inductive* method, which is capable of estimating the influence of seed nodes in networks whose connections and activation probabilities are completely unseen during training. In addition, our method estimates MC simulation results and thus can be equipped with greedy-based IM algorithms [3, 5, 13], while the former [6] directly searches seed nodes. The task in [10], which is to predict the future size of a cascade from its initial stage, is also fundamentally different from ours.

6 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we present MONSTOR, an inductive learning algorithm for estimating the influence of seed nodes under the IC model. In our experiments with three real-world social networks, MONSTOR accurately estimated the influence even in networks unseen during training. Moreover, simulation-based influence maximization algorithms equipped with MONSTOR, which replaces repeated MC simulations, performed reliably well, outperforming state-of-the-art competitors in 18 out of the 27 cases.

REFERENCES

- [1] Deepayan Chakrabarti, Yiping Zhan, and Christos Faloutsos. 2004. R-MAT: A recursive model for graph mining. In *SDM*.
- [2] Amit Goyal, Francesco Bonchi, and Laks V.S. Lakshmanan. 2010. Learning Influence Probabilities in Social Networks. In *WSDM*.
- [3] Amit Goyal, Wei Lu, and Laks V.S. Lakshmanan. 2011. CELF++: Optimizing the Greedy Algorithm for Influence Maximization in Social Networks. In *WWW*.
- [4] Kyomin Jung, Wooram Heo, and Wei Chen. 2012. Irie: Scalable and robust influence maximization in social networks. In *ICDM*.
- [5] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. 2003. Maximizing the Spread of Influence Through a Social Network. In *KDD*.
- [6] Hui Li, Mengting Xu, Sourav S. Bhowmick, Changsheng Sun, Zhongyuan Jiang, and Jiangtao Cui. 2019. DISCO: Influence Maximization Meets Network Embedding and Deep Learning. *CoRR* abs/1906.07378 (2019).
- [7] Yuchen Li, Ju Fan, Yanhao Wang, and Kian-Lee Tan. 2018. Influence Maximization on Social Graphs: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 30 (2018), 1852–1872.
- [8] Hung T. Nguyen, My T. Thai, and Thang N. Dinh. 2016. Stop-and-Stare: Optimal Sampling Algorithms for Viral Marketing in Billion-Scale Networks. In *SIGMOD*.
- [9] Carl Sabottke, Octavian Suciu, and Tudor Dumitras. 2015. Vulnerability Disclosure in the Age of Social Media: Exploiting Twitter for Predicting Real-World Exploits. In *USENIX Security*.
- [10] Z. Shafiq and A. Liu. 2017. Cascade size prediction in online social networks. In *Networking*. 1–9.
- [11] Chi Wang, Wei Chen, and Yajun Wang. 2012. Scalable influence maximization for independent cascade model in large-scale social networks. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 25 (11 2012).
- [12] Bo Yan, Kexiu Song, Jiamou Liu, Fanku Meng, Yiping Liu, and Hongyi Su. 2019. On the Maximization of Influence Over an Unknown Social Network. In *AAMAS*.
- [13] C. Zhou, P. Zhang, J. Guo, X. Zhu, and L. Guo. 2013. UBLF: An Upper Bound Based Approach to Discover Influential Nodes in Social Networks. In *ICDM*.

Table 5: The ratio of the cases where the submodularity holds.

(a) Test with BT			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	0.9988	0.9998	1.0000
U-MON (E+C)	0.9996	1.0000	1.0000
U-MON (W+C)	0.9996	1.0000	1.0000
(b) Test with JI			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	0.9986	0.9992	0.9994
U-MON (E+C)	0.9984	0.9994	0.9996
U-MON (W+C)	0.9986	0.9994	0.9998
(c) Test with LP			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	0.9996	1.0000	0.9928
U-MON (E+C)	0.9994	1.0000	0.9982
U-MON (W+C)	0.9990	0.9996	0.9952

Table 6: MAPE when the submodularity does not hold.

(a) Test with BT			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	1.110e-07	0.0	0.0
U-MON (E+C)	6.543e-08	4.107e-08	0.0
U-MON (W+C)	6.716e-08	0.0	0.0
(b) Test with JI			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	7.082e-08	3.730e-08	1.587e-07
U-MON (E+C)	5.394e-07	6.011e-07	9.381e-06
U-MON (W+C)	4.606e-08	7.809e-08	1.540e-07
(c) Test with LP			
	Extended	WannaCry	Celebrity
U-MON (E+W)	0.0002	0.0	0.0225
U-MON (E+C)	0.0002	0.0	0.0215
U-MON (W+C)	5.821e-08	2.304e-08	0.0133

A APPENDIX: SUBMODULARITY TESTS FOR INFLUENCE MAXIMIZATION

It is well known that the influence maximization is a submodular maximization problem, and many IM algorithms exploit the submodular nature. Therefore, it is crucial to show that MONSTOR has the same characteristic for claiming that IM algorithms based on the submodularity work properly when being integrated with MONSTOR.

In this section, we review our experiments for testing the empirical submodularity of MONSTOR. To this end, we used 5000 test

seed sets that were not used for training. For each seed set, we chose its size uniformly at random from 1 to 10% of $|\mathcal{V}|$ and then chose seed nodes uniformly at random. Using each pair S and T of the seed sets, we tested whether the following submodularity condition is met:

$$f(S) + f(T) \geq f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T).$$

In Table 5, we show the ratio of the pairs where the above submodularity condition is met. When BT or JI was used, for more than 99.9% of the pairs, the submodularity condition held. When LP was used, the ratio was 99.5% or higher.

For each pair S and T where the submodularity condition was not met, we measured the MAPE (i.e., mean absolute percentage error) as follows:

$$\frac{\{f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)\} - \{f(S) + f(T)\}}{f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)}.$$

As shown in Table 6, the error (i.e., $\{f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)\} - \{f(S) + f(T)\}$) was marginal compared to the actual influence (i.e., $f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)$). All these experiment results support that influence estimation by MONSTOR can be considered as submodular in practice.

B APPENDIX: DETAILED SETTINGS OF FOR SCALABILITY TESTS

We generated realistic graphs of various sizes using the R-MAT generator [1] with $a = 0.7$ and $b = c = d = 0.1$. The number of edges in the generated graphs ranged from 2^{20} to 2^{26} , and for every graph, we set the number of nodes to 20% of the number of edges. We used the weighted cascade model [5] to determine the activation probability of each edge in the generated graphs. We measured the runtime of influence estimations by MONSTOR with 1,000 different seed sets. As in the submodularity test above, for each seed set, we chose its size uniformly at random from 1 to 10% of $|\mathcal{V}|$ and then chose seed nodes uniformly at random. The runtime scaled linearly with the number of stacked GCNs (i.e., s), and we report the runtime per stacked GCN in the main paper.