

Optimal Network Modularity for Information Diffusion

Azadeh Nematzadeh, Emilio Ferrara, Alessandro Flammini, and Yong-Yeol Ahn*

School of Informatics and Computing, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47408 USA

(Dated: February 12, 2022)

We investigate the impact of community structure on information diffusion with the linear threshold model. Our results demonstrate that modular structure may have counter-intuitive effects on information diffusion when social reinforcement is present. We show that strong communities can facilitate global diffusion by enhancing local, intra-community spreading. Using both analytic approaches and numerical simulations, we demonstrate the existence of an optimal network modularity, where global diffusion requires the minimal number of early adopters.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k Complex systems; 89.65.-s Social and economic systems; 89.20.Ff Computer science and technology

The study of information diffusion—fads, innovations, collective actions, viral memes—is relevant to a number of disciplines, including mathematical, physical and social sciences, communication, marketing and economics [1–6]. The most common approach is to focus on the affinities between information diffusion and infectious diseases spreading [7, 8]: a piece of information can travel from one individual to another through social contacts and the “infected” individuals can, in turn, propagate the information to others, possibly generating a large-scale diffusion event similar to an epidemic outbreak [9, 10]. In addition to classical epidemic models, two main types of information diffusion models have been proposed: the *independent cascade model*, which was initially adopted to study the dynamics of viral marketing [11–15], describes information diffusion as a branching process; the *threshold model*, originally proposed to study collective social behavior [2, 16–18], incorporates the idea of ‘social reinforcement’ by assuming that each adoption requires a certain number of exposures. Although it is not yet fully understood how the microscopic mechanisms underlying information diffusion differ from those in epidemic spreading, it has been pointed out that social reinforcement could be a crucial one: unlike epidemic spreading, where each exposure acts independently, social reinforcement provisions that each additional exposure to a piece of information sensibly increases the probability of its adoption [19–21].

Since information spreads through social contacts, the structure of the underlying social network is a crucial ingredient in modeling information diffusion. The role of hubs and degree distribution have been studied extensively due to their critical role in epidemic spreading [22–24]. Another obvious network feature that has implications on information diffusion is the presence of a modular structure. Several studies investigated the role of communities in information diffusion [25–30], mostly ignoring the effect of social reinforcement.

Epidemic spreading is hindered by the presence of communities or modular structure, since this helps confining the epidemics in the community of origin [25, 31]. This

may naturally lead to the expectation that the same is true for information diffusion, given the similar approaches used in modeling epidemic and information diffusion. However, recent empirical work suggested that modular structure may, counterintuitively, *facilitate* information diffusion [21]. Other studies also proposed that network modularity plays a more important role in information diffusion than in epidemics spreading [6, 19, 32]. These findings reinforce the need to systematically explore how mechanisms like social reinforcement interact with the ubiquitous presence of modular structure in the underlying network.

In this letter we use the linear threshold model—which incorporates the simplest form of social reinforcement—to systematically study how community structure affects global information diffusion. It is worth stressing that both cooperative interactions (as those provisioned by social reinforcement) and modular structure are common in a variety of phenomena. The results described here could be, therefore, directly relevant in several different areas. Examples include neural networks [33], systems with Ising-like dynamics evolving on a non-homogenous substrate [34], and more in general in the study of phenomena that can be interpreted in terms of spreading.

We here expose two roles played by modular structure: *enhancing local spreading* and *hindering global spreading*. Strong communities facilitate social reinforcement and thereby enhance local spreading [6, 21]; weak community structure makes global spreading easier, because it provides more *bridges* among communities. We show that there exists an *optimal balance* between these two effects, where community structure counterintuitively *enhances*—rather than hinders—global diffusion of information. This draws a parallel with the ‘small world’ phenomenon, where the presence of a small number of short-cuts greatly reduces the average path length of the network while maintaining high clustering [35]. In information diffusion, a small number of bridges between communities allows inter-community diffusion while maintaining intra-community diffusion.

We adopt the linear threshold model to account for

recent observations and experiments that demonstrated the impact of social reinforcement in information diffusion [6, 19–21]. Let us formally define the linear threshold model first. Consider a set of N nodes (agents) connected by M undirected edges. The state of an agent i at time t is described by a binary variable $s_i(t) = \{0, 1\}$, where 1 represents the ‘active’ state and 0 the ‘inactive’ one. At time $t = 0$ a fraction ρ_0 of randomly selected agents, or ‘seeds,’ is initialized in the active state. At each time step, every agent’s state is updated synchronously according to the following threshold rule:

$$s_i(t+1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta k_i < \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} s_j(t), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where θ is the threshold parameter, k_i is the degree of node i , and $\mathcal{N}(i)$ the set of i ’s neighbors. This rule implies that: (i) the dynamics is deterministic; (ii) once a node becomes active, it will remain so forever; and, (iii) if $s_i(t+1) = s_i(t)$ for all nodes, then the system is in a steady state. The linear threshold model exhibits various critical behaviors. For instance, there is a critical threshold parameter at which a single active node can trigger a macroscopic cascade [17]; there also exists a sharp transition, at a constant threshold parameter, from an inactive state where no diffusion occurs, to an active state with global diffusion, triggered at a critical fraction of initially active nodes [36]. In the following, we focus on the latter transition based on the number of seeds and let θ constant.

To systematically investigate the impact of community structure, we prepare an ensemble of networks with two communities with varying degree of strength, using the block-model approach [37–39]. First, half of the nodes are randomly selected and assigned to community A , and the other half are assigned to community B . Then, $(1 - \mu)M$ links are randomly distributed among node pairs in the same community and μM are randomly distributed among node pairs that belong to different communities (see Fig. 1). The parameter μ controls the strength of the community structure: a large value of μ yields more links between the two communities and thus a weak community structure. Finally, we plant the seeds in A , assuming that the diffusion originates from the community A .

Let us introduce two analytic approaches—mean-field (MF) and tree-like (TL) approximations—to understand the behavior of our system. We first assume that the underlying network has a given degree distribution $p(k)$ but is otherwise random. We aim to compute the final density of active nodes (ρ_∞) given the initial density of seeds (ρ_0). When there is no community structure, using the mean-field approximation, ρ_∞ can be computed as




FIG. 1. Example of networks with different degrees of clustering μ . Parameters values are set to $N = 100$, $M = 750$, and $n = 2$.

the smallest stable solution of the equation:

$$\rho_\infty = \rho_0 + (1 - \rho_0) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(k) \sum_{m=\lceil \theta k \rceil}^k \binom{k}{m} \rho_\infty^m (1 - \rho_\infty)^{k-m}. \quad (1)$$

The probability that a node of degree k is in the active state at stationarity is the sum of two contributions: (i) the probability that the node is active at $t = 0$ (ρ_0); and, (ii) the probability that the node is not active at $t = 0$ ($1 - \rho_0$) but has at least θk active neighbors at $t = \infty$ (the second summation). The sum over k accounts for the different degrees a node may have. The equation can be solved iteratively.

Now let us extend Eq. 1 to deal with networks with communities. While it is easy to generalize it for arbitrary configurations of communities, here we focus on the case with two communities. In such a case, the equations for the fraction of active nodes ρ^A (resp., ρ^B) in the community A (resp., B) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\infty^{A(B)} &= \rho_0^{A(B)} + (1 - \rho_0^{A(B)}) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} p(k) \\ &\times \sum_{m=\lceil \theta k \rceil}^k \binom{k}{m} (q^{A(B)})^m (1 - q^{A(B)})^{k-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\rho_0^{A(B)}$ is the density of seeds in the community $A(B)$, and $q^{A(B)} = (1 - \mu)\rho_\infty^{A(B)} + \mu\rho_\infty^{B(A)}$ is the probability that a neighbor of a node is active, which is the sum of: (i) the probability that the neighbor is in the same community $(1 - \mu)$ and is active ($\rho_\infty^{A(B)}$); and, (ii) the probability that it is in the other $B(A)$ community (μ) and is active ($\rho_\infty^{B(A)}$). Finally, $\rho_\infty = (\rho_\infty^A + \rho_\infty^B)/2$.

A more sophisticated framework adopts the tree-like (TL) approximation [26, 40]. It approximates the underlying network with a tree of infinite depth and assumes that the nodes at level n are only affected by those at level $n - 1$. The fraction of active nodes in community $A(B)$ is computed using an auxiliary variable $y_\infty^{A(B)}$ obtained by the following iteration over all the levels in the




FIG. 2. The tradeoff between intra- and inter-community spreading. Stronger communities (small μ) facilitate spreading within the originating community (local) while weak communities (large μ) provide bridges that allow spreading between communities (global). There is a range of μ values that allow both (optimal). The blue squares represents ρ_∞^A , the final density of active nodes in the community A , and the red circles represents ρ_∞^B . The parameters for the simulation are: $\rho_0 = 0.17$, $\theta = 0.4$, $N = 131056$, and $z = 20$.

tree:

$$y_{n+1}^{A(B)} = \rho_0^{A(B)} + (1 - \rho_0^{A(B)}) \sum_k \frac{k}{z} p(k) \times \sum_{m=\lceil \theta k \rceil}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{m} (\bar{y}_n^{A(B)})^m (1 - \bar{y}_n^{A(B)})^{k-1-m}, \quad (3)$$

where z is the average degree and $\bar{y}_n^{A(B)} = (1 - \mu) y_n^{A(B)} + \mu y_n^{B(A)}$. The fraction of active nodes is given by:

$$\rho_\infty^{A(B)} = \rho_0^{A(B)} + (1 - \rho_0^{A(B)}) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p(k) \times \sum_{m=\lceil \theta k \rceil}^k \binom{k}{m} (y_\infty^{A(B)})^m (1 - y_\infty^{A(B)})^{k-m}. \quad (4)$$

We now address the issue of how communities affect information diffusion by first highlighting the trade-off due to the strength of communities. As μ decreases, nodes in A have increasingly more neighbors in A . Thus, the number of seed nodes to which nodes in A are exposed also increases because the seeds exist only in A ($\rho_0^A = 2\rho_0$ and $\rho_0^B = 0$). In other words, strong communities *enhance* local spreading. By contrast, the spreading in community B is triggered entirely by the nodes in A , as $\rho_0^B = 0$. Therefore, larger μ (smaller modularity) helps the spreading of the contagion to community B . The fact that large modularity (smaller μ) facilitates the spreading in the originating community, but small modularity (larger μ) helps inter-community spreading, raises the following question: is there an optimal modularity that facilitates both intra- and inter-community spreading?

Fig. 2 demonstrates that there is indeed a range of values of μ that enables both. In the blue range (“local”),

strong cohesion allows intra-community spreading in the originating community A ; in the red range (“global”), weak modular structure allows inter-community spreading from A to B . The interval where blue and red overlap (purple, “optimal”) provides the right amount of modularity to enable global diffusion. Here the modularity is large enough to initiate the local spreading and small enough to induce inter-community spreading. If μ is too small, the contagion cannot propagate into B , even if A is fully saturated, because there are not enough inter-community bridges. If μ is too large, although there are enough bridges, $\rho_\infty^B \simeq 0$ because the modularity is too small to initiate intra-community spreading from A .

Let us analyze the issue more into detail. Fig. 3 summarizes our results, derived analytically by MF and TL approximations, and by numerical simulations. In our numerical simulations, we compute the mean of ρ_∞ across 1,000 runs of the model, each assuming a different realization of the network and of the seed nodes. We fix the threshold ($\theta = 0.4$) throughout all simulations. We discuss the effect of various values of the threshold and other parameters, including number of communities and more general degree distributions in the supplementary material.

Fig. 3 (a) shows the phase diagram with three phases: no diffusion (white), local diffusion (blue), and global diffusion (red). As expected, a cross-section for $\mu = \text{const.}$ shows that ρ_∞ is an increasing function of ρ_0 . The system undergoes a sharp transition for a broad range of values of μ , including the case in which communities are absent ($\mu = 1/2$) [36]. The behavior of ρ_∞ as a function of μ is more interesting, in that it exhibits qualitatively different patterns depending on ρ_0 .

Fig. 3 (b,c) illustrates a set of possible scenarios, using both numerical simulations and analytic calculations. For small values of ρ_0 (black, $\rho_0 = 0.10$), nodes are hardly activated even in the originating community; the activation essentially fails to propagate, regardless of μ . By increasing ρ_0 (blue, $\rho_0 = 0.13$), one reaches a threshold where the contagion can spread to the whole originating community if μ is sufficiently small. However, when a critical value of μ is exceeded, the internal connectivity becomes insufficient to spread the contagion to the whole originating community. As the originating community is not saturated, the diffusion does not spread to the other community as well. In this situation there is no overlap between the blue and red area in Fig. 2.

A larger value of ρ_0 (red, $\rho_0 = 0.17$) finally allows the global diffusion. The range of values of μ that allows full activation in the originating community is even further extended (fewer internal links are needed), until a sufficient number of links can be *spared* to induce full activation in the second one. If, however, the number of intra-community links becomes too small (large μ), the activation fails to spread in the originating community and therefore it cannot be transmitted over the




FIG. 3. (a) the phase diagram of threshold model in the presence of community structures with $N = 131056$, $z = 20$, and $\theta = 0.4$. There are three phases: no diffusion (white), local diffusion that saturates the community A (blue), and global diffusion (red). The dotted and dashed lines indicate the values of ρ_0 shown in (b) and (c). (b) the cross-sections of the phase diagram (dotted lines in (a)). TL (solid lines) shows excellent agreements with the simulation while MF (dotted lines) overestimate the possibility of global diffusion. (c) the cross-sections represented in dashed lines in (a).

entire network, despite the increased number of cross-community links. The above reflects in a finite, intermediate range of community strength that allows global spreading.

Even larger values of ρ_0 (red and magenta) simply extend the range of μ for which the activation of the entire network is achieved. When ρ_0 becomes larger than the critical value for the transition in networks without communities, increasing μ never blocks the local spreading, and thus the global diffusion always happens as long as the network has enough bridges. Notice that ρ_∞ is always larger for intermediate values of μ with respect to

the no-community case ($\mu = 1/2$) and indeed full activation can be obtained in an ample set of values of ρ_0 if μ is properly chosen. The smallest value of μ that allows full activation of the second community is essentially independent of ρ_0 , if ρ_0 is sufficiently large: once the first community is fully active it is only a matter of providing sufficient external links, therefore the precise value of ρ_0 does not matter. Specifically, using the TL formulation and the present value of θ , we obtained that $\mu_c \simeq 0.2175$ requires the minimal amount of seeds compatible with global diffusion. The value of μ for which the decay of ρ_∞ sets in, instead, results from not having sufficient internal links to achieve full activation of the originating community given the initial seed. The value of μ depends therefore on ρ_0 .

Although we here present results only for the case of random networks with two communities and a specific value of θ , our results are more general. In the supplementary material we provide evidence that our results are robust under changes in the number of communities and assuming degree distributions more general than that induced by the random arrangement of links described above. Our results include experiments run on LFR benchmark graphs [38] that provision for a power law degree distribution both for the degree and the size of multiple communities. It is also worth stressing that both the MF and TL methods are flexible enough to handle arbitrary (and community-specific) degree distributions, and arbitrary inter-community connectivity patterns. To adapt MF to this general case one would need to replace (e.g., in the equation for ρ_∞^A in Eq. 2) $p(k)$ with the specific degree distribution of community A and q^A with $\sum_{J \in \mathcal{C}} p_{AJ} \rho_\infty^J$, where \mathcal{C} is the set of communities and p_{AJ} is the probability that a link departing from a node in A ends in J. In the supplementary material, we also provide evidence that our results are qualitatively unchanged by varying the system size N , the average degree z , and other parameters. Finally, our results are also robust for changes in the threshold θ for a pretty wide range of values (see supplementary material).

In summary, our analysis shows that there exists an optimal strength of community structure that facilitates global diffusion. We demonstrate that the presence of the right amount of community structure may, counter-intuitively, enhance the diffusion of information rather than hinder it. A tight community, with its high level of internal connectivity, can act as an incubator for the localized information diffusion and help to achieve a critical mass. Information can then spread outside the community effectively as long as sufficient external connectivity is guaranteed. Our results enrich the growing body of literature that stresses the influence of the community structure in a large number of processes, including epidemics, viral marketing, opinion formation, and information diffusion. Our findings can be generalized, and offer insights to understand recent empirical obser-

ventions, such as the counterintuitive behavior of information diffusion in clustered networks [21], or the strong link between viral memes and the community structures in Twitter [6]. Further work is needed to understand how our observations hold if different mechanisms of transmission are considered, or a richer and more complex organization of communities is assumed.

We thank James P. Bagrow, Filippo Menczer, and Sergey Melnik for helpful discussions and suggestions. During the review process, we have been made aware of a similar result independently observed by S. Melnik *et al* [41]. AF acknowledges NSF (grant CCF-1101743) and the McDonnell Foundation. AF and EF acknowledge DARPA (grant W911NF-12-1-0037). YA acknowledges support from Microsoft Research.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Introduction

The study of diffusion and spreading processes—such as epidemic spreading, fads, diffusion of innovations, and viral memes—is a fundamental topic in a number of disciplines, including mathematical, physical and social sciences, communication, marketing and economics. In this paper, we investigate how information diffusion is affected by network community structure using the linear threshold model. We simulate information diffusion as following: at time $t = 0$, a fraction ρ_0 of randomly selected agents, ‘seeds’, in one of the communities is initialized in the active state. At each time step, agents’ states are updated synchronously if the fraction of its neighbors who are already in the active state will be greater than the adoption threshold (θ). Using analytical approaches and numerical simulations, we demonstrate the existence of nontrivial optimal modularity, where global cascades require the minimal number of early adopters.

In the present supplementary material we corroborate broaden the scope of our findings by reporting additional results on a wide range of configurations and parameter spaces. Specifically, we vary the threshold parameter θ , the average degree (and therefore clustering coefficient) z , the network size N , the number of communities, the degree distribution, and the community size distribution.

Results

Average degree and clustering coefficient

Figure 4 shows results with various values of average degree. The change in average degree does not change the behavior of the dynamics. As the average degree increases, the optimal value of μ also increases.




FIG. 4. The phase diagram of the threshold model using TL in the presence of community structures for different z and $\theta = 0.4$.




FIG. 5. (a) The phase diagram of the threshold model using simulation in the presence of community structure with $N = 1024$, $z = 200$, and $\theta = 0.4$.

Figure 5 demonstrates that strong clustering hardly changes the qualitative behavior of the system. In this simulation clustering coefficient for $\mu = 0.23$ is 0.226 and for $\mu = 0.01$ is 0.38.

Disassortative (bipartite) mixing

Figure 6 shows the phase diagram across the whole parameter range of μ . An interesting pattern emerges: the minimum ρ_0 value that gives rise to a global cascade increases until around $\mu = 0.45$ and decreases thereafter, while the optimal mixing parameter remains around 0.25. The global cascade for large values of μ is explained by a qualitatively different dynamical scenario: rather than developing in the originating community and then spreading in the second, adoption spreading alternates longitudinally between the two communities thanks to the increased level of connectivity among them.




FIG. 6. The phase diagram of threshold model using TL in the presence of community structure, with $z = 20$ and $\theta = 0.4$. Figure shows three regions in which $\mu < 0.5$ (assortative; modular), $\mu = 0.5$ (random) and $\mu > 0.5$ (disassortative; bipartite).




FIG. 7. The phase diagram of the threshold model, derived through simulations, in the presence of community structure for different network sizes, with $z = 20$ and $\theta = 0.4$.

Network size

Figure 7 shows that the size of networks does not affect our results.

Number of communities

We have repeated our calculation on networks with varying number of communities. We considered both the case in which intra and extra-community connectivity is random (analogously to the case discussed in the




FIG. 8. The phase diagram of threshold model in the TL approximation with different number of communities.

manuscript) and the more general case of networks generated by the so-called LFR benchmark graphs [38]. The LFR benchmark framework is commonly used in testing community detection algorithms because it can generate more realistic—with heterogeneous degree and community size distribution—networks. Figure 8 demonstrates that the optimal modularity behavior persists when the number of communities is larger than two (see also [41] for a similar observation). Figure 9 shows that it is possible to observe the same qualitative behaviors in LFR networks in which degree distribution and community size distribution are generated from power-law functions.

It is worth to emphasize that increasing the number of community can affect other parameters such as adoption threshold. More community requires smaller adoption threshold to complete the cascade since increases in number of community leads to decrement in the number of bridges among communities.

Adoption threshold

Adoption threshold θ controls how easy for the contagion to spread. Figure 10 (TL approximation) and 11 (simulation) shows the phase diagrams for various values of θ . They demonstrate that qualitatively similar behavior can be observed across a wide range of threshold values which extends up to approximately $\theta = 0.5$. Interestingly, if $\theta > 0.5$, the behavior changes qualitatively. When the threshold is very large, higher value of μ allows global cascade earlier. The initial cascade happens only when the seed size is large and modularity is very high ($\mu \simeq 0$) or very low ($\mu \simeq 1$). When the modularity is very high, the cascade does not extend beyond the originating community. By contrast, strong disassortative structure allows a cascade to spread in a longitudinally alternating way between the two communities.




FIG. 9. The behavior of threshold model in the presence of community structures generated by LFR benchmark, with $N = 25000$, $z = 10$, $t_1 = 2.5$ (degree exponent), $t_2 = 1.5$ (community size exponent), $k_{max} = 30$ and $\theta = 0.3$. LFR benchmark generates more *realistic* networks with community structures. The degree distribution may have a power-law distribution (with exponent t_1 and degree cutoff k_{max}). The size of the communities may also follow a power-law distribution (with exponent t_2).




FIG. 11. The phase diagram of threshold model using simulation in the presence of community structure with $N = 8192$, $z = 20$, and (Left) $\theta = 0.3$ (Right) $\theta = 0.6$. These results confirm the analytic solution shown in the previous figure.




FIG. 10. The phase diagram of threshold model using TL in the presence of community structures with $z = 20$ for different values of θ .

* Corresponding author: yyahn@indiana.edu

- [1] B. Ryan and N. Gross. The diffusion of hybrid seed corn in two iowa communities. *Rural Sociol.*, 8(1):15–24, 1943.
- [2] M. Granovetter. Threshold models of collective behavior. *Am. J. Sociol.*, pages 1420–1443, 1978.
- [3] E. M. Rogers. *Diffusion Of Innovations*. Free Press, 2003.

- [4] Daniel Gruhl, Ramanathan Guha, David Liben-Nowell, and Andrew Tomkins. Information diffusion through blogspace. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 491–501. ACM, 2004.
- [5] Eytan Bakshy, Itamar Rosenn, Cameron Marlow, and Lada Adamic. The role of social networks in information diffusion. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 519–528. ACM, 2012.
- [6] Lilian Weng, Filippo Menczer, and Yong-Yeol Ahn. Virality prediction and community structure in social networks. *Sci. Rep.*, 3:2522, 2013.
- [7] W. Goffman and V. A. Newill. Generalization of epidemic theory: An application to the transmission of ideas. *Nature*, 204(4955):225–228, 1964.
- [8] Daryl J. Daley and David G. Kendall. Epidemics and rumours. *Nature*, 204(4963):1118–1118, 1964.
- [9] Norman Bailey. *The Mathematical Theory of Infectious Diseases and Its Applications*. Griffin, London, 2nd edition, 1975.
- [10] R. M. Anderson, R. M. May, and B. Anderson. *Infectious Diseases of Humans: Dynamics and Control*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1992.
- [11] Jacob Goldenberg, Barak Libai, and Eitan Muller. Talk of the network: A complex systems look at the underlying process of word-of-mouth. *Market. Lett.*, 12(3):211–223, 2001.
- [12] Kazumi Saito, Ryohei Nakano, and Masahiro Kimura. Prediction of information diffusion probabilities for in-

- dependent cascade model. In *Knowledge-Based Intelligent Information And Engineering Systems*, pages 67–75. Springer, 2008.
- [13] Pedro Domingos and Matt Richardson. Mining the network value of customers. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 57–66. ACM, 2001.
- [14] Matthew Richardson and Pedro Domingos. Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 61–70. ACM, 2002.
- [15] Jure Leskovec, Lada A Adamic, and Bernardo A Huberman. The dynamics of viral marketing. *ACM Transactions on The Web (TWEB)*, 1(1):5, 2007.
- [16] Thomas C Schelling. Dynamic models of segregation? *J. Math. Sociol.*, 1(2):143–186, 1971.
- [17] D.J. Watts. A simple model of global cascades on random networks. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 99(9):5766, 2002.
- [18] P. L. Krapivsky, S. Redner, and D. Volovik. Reinforcement-driven spread of innovations and fads. *J. Stat. Mech.*, page P12003, 2011.
- [19] Lars Backstrom, Dan Huttenlocher, Jon Kleinberg, and Xiangyang Lan. Group formation in large social networks: Membership, growth, and evolution. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 44–54. ACM, 2006.
- [20] Daniel M Romero, Brendan Meeder, and Jon Kleinberg. Differences in the mechanics of information diffusion across topics: Idioms, political hashtags, and complex contagion on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 695–704. ACM, 2011.
- [21] Damon Centola. The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science*, 329(5996):1194–1197, 2010.
- [22] Romualdo Pastor-Satorras and Alessandro Vespignani. Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86(14):3200, 2001.
- [23] Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 74:47–97, Jan 2002.
- [24] M. E. J. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.
- [25] J-P Onnela, Jari Saramäki, Jorkki Hyvönen, György Szabó, David Lazer, Kimmo Kaski, János Kertész, and A-L Barabási. Structure and tie strengths in mobile communication networks. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 104(18):7332–7336, 2007.
- [26] James P Gleeson. Cascades on correlated and modular random networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 77(4):046117, 2008.
- [27] R. Lambiotte and P. Panzarasa. Communities, knowledge creation, and information diffusion. *J. Informetr.*, 3:180–190, 2009.
- [28] Y Ikeda, T Hasegawa, and K Nemoto. Cascade dynamics on clustered network. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 221(1):012005, 2010.
- [29] Adam Hackett, Sergey Melnik, and James P Gleeson. Cascades on a class of clustered random networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83(5):056107, 2011.
- [30] Kihong Chung, Yongjoo Baek, Daniel Kim, Meesoon Ha, and Hawoong Jeong. Generalized epidemic process on modular networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 89:052811, 2013.
- [31] Xiaoyan Wu and Zonghua Liu. How community structure influences epidemic spread in social networks. *Physica A*, 387(2):623–630, 2008.
- [32] L. Weng, F. Menczer, and Y.-Y. Ahn. Predicting successful memes using network and community structure. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM’14)*, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, June 2014.
- [33] Wulfram Gerstner and Werner M Kistler. *Spiking neuron models: Single neurons, populations, plasticity*. Cambridge university press, 2002.
- [34] Hanshuang Chen and Zhonghuai Hou. Optimal modularity for nucleation in a network-organized ising model. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83(4):046124, 2011.
- [35] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of small-world networks. *Nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.
- [36] P Singh, Sameet Sreenivasan, Boleslaw K Szymanski, and Gyorgy Korniss. Threshold-limited spreading in social networks with multiple initiators. *Sci. Rep.*, 3:2330, 2013.
- [37] M. Girvan and M.E.J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 99(12):7821, 2002.
- [38] Andrea Lancichinetti, Santo Fortunato, and Filippo Radicchi. Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms. *Phys. Rev. E*, 78(4):046110, 2008.
- [39] B. Karrer and M. E. J. Newman. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 83(1):016107, 2011.
- [40] James P Gleeson and Diarmuid J Cahalane. Seed size strongly affects cascades on random networks. *Phys. Rev. E*, 75(5):056103, 2007.
- [41] S. Melnik, M. A. Porter, P. J. Mucha, and J. P. Gleeson. Dynamics on modular networks with heterogeneous correlations. *Chaos*, 24:023106, 2014.