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Microblogs are increasingly exploited for predicting prices and traded volumes of stocks in financial markets. However, it has been demonstrated that much of the content shared in microblogging platforms is created and publicized by bots and spammers. Yet, the presence (or lack thereof) and the impact of fake stock microblogs has never systematically been investigated before. Here, we study 9M tweets related to stocks of the 5 main financial markets in the US. By comparing tweets with financial data from Google Finance, we highlight important characteristics of Twitter stock microblogs. More importantly, we uncover a malicious practice perpetrated by coordinated groups of bots and likely aimed at promoting low-value stocks by exploiting the popularity of high-value ones. Our results call for the adoption of spam and bot detection techniques in all studies and applications that exploit user-generated content for predicting the stock market.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The exploitation of user-generated content in microblogs for the prediction of real-world phenomena, has recently gained huge momentum [26]. An important application domain for such approach is that of finance, and in particular, stock market prediction. Indeed, a number of works developed algorithms and tools for extracting valuable information (e.g., sentiment scores) from microblogs and proved capable of predicting prices and traded volumes of stocks in financial markets [6]. Moreover, finance is increasingly relying on this information through the development of automatic trading systems. All such works ground on the assumption that microblogs collectively represent a reliable proxy for the opinions of masses of users. Meanwhile, evidence of spam and automated (bot) activities in social platforms is being reported at a growing rate [15]. The existence of fictitious, synthetic content appears to be pervasive since it has been witnessed both in online discussions.
about important societal topics (e.g., politics, terrorism, immigration), as well as in discussions about seemingly less relevant topics, such as products on sale on e-commerce platforms, and mobile applications [10]. For instance, regarding politics, it has been demonstrated that bots tampered with recent US [3], Italian [9], and French [13] political elections as well as with online discussions about the 2016 UK Brexit referendum [2].

Thus, on the one hand, user-generated content in microblogs is being exploited for predicting trends in the stock market. On the other hand, without a thorough investigation, we run the risk that much of the content we rely on, is actually fake and possibly purposely created to mislead algorithms and users alike. Should this risk materialize, real-world consequences would be severe, as already anticipated by a few noteworthy events. On May 6 2010, the Dow Jones Industrial Average had the biggest one-day drop in history, later called the Flash Crash. After five months, an investigation concluded that one of the possible causes was an automated high-frequency trading system that had incorrectly assessed some information collected from the Web [20]. In 2013, the US International Press Officer’s Twitter account got hacked and a false rumor was posted reporting that President Obama got injured during a terrorist attack. The fake news rapidly caused a stock market collapse that burned $136B¹. Then, in 2014, the unknown Cynk Technology briefly became a $6B worth company. Automatic trading algorithms detected a fake social discussion and began to invest heavily in the company’s shares. By the time analysts noticed the orchestration, investments had already turned into heavy losses².

This study moves in the direction of investigating the presence of spam and bot activity in stock microblogs, thus paving the way for the development of intelligent financial-spam filtering techniques. Specifically, we first collect a rich dataset comprising 9M tweets posted between May and September 2017, discussing stocks of the 5 main financial markets in the US. We enrich our dataset by collecting financial information from Google Finance about the 30,032 companies mentioned in our tweets. Cross-checking discussion patterns on Twitter against official data from Google Finance uncovers anomalies in tweets related to some low-value companies. Further investigation of this issue reveals a large-scale speculative campaign perpetrated by coordinated groups of bots and aimed at promoting low-value stocks by exploiting the popularity of high-value ones. Finally, we analyze a small subset of authors of suspicious tweets with state-of-the-art bot detection techniques, identifying 71% (18,509 accounts) of them as bots.

2 RELATED WORK
Since no study has previously addressed bot activity in stock microblogs, this section is organized so as to separately survey previous work either related to the exploitation of user-generated content for financial purposes, or to spam and bot characterization.

2.1 Finance and social media
Works in this field are based on the idea underlying the Hong-Page theorem [19]. Such theorem, when cast in the financial domain, states that user-generated messages about a company’s future prospects provide a rich and diverse source of information, in contrast to what the small number of traditional financial analysts can offer.

Starting from the general assumption of the Hong-Page theorem, much effort has been devoted towards the detection of correlations between metrics extracted from social media posts and stock market prices. In particular, sentiment metrics have been widely used as a predictor for stock


²http://mashable.com/2014/07/10/cynk/#HD9o6llp6gw
prices and other economic indicators [5, 17, 23, 28]. The primary role played by the sentiment of the users as a financial predictor is also testified by the interest in developing domain-specific sentiment classifiers for the financial domain [8]. Others have instead proposed to exploit the overall volume of tweets about a company [22] and the topology of stock networks [25] as predictors of financial performance. Specifically, authors of [22] envisioned the possibility to automatically buy or sell stocks based on the presence of a peak in the volume of tweets. However, subsequent work [29] evaluated the informativeness of sentiment- and volume-derived predictors, showing that the sentiment of tweets contains significantly more information for predicting stock prices than just their volume. The role of influencers in social media has also been identified as a strong contributing factor to the formation of market trends [7]. Others have instead used weblogs for studying the relationships between different companies [21]. In detail, co-occurrences of stock mentions in weblogs have been exploited to create a graph of companies, which was subsequently clustered. Authors have verified that companies belonging to the same clusters feature strong correlations in their stock prices. This methodology can be employed for market prediction and as a portfolio-selection method, which has been shown to outperform traditional strategies based on company sectors or historical stock prices.

Nowadays, results of studies such as those briefly surveyed in this section are leveraged for the development of automatic trading systems that are largely fed with social media-derived information [12]. As a consequence, such automatic systems can potentially suffer severe problems caused by large quantities of fictitious posts. As discussed in the next section, the presence of social bots, and of the fake content they produce, is so widespread as to represent a serious, tangible threat to these, and other, systems [16].

2.2 Characterization of spam and bots in social media

Since our study is aimed at verifying the presence and the impact of spam and bot activity in stock microblogs, in this section we focus on discussing previous work about the characterization of spam and bots, rather than on their detection.

Many developers of spammer accounts make use of bots in order to simultaneously and continuously post a great deal of spam content. This is one of the reasons why, despite bots being in rather small numbers when compared to legitimate users, they nonetheless have a profound impact on content popularity and activity in social media [16]. In addition, bots are driven so as to act in a coordinated and synchronized way, thus amplifying their effects [24]. Another problem with bots is that they evolve over time, in order to evade established detection techniques [10]. Hence, newer bots often feature advanced characteristics that make them way harder to detect with respect to older ones. Recently, a general-purpose overview of the landscape of automated accounts was presented in [14]. This work testifies the emergence of a new wave of social bots, capable of mimicking human behavior and interaction patterns in social media better than ever before. A subsequent study [10] compared “traditional” and “evolved” bots in Twitter, and demonstrated that the latter are almost completely undetected by platform administrators. Authors demonstrate that also the majority of bot detection techniques proposed in literature suffer from the same problem. Moreover, a crowdsourcing campaign showed that even tech savvy users are incapable of accurately identifying the evolved bots.

Given this worrying picture, it is not surprising that bots have recently proven capable of influencing the public opinion for many crucial topics [2, 3, 13] and in many different ways, such as by spreading fake news [27] or by artificially inflating the popularity of certain posts [4]. The combination of automatic systems feeding on social media data and the pervasive presence of spam and bots, motivates our investigation on the presence of spam and bots in stock microblogs.
Our dataset for this study is composed of: (i) stock microblogs collected from Twitter, and (ii) financial information collected from Google Finance.

3.1 Twitter data collection

Twitter users follow the convention of tagging stock microblogs with so-called *cashtags*. The cashtag of a company is composed of a dollar sign followed by its ticker symbol (e.g., $AAPL$ is the cashtag of *Apple, Inc.*). Figure 1 shows a sample tweet with the $AAPL$ cashtag. Similarly to hashtags, cashtags can be used as an efficient mean to filter content on Twitter and to collect data about given companies [18]. For this reason, we based our Twitter data collection on an official list of cashtags. Specifically, we first downloaded a list of 6,689 stocks traded on the most important US markets (e.g., NASDAQ, NYSE) from the official NASDAQ Web site\(^3\). Then, we collected all tweets shared between May and September 2017, containing at least one cashtag from the list. Data collection from Twitter has been carried out by exploiting Twitter’s Streaming APIs\(^4\). After our 5 months data collection, we ended up with ~9M tweets (of which 22% are retweets), posted by ~2.5M distinct users, as shown in Table 1.

As a consequence of our data collection strategy, every tweet in our dataset contains at least one cashtag from the starting list. However, many collected tweets contain more than one cashtag, many of which are related to companies not included in our starting list. Indeed, overall we collected data about 30,032 companies traded across 5 different markets.
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3.2 Financial data collection

We enriched our Twitter dataset by collecting financial information about each of the 30,032 companies found in our tweets. Financial information have been collected from public company data hosted on the Google Finance Web site\(^5\). Among collected financial information, is the market capitalization (market cap) of a company and its industrial classification.

The capitalization is the total dollar market value of a company. For a given company \(i\), it is computed as the share price \(P(s_i)\) times the number of outstanding shares \(|s_i|\): \(C_i = P(s_i) \times |s_i|\). In our study, we take the market cap of a company into account, since it allows us to compare the financial value of that company with its social media popularity and engagement. In Table 1 we report the median capitalization of the companies for each considered market. As shown, important markets such as NYSE and NASDAQ trade, on average, stocks with higher capitalization than those traded in minor markets.

Industrial classification is expressed via the Thomson Reuters Business Classification\(^6\) (TRBC). TRBC is a 5-level hierarchical sector and industry classification, widely used in the financial domain for computing sector-specific indices (Figure 2). At the topmost (coarse-grained) level TRBC classifies companies into 10 economic sectors, while at the lowest (fine-grained) level companies are divided into 837 different activities. An example of industrial classification can be seen in Table 2. In our study, we compare companies belonging to the same category, across all 5 levels of TRBC.

4 ANALYSIS OF STOCK MICROBLOGS

4.1 Dataset overview

Surprisingly, the vast majority (76%) of companies mentioned in our dataset do not belong to the NASDAQ list and are traded in OTCMKTS, as shown in Table 1. Having so many OTCMKTS companies in our dataset is already an interesting finding, considering that our data collection grounded on a list of high-capitalization (high-cap) companies. OTCMKTS is a US financial market for over-the-counter transactions, thus with far less stringent requirements than those needed from NASDAQ, NYSE, NYSEARCA, and NYSEMKT. For this reason, many small companies opt to be traded in OTCMKTS

\(^5\)https://www.google.com/finance
instead of the more requiring markets. Thus, from a company viewpoint, our dataset is dominated by OTCMKTS. However, OTCMKTS companies play a marginal role from both a financial and social viewpoint, having low capitalization and small numbers of tweets, the vast majority of which are retweets. In contrast, companies from NASDAQ and NYSE have high capitalization and are mentioned in many tweets, with low percentage of retweets.

In the following, we report on some of the general characteristics of our dataset. Figure 3a shows the mean volume of tweets collected per hour. The largest surge of tweets occurs between 10am and 5pm (US Eastern time), which almost completely overlaps with the opening hours of the New York Stock Exchange (9:30am to 4pm). This fact further highlights the strong relation between stock microblogs and the real-world stock market. Figure 8b shows a cashtag-cloud representing the most tweeted companies in our dataset. In figure, cashtags are color-coded so as to visually highlight companies traded in different markets. The most tweeted companies in our dataset are in line with those found in previous works [1, 18], with $AAPL$ leading the way, followed by $CRM$, $TSLA$, and $FB$. Notably, no company from OTCMKTS appears among top mentioned companies. Finally, as previously introduced, many stock microblogs contain more than one cashtag. Figure 3c shows the distribution of distinct cashtags per tweet, with a mean value of 2 cashtags/tweet.

### 4.2 Stock time series analysis

In order to uncover possible malicious behaviors related to stock microblogs, we carry out a fine-grained analysis of our data. Specifically, we build and analyze the hourly time series of each of the 6,689 stocks downloaded from the NASDAQ Web site. Given a stock $i$, its time series is defined as $s_i = (s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, \ldots, s_{i,N})$, with $s_{i,j}$ being the number of tweets that mentioned the stock $i$ during the hour $j$. Figure 11 shows some examples of our stock time series, for 4 highly tweeted stocks. As shown in figure, stock time series are characterized by long time spans over which tweet discussion volumes remain rather low, occasionally interspersed by large discussion spikes. To give a better characterization of this phenomenon we ran a simple anomaly detection technique on all the 6,689 time series. As typically done in many time series analysis tasks, our anomaly detection technique is designed so as to detect a peak $p_{i,j}$ in a time series $s_i$ iff the tweet volume for the hour $j$ deviates from the mean tweet volume $\bar{s}_i$ by a number $K$ of standard deviations:

$$p_{i,j} \iff s_{i,j} > \bar{s}_i + K \times \sigma(s_i)$$

The parameter $K$ determines the number of peaks found by our anomaly detection technique. In fact, a bigger $K$ implies that a larger deviation from the mean is needed in order to detect a peak. Figure 6 shows the number of peaks detected in our time series, as a function of the parameter $K$. For the remainder of our analysis we set $K = 10$, which represents a trade-off between the height of considered peaks and the number of peaks to analyze. This choice of $K$ results in 1,926 peaks.
detected in our time series. Time series depicted in Figure 11 also show mean values (cyan solid line) and the $10\sigma$ threshold (red solid line) above which peaks are detected.

Next, we are interested in analyzing the tweets that generated the peaks (henceforth, peak tweets). In detail, a peak $p_{i,j}$ is composed of a set of tweets $t_{i,j}$, such that each tweet $t \in t_{i,j}$ contains the cashtag related to the stock $i$ and has been posted during the hour $j$ (i.e., the peak hour):

$$t_{i,j} = \{t_{i,j}^1, t_{i,j}^2, \ldots, t_{i,j}^M\}, \quad M = s_{i,j}$$

Thus, for each of the 1,926 peaks $p_{i,j}$ we analyze the corresponding set of tweets $t_{i,j}$. We find out that, on average, 60% of tweets $t \in t$ are retweets. In other words, the peaks identified by our anomaly detection technique are largely composed of retweets. In addition, considering that our time series have hourly granularity, those retweets also occurred within a rather limited time span, in a bursty fashion. This finding is particularly interesting also considering that in all our dataset, we had only 22% retweets, versus 60% measured for peak tweets.
We also analyzed tweets $t \in t$ by considering the co-occurrences of stocks. From this analysis we see that tweets $t \in t$ typically contain many more cashtags than tweets $t \notin t$. Indeed, the mean number of cashtags per tweet is 6 for $t \in t$, versus 2 for the whole dataset. The cashtags that co-occur in peak tweets seem unrelated, and the authors of those tweets don’t provide further information to explain such co-occurrences. As an example, Figure 5 shows 4 of such suspicious tweets. In figure, in every tweet, a few cashtags of high-capitalization (high-cap) stocks co-occur with many cashtags of low-cap stocks.

The characteristics of peak tweets previously highlighted – that is, the percentage of retweets and the number of co-occurring cashtags – differ significantly from those measured for the whole dataset. The reason for this peculiar phenomenon could be related to some real-world news or event, that motivates the surge of retweets and the co-occurrences of different cashtags. However, such differences could also be the consequence of a shady, malicious activity. Indeed, there have already been reports of large groups of bots that coordinately and simultaneously alter popularity...
and engagement metrics of Twitter users and content [4, 15]. In particular, mass retweets have been identified as one mean to artificially increase the popularity of certain content [10].

5 ANATOMY OF FINANCIAL SPAM
In this section we evaluate different hypotheses in order to thoroughly understand the reasons why so many seemingly-unrelated cashtags co-occur in peak tweets, and the reason for the high percentage of retweets in peaks.
5.1 Analysis of co-occurring stocks by industrial classification

Previous work have investigated the co-occurrences of stocks in weblogs and their relation to real-world events. In particular, authors of [21] applied a clustering technique over a stock co-occurrences matrix, identifying a number of clusters containing highly correlated stocks. Results of this study highlighted that stocks that co-occur in blog articles as a consequence of real-world events, belong to the same industrial sector. In other words, results of [21] support the assumption that stocks that legitimately appear related between one another in weblogs (or microblogs), are also related in real-world. Thus, as a consequence of common sense and previous studies, it would be suspicious for some stocks to appear related (i.e., co-occurring) in microblogs, without being related (i.e., belonging to the same industrial sector) in real-world.

To evaluate whether co-occurring stocks in peak tweets of our dataset are also related in real-world, we exploited the TRBC classification previously introduced. Specifically, for each tweet $t \in T$ we measured the extent to which the stocks mentioned in $t$ belong to the same (or to different) TRBC class(es), for all the 5 hierarchical levels of TRBC. As a measurement for the difference in TRBC classes across stocks in a tweet, we leveraged the notion of entropy. Thus, given a tweet $t \in T$ containing $X$ distinct cashtags (i.e., each one associated to a different company) and the level $j$ of TRBC with $N_j$ classes, we first built the list of TRBC classes of the $X$ companies mentioned in $t$:

$$c = (c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_X)$$

Then, we computed the normalized Shannon entropy of the TRBC classes in $c$, for TRBC level $j$, as:

$$H^c_{\text{norm}}(j) = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_j} p^c_i \log_2 p^c_i}{H_{\text{max}}(j)}$$

where $p^c_i$ is the empirical probability that TRBC class $i$ appears in $c$, and $H_{\text{max}}(j)$ is the maximum theoretical entropy for TRBC level $j$:

$$H_{\text{max}}(j) = -\log_2 \frac{1}{N_j}$$

Because of the normalization term, $0 \leq H^c_{\text{norm}} \leq 1$, with $H^c_{\text{norm}} \sim 0$ meaning companies of the same industrial sector, while $H^c_{\text{norm}} \sim 1$ implying unrelated companies.

Intuitively, considering that the 5 TRBC levels are hierarchical, we expect $H^c_{\text{norm}}$ to be higher (i.e., more heterogeneity) for fine-grained TRBC levels, while we expect $H^c_{\text{norm}}$ to be lower (i.e., less heterogeneity) for the topmost, coarse-grained TRBC level. Results of this experiment, with TRBC level $j$ ranging from the lowest level 1 to the topmost level 5, are shown in Figure 7. For every TRBC level, a boxplot and a scatterplot show the distribution of normalized entropy measured for each peak tweet. As expected, $H^c_{\text{norm}}$ actually lowers when considering coarse-grained TRBC levels, as shown by the median value of the boxplot distributions. Nonetheless, median $H^c_{\text{norm}} \sim 1$ for all 5 TRBC levels, meaning that co-occurring companies in peak tweets are almost unrelated. Notably, even for fine-grained TRBC levels, there is a minority of peak tweets for which we measured $H^c_{\text{norm}} = 0$. These tweets might actually contain mentions to companies related also in real-world. Summarizing, the results of this experiment seem to suggest that, overall, co-occurrences of stocks in peak tweets are not motivated by the fact that stocks belong to the same industrial or economic sectors.

5.2 Analysis of co-occurring stocks by market capitalization

Since real-world relatedness (as expressed by industrial classification) is not a plausible explanation for co-occurring stocks in our dataset, we now turn our attention to market capitalization. We are
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Fig. 7. Normalized Shannon entropy of TRBC classes in peak tweets, for all 5 levels of TRBC. As shown, median \( H_{\text{norm}} \sim 1 \) for all 5 TRBC levels, meaning that co-occurring companies in peak tweets are almost unrelated.

(a) Standard deviation of the capitalization of co-occurring companies in peak tweets, and comparison with a bootstrap. The large measured standard deviation implies that high-cap companies co-occur with low-cap ones.

(b) Standard deviation of the capitalization of co-occurring companies in full dataset, and comparison with a bootstrap. The large measured standard deviation implies that high-cap companies co-occur with low-cap ones.

Fig. 8. Overall statistics about our dataset.

interested in evaluating whether a relation exists between the capitalization of co-occurring stocks. For instance, legitimate peak tweets could mention multiple stocks with similar capitalization. Conversely, malicious users could try to exploit the popularity of high-cap stocks by mentioning them together with low-cap ones.

One way to evaluate the similarity (or dissimilarity) in market capitalization of co-occurring stocks is by computing statistical measures of spread, \textit{standard deviation} (std.) being a straightforward one. Thus, for each peak tweet \( t \in T \) we computed the std. of the capitalization of all companies mentioned in \( t \). Results are shown in Figure 8a, where boxplots and scatterplots are depicted as a...
function of the number of distinct companies mentioned in tweets. Then, in order to understand whether the measured spread in capitalization is due to the intrinsic characteristics of our dataset (i.e., the underlying statistical distribution of capitalization) or to other factors, we compared mean values of our empiric measurements with the result of a bootstrap. For bootstrapping the std. of tweets that mention \( x \) companies, we randomly sampled 10,000 groups of \( x \) companies from our dataset. Then, for each of the 10,000 random groups we computed the std. of the capitalization of the \( x \) companies of the group. Finally, we averaged results over the 10,000 groups. This procedure is executed for \( x = 1, 2, \ldots, 22 \), thus covering the whole extent of Figure 8a. Results in figure highlight a large empiric std. between the capitalization of co-occurring companies. This means that in our peak tweets, high-cap companies co-occur with low-cap ones. Moreover, the measured std. is larger than that obtained with the bootstrap. In turn, this means that the large difference in capitalization can not be explained by the intrinsic characteristics of our dataset, but it is rather the consequence of an external action.

5.3 Social and financial importance

So far, we demonstrated that tweets responsible for generating peaks, mention a large number of unrelated stocks, some of which are high-cap stocks while the others are low-cap ones. Adding to these findings, we are also interested in assessing the relation between the social and financial importance of our 30,032 stocks. Financial importance of a stock \( i \) can be measured by its market capitalization \( C_i \). Social importance can be quantified as the number of times a stock is mentioned in stock microblogs. Intuitively, we expect a positive correlation between stock capitalization and mentions, meaning that high-cap stocks are mentioned more frequently than low-cap stocks. Notably, this positive relation has already been measured in a number of previous works, such as [22], and has been leveraged for predicting stock prices.

Our data in Table 1 allow to make a first assessment of this relation over the whole dataset. It shows that on average we collected 25.5 tweets/stock for OTCMKTS stocks, versus 1,333.3 tweets/stock
Fig. 10. Number of peaks detected, as a function of $K$ for OTCMKTS cashtags.

for NASDAQ and 1,471.5 tweets/stock for NYSE. Results for NYSEARCA and NYSEMKT fall in between. Minding that OTCMKTS stocks feature the lowest capitalization while stocks from NASDAQ and NYSE have the highest, the positive relation between financial and social importance seem confirmed, when considering all tweets of our dataset. However, we are also interested in assessing whether this relation holds when only considering peak tweets. We performed this measurement as follows. Given a stock $i$ and a peak $p$, we counted the number of times that $i$ is mentioned in peak tweets of $p$. We repeated this measurement for every peak $p$, and we computed the median value of these measurements that represents the social importance of $i$ in all peak tweets. Then, for every stock, we plotted its measurement of social importance versus that of financial importance, and we visually grouped stocks by their market. To avoid overplotting, we performed a bivariate (i.e., 2D) kernel density estimation, whose results are shown in Figure 9. For the sake of clarity, we split the social–vs–financial space into 4 sectors. Sector $A$ defines a region of space with stocks having both a high social and financial importance. Stocks in Sector $B$ are characterized by high financial importance, but low social importance. Stocks in Sector $C$ have both low social and financial importance, while stocks in Sector $D$ have high social importance despite low financial importance.

By comparing stock densities of different markets in Figure 9, we see that OTCMKTS stocks almost completely lay in Sector $D$. All other markets have their stock densities mainly laying in Sector $B$ and Sector $A$. In other words, OTCMKTS stocks have a suspiciously high social importance (i.e., they are mentioned in many tweets and across many peaks), despite their low financial importance. Results for all other markets are more intuitive, with NYSEARCA stocks achieving the best combination of social and financial importance. Summarizing, we measured a positive relation between social and financial importance when considering all stock microblogs shared during the 5 months of our study. However, when focusing our analysis on peaks in stock microblogs, we observed a suspicious behavior related to OTCMKTS stocks.
(a) $\text{UPZS} (\text{Unique Pizza & Subs Corp.}).$

(b) $\text{KNSC} (\text{Kenergy Scientific, Inc.}).$

(c) $\text{INNV} (\text{Innovus Pharmaceuticals, Inc.}).$

(d) $\text{NNSR} (\text{NanoSensors, Inc.}).$

Fig. 11. Examples of stock time series for 4 OTCMKTS tweeted stocks. Mean values are marked with cyan solid lines and thresholds above which peaks are detected are marked with red solid lines.

Fig. 12. Examples of tweets with just one OTCMKTS cashtag.

Fig. 13. Examples of suspicious users classified as bots. The many characteristics shared between all these users (e.g., name, profile picture, social links) support the hypothesis that they are part of a larger botnet.
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6 ANALYSIS OF SUSPICIOUS USERS

In previous sections we identified a wide array of suspicious phenomena related to stock microblogs. In particular, peaks in microblog conversations about high-cap stocks are filled with mentions of low-cap (mainly OTCMKTS) stocks. Such mentions cannot be explained by real-world stock relatedness. Moreover, the peaks in microblog conversations are largely caused by mass retweets. Despite not having been studied before, this scenario resembles those recently discovered when investigating the activities of bots tampering with social political discussions [10, 15, 24]. Unfortunately, systems for automatically detecting spam in stock microblogs are yet to be developed. However, recent scientific efforts lead to the development of several general-purpose bot and spam detection systems. Thus, in this section we employ a state-of-the-art bot and spam detection system, specifically developed for spotting malicious group activities, to classify suspicious users [9, 11]. The goal of this experiment is to assess whether users that shared/retweeted the suspicious peak tweets we previously identified, are classified as bots. In turn, this would bring definitive evidence of bot activities in the stock microblogs that we analyzed. The system in [9, 11] performs bot detection in 2 steps. Firstly, it encodes the online behavior of a user into a string of characters that represents the digital DNA of the user. Then, multiple digital DNA sequences, one for each user of the group under investigation, are compared between one another by means of string mining and bioinformatics algorithms. The system classifies as bots those users that have suspiciously high similarities among their digital DNA sequences. Notably, the system in [9, 11] proved capable of accurately detecting also “evolved” bots ($F_1 = 0.97$), such as those described in [14].

Because of the computationally intensive analyses performed by [9, 11], we constrained this experiment to the 100 largest peaks (i.e., those generated by the greatest number of tweets) of our dataset. Starting from those top-100 peaks, we then analyzed the 25,988 distinct users that shared or retweeted at least one peak tweet. Behavioral information needed by the detection system to perform user classification have been collected by crawling the Twitter timelines of such 25,988 users. Notably, the bot detection system classified as much as 71% (18,509) of the analyzed users as bots. Figure 13 shows 6 examples of users classified as bots. A manual analysis of a subset of bots allowed to identify characteristics shared between all the users (e.g., similar name, join date, profile picture, etc.), supporting the hypothesis that they are part of a larger botnet. Users classified as bots also feature very high retweet rates (ratio of retweets over all posted tweets), thus explaining the large number of retweets in our peaks and among OTCMKTS stock microblogs.
We obtained these results by analyzing only the 100 largest detected peaks, therefore analyses of minor peaks might yield different results. Nonetheless, the overwhelming ratio of bots that we discovered among large peaks discussing popular stocks, raises serious concerns over the reliability of stock microblogs.

7 DISCUSSION

Results of our extensive investigation highlighted the presence of spam and bot activity in stock microblogs. For the first time, we described an advertising practice where many financially unimportant (low-cap) stocks are massively mentioned in microblogs together with a few financially important (high-cap) stocks. Analyses of suspicious users suggest that the advertising practice is carried out by large groups of coordinated social bots. Considering the already demonstrated relation between social and financial importance [22], a possible outcome expected by perpetrators of this advertising practice is the increase in financial importance of the low-cap stocks, by exploiting the popularity of high-cap ones.

The potential negative consequences of this new form of financial spam are manifold. On the one hand, unaware investors could be lured into believing that the social importance of promoted stocks have a basis in reality. On the other hand, also the multitude of automatic trading systems that feed on social information, could be tricked into buying low value stocks. Market collapses such as the Flash Crash, or disastrous investments such as that of Cynk Technology, could occur again in the future, with dire consequences. For this reason, a favorable research avenue for the future could involve quantifying the impact of social bots and microblog financial spam in stock prices fluctuations, similarly to what has already been done for financial e-mail spam.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first exploratory study on the presence of spam and bot activity in stock microblogs. As such, future works related to the characterization and detection of financial spam in microblogs, are much desirable. Indeed, no automatic system for the detection of financial spam in microblogs has been developed to date. To overcome this limitation, in our analyses we employed a general-purpose bot detection system. However, such approach hardly scales on the massive number of users, both legitimate and automated, involved in financial discussions on microblogs. Hence, another promising direction of research involves with the development of tools and techniques for promptly detecting promoted stocks, thus avoiding the need for user classification.

Finally, we believe it is useful – and worrying at the same time – to demonstrate the presence of bot activity in stock microblogs. Finance thus adds to the growing list of domains recently tampered by social bots (joining the political, social, and commercial domains, to name but a few).

8 CONCLUSIONS

Motivated by the widespread presence of social bots, we carried out the first large-scale, systematic analysis on the presence and impact of spam and bot activity in stock microblogs. By cross-checking 9M stock microblogs from Twitter with financial information from Google Finance, we uncovered a malicious practice aimed at promoting low-value stocks by exploiting the popularity of high-value ones. In detail, many stocks with low market capitalization, mainly traded in OTCMKTS, are mentioned in microblogs together with a few high capitalization stocks traded in NASDAQ and NYSE. We showed that such co-occurring stocks are not related by economic and industrial sector. Moreover, the large discussion spikes about low-value stocks are due to mass, synchronized retweets. Finally, an analysis of retweeting users classified 71% of them as bots.
Given the severe consequences that this new form of financial spam could have on unaware investors as well as on automatic trading systems, our results call for the prompt adoption of spam and bot detection techniques in all applications and systems that exploit stock microblogs.
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