arXiv:1805.10244v1 [cs.SI] 25 May 2018

# Detecting Influence Campaigns in Social Networks Using the Ising Model

Nicolas Guenon des Mesnards
Operations Research Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, ngdm@mit.edu
Tauhid Zaman
Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, zlisto@mit.edu

We consider the problem of identifying coordinated influence campaigns conducted by automated agents or bots in a social network. We study several different Twitter datasets which contain such campaigns and find that the bots exhibit heterophily - they interact more with humans than with each other. We use this observation to develop a probability model for the network structure and bot labels based on the Ising model from statistical physics. We present a method to find the maximum likelihood assignment of bot labels by solving a minimum cut problem. Our algorithm allows for the simultaneous detection of multiple bots that are potentially engaging in a coordinated influence campaign, in contrast to other methods that identify bots one at a time. We find that our algorithm is able to more accurately find bots than existing methods when compared to a human labeled ground truth. We also look at the content posted by the bots we identify and find that they seem to have a coordinated agenda.

*Subject classifications*: Social networks, Influence campaigns, Ising model.

## 1. Introduction

Social networks face the challenge posed by automated bots which create spam in the network and result in a degraded user experience. However, recently these bots have become a serious threat to democracies. There have been multiple reports alleging that foreign actors attempted to penetrate U.S. social networks in order to manipulate elections (Parlapiano and Lee 2018, Shane 2017, Guilbeault and Woolley 2016, Byrnes 2016, Ferrara 2017). The perpetrators used bots to share politically polarizing content, much of it fake news, in order to amplify it and extend its reach, or directly interacted with humans to promote their agenda. While no one knows exactly how many

people were impacted by these influence campaigns, it has still become a concern for the U.S. and many other governments (Fandos and Shane 2017, Price 2018).

Social network counter-measures are needed to combat these coordinated influence campaigns. Conventional methods of bot detection may not be sufficient because they can be fooled by modifying certain elements of bot behavior, such as the frequency of posting or sharing content. However, because many of these bots are coordinated, they may exhibit joint behaviors which are difficult to mask and which allow for more accurate and robust detection. These behaviors may not be observable by looking at accounts in isolation. Therefore, conventional algorithms which focus on individual detection may not find these bots. What is needed is an algorithm that can simultaneously detect multiple bots.

### 1.1. Our Contributions

We provide evidence that modern bots in the social network Twitter coordinate their attacks. They do not create original content, but rather amplify certain human users by disproportionately retweeting them. We find that the bots exhibit *heterophily*, which means they interact with humans much more frequently than they interact with each other (Rogers 2010). This is the opposite of the more common homophily phenomenon, where similar individuals interact with each other.

We use heterophily to design a new algorithm for bot detection. We utilize the Ising model from statistical physics to model the network structure and bot labels. We show that the maximum likelihood estimation of the bot labels in this Ising model reduces to solving a minimum cut problem, which allows for efficient estimation. Our algorithm scales to large networks and is much faster than modern bot detection algorithms (see Table 4).

A natural application of our algorithm is understanding the agenda of the bots' influence campaigns. We do this by analyzing the content of the detected bots. We find that the bots seem to promote certain geo-political issues.

We emphasize that our algorithm is *language agnostic* and relies only on the interaction network. Therefore, it can be used on social networks in many different countries without having prior

knowledge of the language, culture, or individuals involved. Also, our algorithm is not restricted to Twitter, and can be used on any online platform where individuals can interact with one another (Facebook, Reddit, Instagram, etc.).

### 1.2. Previous Work

Originating from spam detection (Sahami et al. 1998), a significant subset of bot detection algorithms are based on recognizing patterns of automation (Heymann et al. 2007, Gyöngyi et al. 2004, Gyöngyi and Garcia-Molina 2005, Ntoulas et al. 2006, Castillo et al. 2007). It was observed by Malmgren et al. (2009) and Raghavan et al. (2014) that human beings present specific circadian patterns which can further be used for strategic timing or promotion campaigns (Li et al. 2014, Modaresi et al.), or, in our case, to discriminate humans from bots (Zhang and Paxson 2011, Chu et al. 2012, Ghosh et al. 2011). Posting at random times makes bots easily detectable, as shown in Gianvecchio et al. (2011), but bots that retweet tweets of actual humans will replicate human rhythms with a lag. Modern bots are no longer unintelligent spam accounts, and have learned how to mimic humans.

A meticulous study of the rise of social bots is presented in Ferrara et al. (2016). Social bots are designed to interact with other users (Hwang et al. 2012, Messias et al. 2013, Boshmaf et al. 2013), and post human-like content (Freitas et al. 2015). Not only do bots *look* more human, but turn out to *be* half-human: Chu et al. (2012) mentions the concept of *cyborgs*, where a real person manages dozens of otherwise automated accounts. Such hybrid accounts[1] make the detection task extremely challenging (Zangerle and Specht 2014, Syeed and Frier 2017).

Bot detectors also became more sophisticated, from the earliest instances (Yardi et al. 2009) to the current state of the art (Davis et al. 2016) currently used in most applications today (Ferrara 2017, Mønsted et al. 2017, Vosoughi et al. 2018, Badawy et al. 2018). In Ferrara et al. (2016) the authors present a taxonomy of bot detectors, from crowd-sourcing (Wang et al. 2012, Stein et al. 2011, Elovici et al. 2014, Twitter b,a) and honeypot traps (Lee et al. 2011, Paradise et al. 2017), to

[1] See the example $@TeamTrumpRussia$, https://twitter.com/teamtrumprussia.

user feature oriented classifiers (Davis et al. 2016, Chu et al. 2012, Benevenuto et al. 2010, Wang 2010, Egele et al. 2013, Viswanath et al. 2014, Thomas et al. 2011). Both approaches treat accounts individually, but do not detect coordinated attacks. Extant work exists for coordinated attacks, a few instances of which are *CopyCatch* for Facebook 'liked' pages (Beutel et al. 2013), Twitter memes (Ratkiewicz et al. 2011), and more generally *Sybil detection* in online communities (Benevenuto et al. 2009, Aggarwal 2014, Cao et al. 2014, Yang et al. 2014, Ghosh et al. 2012, Tran et al. 2009, Yu et al. 2008, Danezis and Mittal 2009, Yu et al. 2006, Wang et al. 2013, Alvisi et al. 2013, Cao et al. 2012). Our algorithm is strongly inspired from work on image segmentation from Zabih and Kolmogorov (2004), which was also applied to social networks in Marks and Zaman (2017) to detect user location. To the best of our knowledge, no model for bot-human *heterophilic* interactions on social networks exist, nor an efficient algorithm for joint bot detection based on such a model.

## 2. Data

We collected Twitter data from six different controversial events that occurred in a variety of nations (US, France, Hungary), over various time periods (2015 to 2018), and for different durations. Some of the events were elections in the US and Hungary. Others were for politically motivated conspiracy theories or scandals, such as Pizzagate and Macron Leaks. Finally, there were activist groups such as Black Lives Matter (BLM). Details of the data are shown in Table 1. The data was collected using Twitter's REST and STREAM APIs. For the Pizzagate, BLM 2015 and Hungary Election datasets, we collected tweets containing relevant keywords. The US election dataset is from Littman et al. (2016). The Macron Leaks and BLM 2016 were collected by Summers (2017b,a). In addition to the basic content information, for each tweet we also collected the user profile.

### 2.1. Ground Truth Construction.

To obtain a ground truth for bot identities, we manually labeled approximately 300 accounts per event. The accounts were randomly selected and only required to have a minimum activity level. For each account, the labeler was given three options: human, bot, or no idea. The decision is guided

**Table 1** Twitter dataset descriptions.

| | Descriptive statistics | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dataset | Description | Time-period | Number of tweets/users |
| Pizzagate | Pizzagate conspiracy | Nov-Dec 2016 | 1,025,911 / 176,822 |
| BLM 2015 | Black Lives Matter | Jan-Dec 2015 | 477,344 / 242,164 |
| US election | First presidential debate | Sep-Oct 2016 | 2,435,886 / 995,918 |
| Macron Leaks | French election scandal | May 2017 | 570,295 / 150,848 |
| Hungary | Parliamentary election | Apr 2018 | 504,170 / 198,433 |
| BLM 2016 | Black Lives Matter | Sep 2016 | 1,274,596 / 545,937 |

by the activity patterns (number of retweets versus original tweets, volume, etc.), content of tweets (level of creativity, replies, topic diversity), and other profile features (pictures, followers/friends ratio, etc.). Some events occurred two or three years ago, but the labeling is based on the most recent 2018 activity. Therefore, labelers were also given quick statistics about the account's activity during the event, but were explicitly told not to weigh it too much into their final decision. Statistics for the number of accounts labeled as bots on each event are found in Table 2. We found that approximately 10% of the accounts were labeled bots across the different datasets.

**Table 2** Statistics for hand labeled accounts for each dataset.

| Dataset | Pizzagate | BLM2015 | US Election | Macron Leaks | Hungary | BLM2016 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bot labels / Total number of accounts | 23/304 | 21/262 | 30/300 | 19/256 | 24/300 | 30/285 |

## 2.2. Heterophily.

We study the collective behavior of the bots. One such behavior concerns who the bots interact with or retweet. Figure 1 shows different networks of retweeting interactions in the Pizzagate dataset by accounts labeled by humans (see Table 2). We place the bots on the peripheral ring, humans in

the central ring, and draw directed edges for the retweet interactions. Each network corresponds to different node types on the edges. We see qualitatively that bots prefer to retweet humans than other bots, and that humans prefer to retweet other humans instead of bots. This phenomenon where members of a group do not interact with each other, but do interact with members of different groups is known as *heterophily*.





**Figure 1** Retweet interaction networks for Pizzagate accounts labeled by humans. Each network consists of edges between a certain pair of account types (bots and humans).

To obtain a more quantitative measure of heterophily, we broaden the set of ground truth labeled accounts by using a popular bot detection algorithm from Davis et al. (2016). This algorithm provides a probability of being a bot. We chose 0.5 as our threshold for being a bot. Then for each account, we calculated the total number of retweets it gives to humans/bots, normalized by the number of unique humans/bots it retweets. This measures the average number of retweets per human and retweets per bot for each account. We refer to this quantity as the *retweet rate*. We then look at the distribution of the retweet rates conditioned on the nodes on each end of the retweet edges: human to human, human to bot, bot to human, and bot to bot. In Table 3 we show the mean retweet rates for the different retweet types. As can be seen, the bot to human mean is much higher than the bot to bot mean. Also, the human to human mean is higher than the human

to bot mean. To further quantify the difference, we perform a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test on each pair of retweet rate distributions. The p-value for the tests on each dataset are also shown in Table 3. We find that there is a statistically significant difference between the distributions. This supports the hypothesis that there is heterophily for the bots. It also suggests that the humans exhibit homophily, meaning they are more likely to interact with each other than with bots. We will use these properties to design our bot detection algorithm.

**Table 3** Retweet rate and p-value of KS test for different rewteet networks. B stands for bot and H stands for human. The zeros for the p-value mean that the p-value was less than $10^{-6}$.

| | Bots' Mean Retweet Rate | | Humans' Mean Retweet Rate | | KS-test p-value | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dataset | B → H | B → B | H → H | H → B | B →B vs. B →H | H→H vs. H→B | B→H vs. H→H | H→B vs. B→B |
| US Pizzagate | 0.99 | 0.18 | 0.98 | 0.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US BLM 2015 | 0.88 | 0.17 | 0.84 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 0.013 | 0 |
| US election | 0.99 | 0.66 | 0.95 | 0.35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Macron Leaks | 1.26 | 0.08 | 1.13 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hungary | 0.73 | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US BLM 2016 | 0.4 | 0.23 | 0.45 | 0.15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## 3. Joint Detection Using the Ising Model

In this Section, we present our joint classification model. We assume we have an interaction graph $G = (V, E)$ of accounts with vertex set $V$ (the accounts) and edge set $E$ (the interactions). For each node $u_i \in V$ we observe features $\mathbf{x}_i$ and for each pair of users $u_i, u_j \in V$ we observe interaction features $\mathbf{z}_{ij}$. The interaction features could be the number of retweets, out degree, and in-degree. Each node $i$ in the network has a latent variable $\Delta_i$ which is one if $i$ is a bot and zero otherwise. We use a factor graph to model the joint distribution of the observed features and latent

variables. We define functions $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta_i)$ for each $i \in V$ and $\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, \Delta_i, \Delta_j)$ for $i, j \in V$. We refer to $\phi$ and $\psi$ respectively as the *node energy* and *link energy* functions. Then given $N$ accounts in an interaction graph/network with node features $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and interaction features $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{z}_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^N$, the probability of the observed features and latent variables is

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{\Delta}) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N e^{-\phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta_i)} \prod_{\{i,j:\, i<j\}} e^{-\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, \Delta_i, \Delta_j)}}{\mathcal{Z}}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}$ is the partition function. A probability model of this form which involves products of functions of single nodes and pairs of nodes has the structure of the Ising model from statistical physics (Ising 1925). Inference of the latent variables in general can be difficult because of the presence of the partition function. However, it has been shown that inference problem is much easier if one specifies certain characteristics of the model (Zabih and Kolmogorov 2004, Marks and Zaman 2017), which we do next.

### 3.1. Model Characteristics.

**Link Energy.** We begin by defining the link energy functions. First there is the case where there is no edge between nodes $u_i$ and $u_j$. In this case we assume that we can infer nothing about the latent variables $\Delta_i$ and $\Delta_j$, so we set the link energy to be independent of the latent variables. For simplicity, we assume that $\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, \Delta_i, \Delta_j) = 0$ when there is no edge between $i$ and $j$.

For pairs of nodes with an edge, we choose a functional form for the link energy. Suppose node $u_1$ has $z_1$ retweets (its out-degree), node $u_2$ receives $z_2$ retweets (its in-degree), and $u_1$ retweets $u_2$ a total of $w_{12}$ times. If either degree is small, then the retweet edge from $u_1$ to $u_2$ provides little information about node labels because occasional retweets are very common on Twitter. For example, let $u_1$ be a human that retweeted $u_2$ once. If $u_1$ retweeted no one else, the edge $(u_1, u_2)$ would increase the probability that it is a bot, though it is not. In simpler terms, the only edges that contain information are the ones where $u_2$ happens to be a popular target and $u_1$ a suspiciously active retweeter. Using these insights and following Marks and Zaman (2017) we define the link energy as

$$\psi(\mathbf{z}_{1,2}, \Delta_1, \Delta_2 | u_1 \to u_2) = \frac{w_{12}\gamma}{1 + \exp((\alpha_1/z_1 - 1) + (\alpha_2/z_2 - 1))},$$

where $\gamma$ controls the weight of the link energy relative to the node energy, and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ represent thresholds for the in and out-degrees.

As mentioned in Section 2.2, we require heterophily in our model between the bots, and homophily between the humans. This imposes the following constraint on the link energies when there is an edge from $u_i$ to $u_j$ (a high energy corresponds to small likelihood):

$$\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 1, 0 | u_i \to u_j) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 0, 0 | u_i \to u_j) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 1, 1 | u_i \to u_j) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 0, 1 | u_i \to u_j). \tag{2}$$

The constraints above simply say that if $u_i$ retweets $u_j$, the most likely labeling is $u_i$ is a bot and $u_j$ is a human ($\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 1, 0 | u_i \to u_j)$), and the least likely is $u_i$ is a human and $u_j$ is a bot ($\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 0, 1 | u_i \to u_j)$ ). To parameterize these energies, we introduce the constants $\epsilon < \lambda_2 < \lambda_1 \in [0, 1]$ and set the link energies to

$$\psi_{ij} = \frac{w_{ij}\gamma}{1 + \exp((\alpha_1/z_i - 1) + (\alpha_2/z_j - 1))}, \quad \begin{cases} \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 0, 1 | u_i \to u_j) = \psi_{ij} \\ \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 1, 1 | u_i \to u_j) = \lambda_1 \psi_{ij} \\ \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 0, 0 | u_i \to u_j) = \lambda_2 \psi_{ij} \\ \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, 1, 0 | u_i \to u_j) = \epsilon \psi_{ij}. \end{cases}$$

For pairs of nodes with reciprocate edges $u_i \to u_j$ and $u_j \to u_i$, the energy of the pair is the aggregate of the two one-way energies. In order to efficiently infer the latent labels, the constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ and $\epsilon$ must satisfy a set of constraints that we present in Section 4.

*Node Energy.* We choose a relatively simple form for the node energy. If we have no prior knowledge on which accounts are bots, we set $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i, 1) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, 0) = 0$. If we have prior knowledge, perhaps from an expert or another bot detection algorithm, we can use it for the node energy. However, it turns out the simple uninformative energy performs quite well.

## 4. Inference via Minimum Cut

To find the most likely values for the labels given observed values $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$, we want to maximize equation (1), which is equivalent to solving

$$\underset{\mathbf{\Delta}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_i \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta_i) + \sum_{i<j} \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij}, \Delta_i, \Delta_j). \tag{3}$$

It has been shown that performing the optimization in equation (3) is equivalent to finding the minimum capacity cut on an appropriately defined graph (Boykov et al. 2001). The expression in equation (3) can be viewed as the *energy* of the label configuration, so the graph on which the minimum cut is equal to the maximum likelihood label set is referred to as the *energy graph*. We now show how to construct this graph.

Figure 2 illustrates how to map an interaction network/graph into an energy graph. There is a source node $s$ and a sink node $t$ in the energy graph. There are three types of edges in the energy graph. For each node $u_i$ in the interaction graph, there is an edge from the source and an edge to the sink: $(s, u_i)$ and $(u_i, t)$. There are also edges between every pair of nodes with an interaction edge. For each node $u_i$ in the interaction graph, every valid $s-t$ cut in the energy graph must either cut the edge $(s, u_i)$ or $(u_i, t)$. If $(s, u_i)$ is cut, then $\Delta_i = 0$ and $u_i$ is a human. Otherwise, $(u_i, t)$ is cut, $\Delta_i = 1$ and $u_i$ is a bot. This is how a cut in the energy graph maps to a label configuration. By proper choice of the edge weights, a minimum weight cut in the energy graph will correspond to a maximum likelihood label configuration. We now define the edge weights following the results in Boykov et al. (2001).





**Figure 2** Energy graph representation of the label configuration energy.

For each pair of users $u_i, u_j$ with an edge from $u_i$ to $u_j$ in the interaction graph, we add edges $(u_i, u_j)$ and $(u_j, u_i)$ in the energy graph with weights:

$$c_{(u_i,u_j)} = c_{(u_j,u_i)} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,0) + \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,1) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,0) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,1)\right).$$

For each user $u_i$, the weight of the edge $(s, u_i)$ is $c_{(s,u_i)} = c^{out}_{(s,u_i)} + c^{in}_{(s,u_i)}$, where

$$c^{out}_{(s,u_i)} = \frac{1}{2}\phi(\mathbf{x}_i,0) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\{j:i\to j\}}\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,0) + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\{j:i\to j\}}(\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,1) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,0)),$$

and

$$c^{in}_{(s,u_i)} = \frac{1}{2}\phi(\mathbf{x}_i,0) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\{j:i\leftarrow j\}}\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,0) + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\{j:i\leftarrow j\}}(\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,1) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,0)).$$

For each user $u_i$, the weight of the edge $(u_i, t)$ is $c_{(u_i,t)} = c^{out}_{(u_i,t)} + c^{in}_{(u_i,t)}$, where

$$c^{out}_{(u_i,t)} = \frac{1}{2}\phi(\mathbf{x}_i,1) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\{j:i\to j\}}\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,1) + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\{j:i\to j\}}(\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,0) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,1)),$$

and

$$c^{in}_{(u_i,t)} = \frac{1}{2}\phi(\mathbf{x}_i,1) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\{j:i\leftarrow j\}}\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,1) + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\{j:i\leftarrow j\}}(\psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},1,0) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_{ij},0,1)).$$

It can easily be shown that with these edge weights, the weight of an $s-t$ cut in the energy graph equals the energy of the corresponding label configuration in the interaction graph.

**Energy Constraints.** In order for the minimum weight cut to be the most likely labels, we need the energy graph edge weights to be positive. Also, from Boykov et al. (2001), it was shown that the link energies had to satisfy the condition $\psi(\mathbf{z},1,1) + \psi(\mathbf{z},0,0) \le \psi(\mathbf{z},1,0) + \psi(\mathbf{z},0,1)$. This condition made the energy function from equation (3) submodular and also solvable via minimum cut. Finally, we have the heterophily constraint from equation (2). We express these constraints in terms of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ ,and $\epsilon$. First, heterophily gives

$$0 < \epsilon < \lambda_2 < \lambda_1 < 1. \tag{4}$$

Submodularity gives

$$\epsilon = \lambda_2 + \lambda_1 - 1 + \delta, \tag{5}$$

for some $\delta \ge 0$. We choose $\delta = 0$ and find that edge weight positivity gives

$$0 \le \lambda_2 - \frac{1}{2}(1-\epsilon) \iff 2 \le 3\lambda_2 + \lambda_1. \tag{6}$$

## 5. Results

In this section, we present the results of the performance of our bot detection algorithm based on the human labelers' ground truth. In addition to the 300 hand labeled accounts for each event, we also include all the Twitter verified users. Verified users have undergone robust identity checks from Twitter in order to receive such label. This increases the number of ground-truth labels by approximately one to two thousand. We compare our performance to the state of the art bot detection algorithm known as BotOrNot (Davis et al. 2016). In the results presented, $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (100, 100)$, except for BLM2016, where the volume of interactions is much bigger. There we set $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (100, 1000)$. For all events we set $\gamma = 1$, $\lambda_1 = 0.8$, $\lambda_2 = 0.6$ and $\epsilon = 0.4$. $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is picked as the barycenter of the feasible region defined by constraints (4), (6) while $\epsilon$ is determined by setting $\delta = 0$ in (5) as we want $\epsilon$ as small as possible. As we consider the case of null node energies $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta_i) = 0$, the choice of $\gamma$ does not impact the optimal cut, and only intervenes in computing the marginal probability of belonging to each class. We do not tune this parameter, and fix it to $\gamma = 1$, in order for the link energy differences to scale with the number of retweets $w_{ij}$.





**Figure 3** ROC curves for bot detection algorithms on different Twitter datasets.

**Table 4** AUC and runtime for our Ising model based bot detection algorithm and BotOrNot on different Twitter datasets.

| Dataset | AUC | | Runtime | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ising Model | Bot or Not | Ising Model | Bot or Not |
| Pizzagate | **0.91** | 0.81 | **≈5 min** | 3.5s×170,000 |
| BLM 2015 | 0.67 | **0.73** | **≈10 min** | 3.5s×240,000 |
| US election | **0.83** | 0.82 | **≈20 min** | 3.5s×300,000 |
| Macron Leaks | **0.84** | 0.72 | **≈5 min** | 3.5s×150,000 |
| Hungary | **0.83** | 0.71 | **≈5 min** | 3.5s×200,000 |
| BLM 2016 | **0.91** | 0.84 | **≈4 hours** | 3.5s×545,000 |

To evaluate the algorithms performance, we use the inferred labels to calculate the marginal probability of being a bot for each node. This allows us to calculate receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for our algorithm and compare it to BotOrNot. We show the ROC curves in Figure 3. In Table 4 we present the area under the curve (AUC) metric for the algorithms along with their run-time. We note that for BotOrNot, the run-time is the time it takes to query its API, which may include additional delays beyond computation time. Therefore, the runtimes for BotOrNot are an upper bound to the actual computational time. From Figure 3 and Table 4 it can be seen that our algorithm usually performs better than BotOrNot in terms of AUC. The one exception is BLM 2015. We suspect here that the coordinated bot campaigns we are trying to detect were not as prevalent. Our algorithm runs on several hundred thousand accounts in several minutes to a few hours.

We find that we have much fewer false positives than BotOrNot. One of the reason is that BotOrNot labels news broadcasting accounts as bots. Examples of this in our datasets include the Twitter accounts for Newsweek, CNN, and the New York Times.[2] Because our Ising model algorithm looks for who the accounts interact with and also who interacts with the accounts, we do not mistake

[2] As per the documentation on their website, bot scores were updated on May 10, 2018. The later problem seems to have been fixed, since the aforementioned verified news broadcasting accounts are now given low bot scores. However,

these trusted news sources for bots. BotOrNot uses mainly the account behavior, so the high activity of these accounts make them appear like bots.

In addition to the increased accuracy and fast runtime, our algorithm relies on much less information than BotOrNot (recall that we use uninformative node energies). This shows that there is a great deal of information in the interaction graph which maps out the retweet behavior of the accounts.

**Bot Agenda.** A way to understand the underlying agenda of bot designers is by looking at the content of the tweets posted by the bots. After applying our bot detection algorithm to an event, we look at the hashtags used by the bots, but not by the humans. Figure 4 illustrates the results of such analysis on the Pizzagate and Macron Leaks datasets.

In Pizzagate, the bots try to export the controversy outside of the US, by transforming the usual *#WakeUpAmerica* into *# WakeUpBritain*, and *#WakeUpFrance*. Similar intent can be seen in the Macron Leaks analysis, with the use of the *#furherMerkel* and *#stopGlobalists* hashtags. In both cases, it looks like bots intend to internationalize an otherwise local controversy in order to reach a broader audience, especially that of western Europe. It appears as if the bots are trying to shift the theme of the conversation to certain types of controversies (instability of Europe, Brexit, Frexit, etc.).

## 6. Conclusion

We have presented an Ising model for the probability of bot labels in a social network. Our model was motivated by the observation of heterophily in bot interactions. We infer the bot labels efficiently by solving a minimum cut problem. We find our joint detection algorithm outperforms current existing algorithms. This may be due to the fact that the bots are coordinated. Individual detection does not allow one to take advantage of the coordinated behavior. We also find that our algorithm is able to discern bot accounts from just active trusted news source accounts, in contrast to other popular

regular users that have no bad intentions, but use automation softwares to gain popularity would still be mistaken with bots, although they are in no way involved in any influence campaign.





**Figure 4** Word clouds of hashtags used during (left) Pizzagate and (right) Macron Leaks by bots and not by humans.

algorithms. This is a result of our incorporation of the joint interactions of all accounts. Analysis of the content of the bots reveals that they seem to have an agenda focused on controversial topics. We feel that for these types of coordinated campaigns, joint detection is much more effective than individual detection.

**Acknowledgments** This research was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research (ONR) and Charles Stark Draper Laboratory, Inc (Draper). The views presented here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of ONR, Draper, or MIT.

## References

Charu C Aggarwal. *Data classification: algorithms and applications*. CRC Press, 2014.

Lorenzo Alvisi, Allen Clement, Alessandro Epasto, Silvio Lattanzi, and Alessandro Panconesi. Sok: The evolution of sybil defense via social networks. In *Security and Privacy (SP), 2013 IEEE Symposium on*, pages 382–396. IEEE, 2013.

Adam Badawy, Emilio Ferrara, and Kristina Lerman. Analyzing the digital traces of political manipulation: The 2016 russian interference twitter campaign. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04291*, 2018.

Fabrício Benevenuto, Tiago Rodrigues, Virgílio Almeida, Jussara Almeida, and Marcos Gonçalves. Detecting spammers and content promoters in online video social networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 620–627. ACM, 2009.

Fabricio Benevenuto, Gabriel Magno, Tiago Rodrigues, and Virgilio Almeida. Detecting spammers on twitter. In *Collaboration, electronic messaging, anti-abuse and spam conference (CEAS)*, volume 6, page 12, 2010.

Alex Beutel, Wanhong Xu, Venkatesan Guruswami, Christopher Palow, and Christos Faloutsos. Copycatch: stopping group attacks by spotting lockstep behavior in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 119–130. ACM, 2013.

Yazan Boshmaf, Ildar Muslukhov, Konstantin Beznosov, and Matei Ripeanu. Design and analysis of a social botnet. *Computer Networks*, 57(2):556–578, 2013.

Yuri Boykov, Olga Veksler, and Ramin Zabih. Fast approximate energy minimization via graph cuts. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 23(11):1222–1239, 2001.

Nanette Byrnes. How the bot-y politic influenced this election. *Technology Rev.*, 2016.

Qiang Cao, Michael Sirivianos, Xiaowei Yang, and Tiago Pregueiro. Aiding the detection of fake accounts in large scale social online services. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 15–15. USENIX Association, 2012.

Qiang Cao, Xiaowei Yang, Jieqi Yu, and Christopher Palow. Uncovering large groups of active malicious accounts in online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 477–488. ACM, 2014.

Carlos Castillo, Debora Donato, Aristides Gionis, Vanessa Murdock, and Fabrizio Silvestri. Know your neighbors: Web spam detection using the web topology. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 423–430. ACM, 2007.

Zi Chu, Steven Gianvecchio, Haining Wang, and Sushil Jajodia. Detecting automation of twitter accounts: Are you a human, bot, or cyborg? *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 9(6): 811–824, 2012.

George Danezis and Prateek Mittal. Sybilinfer: Detecting sybil nodes using social networks. In *NDSS*, pages 1–15. San Diego, CA, 2009.

Clayton Allen Davis, Onur Varol, Emilio Ferrara, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Botornot: A system to evaluate social bots. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web*, pages 273–274. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2016.

Manuel Egele, Gianluca Stringhini, Christopher Kruegel, and Giovanni Vigna. Compa: Detecting compromised accounts on social networks. In *NDSS*, 2013.

Yuval Elovici, Michael Fire, Amir Herzberg, and Haya Shulman. Ethical considerations when employing fake identities in online social networks for research. *Science and engineering ethics*, 20(4):1027–1043, 2014.

Nocholas Fandos and Scott Shane. Senator Berates Twitter Over 'Inadequate' Inquiry Into Russian Meddling . *The New York Times*, September 2017. URL `https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/28/us/politics/twitter-russia-interference-2016-election-investigation.html?mtrref=www.google.com`.

Emilio Ferrara. Disinformation and social bot operations in the run up to the 2017 french presidential election. 2017.

Emilio Ferrara, Onur Varol, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. The rise of social bots. *Communications of the ACM*, 59(7):96–104, 2016.

Carlos Freitas, Fabricio Benevenuto, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Adriano Veloso. Reverse engineering socialbot infiltration strategies in twitter. In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM), 2015 IEEE/ACM International Conference on*, pages 25–32. IEEE, 2015.

Rumi Ghosh, Tawan Surachawala, and Kristina Lerman. Entropy-based classification of'retweeting'activity on twitter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1106.0346*, 2011.

Saptarshi Ghosh, Bimal Viswanath, Farshad Kooti, Naveen Kumar Sharma, Gautam Korlam, Fabricio Benevenuto, Niloy Ganguly, and Krishna Phani Gummadi. Understanding and combating link farming in the twitter social network. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 61–70. ACM, 2012.

Steven Gianvecchio, Mengjun Xie, Zhenyu Wu, and Haining Wang. Humans and bots in internet chat: measurement, analysis, and automated classification. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 19(5):1557–1571, 2011.

Douglas Guilbeault and Samuel Woolley. How twitter bots are shaping the election. *The Atlantic*, 1, 2016.

Zoltan Gyöngyi and Hector Garcia-Molina. Web spam taxonomy. In *First international workshop on adversarial information retrieval on the web (AIRWeb 2005)*, 2005.

Zoltán Gyöngyi, Hector Garcia-Molina, and Jan Pedersen. Combating web spam with trustrank. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth international conference on Very large data bases-Volume 30*, pages 576–587. VLDB Endowment, 2004.

Paul Heymann, Georgia Koutrika, and Hector Garcia-Molina. Fighting spam on social web sites: A survey of approaches and future challenges. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 11(6), 2007.

Tim Hwang, Ian Pearce, and Max Nanis. Socialbots: Voices from the fronts. *interactions*, 19(2):38–45, 2012.

Ernst Ising. Beitrag zur theorie des ferromagnetismus. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 31(1):253–258, 1925.

Kyumin Lee, Brian David Eoff, and James Caverlee. Seven months with the devils: A long-term study of content polluters on twitter. In *ICWSM*, 2011.

Huayi Li, Arjun Mukherjee, Bing Liu, Rachel Kornfield, and Sherry Emery. Detecting campaign promoters on twitter using markov random fields. In *Data Mining (ICDM), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 290–299. IEEE, 2014.

Justin Littman, Laura Wrubel, and Daniel Kerchner. 2016 united states presidential election tweet ids, 2016. URL `https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/PDI7IN`.

R Dean Malmgren, Jake M Hofman, Luis AN Amaral, and Duncan J Watts. Characterizing individual communication patterns. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 607–616. ACM, 2009.

Christopher Marks and Tauhid Zaman. Building a location-based set of social media users. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.01481*, 2017.

Johnnatan Messias, Lucas Schmidt, Ricardo Oliveira, and Fabrício Benevenuto. You followed my bot! transforming robots into influential users in twitter. *First Monday*, 18(7), 2013.

Sina Modaresi, Juan Pablo Vielma, and Tauhid Zaman. Strategic timing of content in online social networks.

Bjarke Mønsted, Piotr Sapieżyński, Emilio Ferrara, and Sune Lehmann. Evidence of complex contagion of information in social media: An experiment using twitter bots. *PloS one*, 12(9):e0184148, 2017.

Alexandros Ntoulas, Marc Najork, Mark Manasse, and Dennis Fetterly. Detecting spam web pages through content analysis. In *Proceedings of the 15th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 83–92. ACM, 2006.

Abigail Paradise, Asaf Shabtai, Rami Puzis, Aviad Elyashar, Yuval Elovici, Mehran Roshandel, and Christoph Peylo. Creation and management of social network honeypots for detecting targeted cyber attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 4(3):65–79, 2017.

Alicia Parlapiano and C. Lee, Jasmine. The Propaganda Tools Used by Russians to Influence the 2016 Election. *The New York Times*, February 2018. URL `https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/02/16/us/politics/russia-propaganda-election-2016.html`.

Molly Price. Democrats urge facebook and twitter to probe russian bots. *CNET*, January 2018. URL `https://www.cnet.com/news/facebook-and-twitter-asked-again-to-investigate-russian-bots/`.

Vasanthan Raghavan, Greg Ver Steeg, Aram Galstyan, and Alexander G Tartakovsky. Modeling temporal activity patterns in dynamic social networks. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 1 (1):89–107, 2014.

Jacob Ratkiewicz, Michael Conover, Mark R Meiss, Bruno Gonçalves, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. Detecting and tracking political abuse in social media. *ICWSM*, 11:297–304, 2011.

Everett M Rogers. *Diffusion of innovations*. Simon and Schuster, 2010.

Mehran Sahami, Susan Dumais, David Heckerman, and Eric Horvitz. A bayesian approach to filtering junk e-mail. In *Learning for Text Categorization: Papers from the 1998 workshop*, volume 62, pages 98–105, 1998.

S Shane. The fake americans russia created to influence the election. *The New York Times*, 7, 2017.

Tao Stein, Erdong Chen, and Karan Mangla. Facebook immune system. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Social Network Systems*, page 8. ACM, 2011.

Ed Summers. Black lives matter tweets - dataset, 2017a. URL `https://archive.org/details/blacklivesmatter-tweets-2016.txt`.

Ed Summers. Macron leaks tweets - dataset, 2017b. URL `https://archive.org/details/MacronleaksTweets`.

Nafeesa Syeed and Sarah Frier. Pro-Russian Bots Sharpen Online Attacks for 2018 U.S. Vote. *Bloomberg*, September 2017. URL `https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-09-01/russia-linked-bots-hone-online-attack-plans-for-2018-u-s-vote`.

Kurt Thomas, Chris Grier, Dawn Song, and Vern Paxson. Suspended accounts in retrospect: an analysis of twitter spam. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement conference*, pages 243–258. ACM, 2011.

Dinh Nguyen Tran, Bonan Min, Jinyang Li, and Lakshminarayanan Subramanian. Sybil-resilient online content voting. In *NSDI*, volume 9, pages 15–28, 2009.

Twitter. Twitter unofficial botspot feed, a. URL `https://twitter.com/hashtag/BotSpot`.

Twitter. Twitter official spam report tool, b. URL `https://help.twitter.com/en/safety-and-security/report-spam`.

Bimal Viswanath, Muhammad Ahmad Bashir, Mark Crovella, Saikat Guha, Krishna P Gummadi, Balachander Krishnamurthy, and Alan Mislove. Towards detecting anomalous user behavior in online social networks. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, pages 223–238, 2014.

Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380): 1146–1151, 2018.

Alex Hai Wang. Detecting spam bots in online social networking sites: a machine learning approach. In *IFIP Annual Conference on Data and Applications Security and Privacy*, pages 335–342. Springer, 2010.

Gang Wang, Manish Mohanlal, Christo Wilson, Xiao Wang, Miriam Metzger, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. Social turing tests: Crowdsourcing sybil detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.3856*, 2012.

Gang Wang, Tristan Konolige, Christo Wilson, Xiao Wang, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y Zhao. You are how you click: Clickstream analysis for sybil detection. In *USENIX Security Symposium*, volume 9, pages 1–008, 2013.

Zhi Yang, Christo Wilson, Xiao Wang, Tingting Gao, Ben Y Zhao, and Yafei Dai. Uncovering social network sybils in the wild. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 8(1):2, 2014.

Sarita Yardi, Daniel Romero, Grant Schoenebeck, et al. Detecting spam in a twitter network. *First Monday*, 15(1), 2009.

Haifeng Yu, Michael Kaminsky, Phillip B Gibbons, and Abraham Flaxman. Sybilguard: defending against sybil attacks via social networks. In *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, volume 36, pages 267–278. ACM, 2006.

Haifeng Yu, Phillip B Gibbons, Michael Kaminsky, and Feng Xiao. Sybillimit: A near-optimal social network defense against sybil attacks. In *Security and Privacy, 2008. SP 2008. IEEE Symposium on*, pages 3–17. IEEE, 2008.

Ramin Zabih and Vladimir Kolmogorov. Spatially coherent clustering using graph cuts. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2004. CVPR 2004. Proceedings of the 2004 IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, volume 2, pages II–II. IEEE, 2004.

Eva Zangerle and Günther Specht. Sorry, i was hacked: a classification of compromised twitter accounts. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 587–593. ACM, 2014.

Chao Michael Zhang and Vern Paxson. Detecting and analyzing automated activity on twitter. In *International Conference on Passive and Active Network Measurement*, pages 102–111. Springer, 2011.