

Locating privileged information spreaders during political protests on an Online Social Network

Javier Borge-Holthoefer^{*}
 Institute for Biocomputation
 and Physics of Complex
 Systems (BIFI)
 University of Zaragoza
 C/ Mariano Esquillor s/n
 50018 Zaragoza, Spain

Alejandro Rivero
 Institute for Biocomputation
 and Physics of Complex
 Systems (BIFI)
 University of Zaragoza
 C/ Mariano Esquillor s/n
 50018 Zaragoza, Spain

Yamir Moreno
 Institute for Biocomputation
 and Physics of Complex
 Systems (BIFI)
 and Department of
 Theoretical Physics
 University of Zaragoza
 C/ Mariano Esquillor s/n
 50018 Zaragoza, Spain

ABSTRACT

Although the phrase “Twitter revolution” was coined back in 2009 to refer to the mass mobilizations in Moldova and soon after in Iran, year 2011 has confirmed the connection between social media and social unrest. Undoubtedly, the “Arab spring” or the “Spanish revolution” –which has spread throughout and culminated with Liberty Square occupation in New York– cannot be understood without the role of social networking sites to help protesters self-organize and attain a critical mass of participants. In this context, we need to distinguish dynamic activity (which comprises actual information exchange) from the underlying structure (which reflects relatively stable relationships between users –who follows who). We provide a quantitative analysis which stems from complex network theory to scrutinize the mobilization’s temporal evolution and its resulting structure and dynamics both at the macro- and micro-scale levels. Most importantly, we study the interplay between the structural and dynamic levels to decipher how the former facilitates the latter’s success, understood as efficiency in information spreading. We discuss who (and why) has privileged spreading capabilities when it comes to information diffusion, based on the analysis of empirical data.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

G.2.2 [Graph Theory]: Network problems; J.4 [Computer Applications]: Social and Behavioral Sciences—*Sociology*; E.0 [Data]: General

General Terms

Algorithms, Experimentation, Measurement

^{*}corresponding author: borge.holthoefer@gmail.com

Keywords

Online social networks, collective action, information cascade, spreading dynamics

1. INTRODUCTION

All along 2011, we have witnessed an unusual amount of social unrest throughout the world. In the aftermath of financial and political crisis, and changes to welfare policies, protests have aroused in the form of pacific civil movements –the Spanish “indignados” in May or Occupy Wall-Street in the United States, culminated in global marches in October 15th.–, economy-related demonstrations with some violent episodes –Greece–, political (and sometimes violent) uprisings –the “Arab spring”– and still unclear riots in the United Kingdom in summer. In all of them, different online social sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) played an unprecedented key role and were used to help protesters self-organize and attain a critical mass of participants.

With some exception [6], these movements have not been studied in depth. The reason for this is that the role of online social networks (OSN) has not been perceived as fundamental in the organization of political movements until recently; and interests regarding OSNs have focused rather in other issues, such as understanding the emergence of authoritative or privileged nodes [12, 13, 19], the importance of the strength and range of connections [16], time patterns of activity [3], etc. Or, when political content has been taken into account, it has been in relation to normal periods of debate and ideological interchange [1, 10, 17], rather than bursty collective action and civil movements (next section reviews some of the most outstanding works regarding some of the mentioned issues, those which lie closer to the our proposal).

In any case, these new forms of social mobilization and protest demand new quantitative approaches to answer old sociological questions, such as recruitment patterns (how, why and when do people join protests?) or information diffusion mechanisms (how do protest adherents coordinate and share information to synchronize their activity?). This article will be focused on the latter question, relying on complex network methods [5].

Among all the examples of political unrest mentioned above, we focus on the Spanish May 15th movement (15M movement from now on) [6]. The 15M movement is a civic initiative with no party or union affiliation that emerged as a reaction to perceived political alienation and to demand better channels for democratic representation. The first mass demonstration, held on Sunday May 15th (D from now on), was conceived as a protest against the management of the economy in the aftermath of the financial crisis. It was organized by the digitally coordinated platform “Real Democracy Now” (“Democracia Real Ya”), born online about three months before the first day of demonstrations. Hundreds of entities joined the platform, from small local associations to larger groups like ATTAC (an international anti-globalization organization). Under the motto “take the streets” (“toma la calle”), the movement organized peaceful protests that brought tens of thousands of people to the streets of more than fifty cities all over the country, with Madrid and Barcelona leading in numbers.

After the demonstrations on day D , hundreds of participants decided to continue the protests camping in the main squares of several cities (Puerta del Sol in Madrid, Plaça de Catalunya in Barcelona) until May 22, the following Sunday and the date for regional and local elections. During that week, protesters created committees to coordinate the logistics of the camp sites and organized around open popular assemblies. The media, which had not covered the movement until the day of the first big demonstrations, started covering the protests on a daily basis, particularly after the authorities tried to evict protesters from the squares by force, and the Electoral Committee declared the protests illegal. Despite the prohibition, the camps remained in place, receiving increasing popular support and staging daily demonstrations.

As it will be shown later, data from the 15M movement provide a unique opportunity to observe system-wide information cascades. Then, useful lessons can be learned about how they are triggered and how they grow, both to understand these particular movements and for other purposes, such as viral marketing. In particular, paying attention to the network structure allows for a characterization of which users have outstanding roles for the success of cascades of information.

2. RELATED WORK

The phenomena under study presents many facets. The first outstanding feature is the political accent contained in the data. Political ideas and opinions in OSNs have not been unattended in the recent literature. In their pioneering work [1], Adamic and Glance gave empirical evidence of the emergence of modular structure in the blogosphere around the specific topic of U.S. warfare policy, and the interaction of these communication tools with mainstream media. By using community detection techniques (clustering algorithm) it became apparent that opinions in blogs could be clearly divided into two main trends, conservative and liberal.

More recently, Conover and collaborators [10] offered a different approach to political contents in Twitter, although detecting opinion clusters also played a major role. Focusing on the semantics of politics-related tweets, they attempted

a better understanding of the way in which OSNs mediate different political orientations and how these orientations interact. A significant conclusion was their finding that information diffusion operates differently when users intend to spread their opinions. A first mechanism has to do with *retweets*, which are used mainly to communicate with ideologically close users (yielding a highly polarized network of interactions), whereas *mentions* induce a more mixed structure.

Our work, however, also deals with information cascades and the identification of most influential users, or “privileged spreaders”, as we name them in the following sections. Although under different names, many works have been devoted to the characterization of “authorities”, “reputation”, “popularity growth”, etc. This has been the case of the works by Fortunato *et al.* [11], and Ratkiewicz *et al.* [19]. The first work demonstrates that a scale-free network, similar to the observed ones, can be obtained by just paying attention to the position (rank) of a node in a network, be this rank prestige, influence, importance, etc. The second one emphasizes the importance of bursty activity in the emergence of authorities and its relation to network growth, i.e., how a node can increase its prestige and thus change its place in the rank. The scope of these works lies outside of OSNs (reference [19] focuses on Wikipedia articles and web-sites), but [6] shows that the approach is valid also for interactions in Twitter. A different approach is used in the work of Gupte and collaborators [13]. The authors do not aim at the identification of single, special users in OSNs, but at the design of an efficient algorithm to detect particular (sub)graph structures: hierarchies, i.e. tree-like structures. Finally, Gonçalves *et al.* [12] point out the constraints regarding the number of contacts a user can maintain in OSNs, which in the end dampens the growth of fame in a networked system.

We deviate from these referenced works because we seek not who is perceived by the network as an authority, or who is at the top of a hierarchical structure. We rather talk about influential nodes in a dynamical sense, i.e., they may or may not be seen as important, but they have an outstanding role in the dissemination of information. This dynamical perspective is shared in [14], where the topological characteristics of nodes with special spreading capacities under a given epidemic spreading dynamics are studied. The authors’ findings suggest that centrality, and not degree, is the key topological feature to understand such spreading capacities. In what follows, we adopt the approach in [14], but focusing on information cascades. Also the works by Centola [8], Ratkiewicz *et al.* [17, 18] and Cha *et al.* [9] are closer to the current dynamical perspective, with the accent on information diffusion mechanisms.

3. DATA: A NETWORKED VIEW OF THE 15M MOVEMENT

The data used in this study is a set of messages (tweets) that were publicly exchanged through *www.twitter.com*. The whole time-stamped data collected comprises a period of one month (between April 25th, 2011 at 00:03:26 and May 26th, 2011 at 23:59:55) and it was archived by *Cierzo Development Ltd*, a local start-up company. The company restricts its collection to messages in Spanish language that come preferentially from users within or related to Spain.

The internals of data collection are private to the company, but basically 23 hours of data are homogeneously collected each day, always leaving the same timeframe (16:00 to 17:00 CET time) to readjust the database due to the introduction of new Spanish nodes, purging of the non-Spanish related ones, etc. See http://15m.bifi.es/index_en.php for more details.

To filter out the whole sample and choose only those messages related to the 15M movement, 70 keywords (*hashtags*) were selected, those which were systematically used by the adherents to the demonstrations and camps. The final sample consists of 581,749 tweets, out of which 46,557 were identified as *retweets* of unknown origin, and therefore were discarded. On its turn, these tweets were generated by 85,851 unique users (out of a total of 87,569 users of which 1,718 do not show outgoing activity, i.e., they are only receivers).

Throughout this work a fundamental distinction must be kept in mind: on one hand, we have information about a rapidly changing dynamic activity, which has to do with message emission and reception. At this level, we consider messages that are emitted by users and which, sometimes, are directed towards other users (those including mentions, which contain the symbol @). The subset of directed messages (*mentions*) allows for the construction of a directed and weighted structure, the “activity” or “dynamical” network, where direction indicates a source-target message emission, and link weight stands for the number of times that a particular interaction took place. This network, unsurprisingly, changes by the hour, and disruptions are ever more dramatic during the critical period when protests arouse (from May 15th onwards). Figure 1 shows the activity profile of the 15M network as time goes on. Restricting data to messages that contain an explicit mention is useful to characterize direct interactions between pairs of users, and the pace at which users get involved with the protests; this was the approach in [6]. And yet, 2/3 of the information is left aside, because most messages are not directed to a specific target; rather, Twitter is most frequently used as a broadcasting platform, and to study information cascades we will focus on the whole set of messages, regardless of specific recipients, i.e. over half a million.

We stress, however, that the activity network is a dynamical instance of a larger underlying network (i.e., that made up of followers and followings in Twitter). This offers an almost-static view of the relationships between users, the “follower network” for short. To build it, data for all the involved users were scrapped directly from www.twitter.com using a cloud of 128 different nodes of a subnet. The scrap was successful for the 87,569 identified users, for whom we also obtained their official list of followers. It is worth remarking that the extraction of followers gave a list in the order of 3 millions users, which roughly coincides with the order of the audience estimated by Twitter in Spain; the list was however restricted to those who had some participation in the protests. The resulting structure is also a directed network, direction indicates who follows who in the online social platform. In practice, we take this underlying structure as completely static (does not change through time) because its time scale is much slower, i.e., changes occur probably in the scale of weeks and months. Incoming




Figure 1: Temporal evolution of the activity in the online social network. In green, the proportion of nodes that had shown some activity at a certain time t . In yellow, the cumulative proportion of emitted messages as a function of time. Note that the two lines evolve in almost the same way. According to this evolution, we have distinguished two sub-periods: one of them characterized as “relaxed” due to the low activity level and the other one tagged as “bursty” due to the intense information traffic within it.

links to a node i signal which users i is listening to, whereas out-going links point at those who are paying attention to (following) i . This network exhibits a high level of reciprocity, a typical user holds many reciprocal relationships (with other users who the node probably knows personally), plus a few unreciprocated nodes which typically point at hubs, the so-called network “authorities”. It must be kept in mind that any emitted message from a node i will be immediately available to anyone following him, plus to those to whom the message is directed if it contains a @ symbol. This is of utmost importance to understand the concept of information cascade in the next sections.

Table 1 summarizes the main topological features of these two views of the data (static follower network, activity or dynamical network). Note that both the static and the dynamical levels fit well in the concept of “small-world” [20], i.e., low average shortest path length and high clustering coefficient. Furthermore, both in- and out-degree distribute as a power-law, indicating that connectivity is extremely heterogeneous. This is true for the dynamic network even at different days from the beginning of mobilizations [6]. Thus, the networks under analysis are scale-free with some rare nodes that act as hubs [4].

4. METHODS

4.1 Information cascades

An information cascade, starting at a *seed*, occurs whenever a piece of information is (more or less unchanged) repeatedly forwarded towards other users. If one of those who “hear” the piece of information decides to forward it, he becomes




Figure 2: The figure illustrates the concept of cascade that is used throughout this article. User 1 emits a message at time t , and all of his followers automatically receive it. Thus, they are already counted as part of the cascade (small red circles). One of his followers (user 2, big blue node), driven by the previous message, decides himself to participate at time $t + \Delta t$, posting a message himself. A second set of followers are included in the cascade. Finally, a third node (user 3, big green circle) joins in and spreads the cascade further at time $t + 2\Delta t$. A node can not be counted twice, note for example that user 4 is also following node 3. Many nodes remain unaffected, because they are not connected to any of the spreaders. The final size of the cascade is $\frac{N_c}{N} = \frac{22}{34}$; the success of the cascade largely depends on the capacity to contact a “leader” or “privileged spreader”, i.e., a hub to whom many people listens and who decides to participate. The interesting point, however, is that the number of spreaders needed to attain such success is very low (3), and over 50% of the cascade is triggered by just one of them.

a *spreader*, otherwise he remains as a mere *listener*. The information cascade becomes global if the final number of affected users N_c (including the set of spreaders and listeners, plus the seed) is comparable to the size of the whole system N . Intuitively, the success of an information cascade greatly depends on whether spreaders have a large set of followers or not (Figure 2). This fact highlights the entanglement between dynamics and the underlying (static) structure.

Note that the previous definition is too general to attain an *operative* notion of cascade. One possibility is to leave time aside, and consider only identical pieces of information traveling across the topology. This may lead to inconsistencies, such as the fact that a node decides to forward a piece of information long after receiving it (perhaps days or weeks). It is impossible to know whether his action is motivated by the original sender, or for some exogenous reason, i.e., invisible to us. One may, alternatively, take into consideration time, thus considering that, regardless of the exact content of a message, two nodes belong to the same cascade as consecutive spreaders if they are connected (the latter follows the former) and they show activity within a certain (short) time interval, Δt . The probability that exogenous factors

are leading activation is in this way minimized. This scheme exploits the concept of spike train from neuroscience, i.e., a series of discrete action potentials from a neuron taken as a time series. At a larger scale, two brain regions are identified as functionally related if their activation happens in the same time window. Consequently, message chains are reconstructed assuming that activity is contagious if it takes place in short time windows.

We apply the latter definition to explore the occurrence of information cascades in the data. In practice, we take a seed message posted by i at time t_0 and mark all of i 's followers as listeners. We then check whether any of these listeners showed some activity at time $t_0 + \Delta t$. This is done recursively until no other follower shows activity, see Figure 2. In our scheme, a node can only belong to one cascade; this constraint introduces a bias in the measurements, namely, two nodes sharing a follower may show activity at the same time, so their follower may be counted in one or another cascade (with possible important consequences regarding average cascades' size and penetration in time). To minimize this degeneration, we perform calculations for many possible cascade configurations, randomizing the way we process data. We distinguish information cascades (or just cascades,




Figure 3: Upper panels (*a,b,c*): Cascade size probability distributions for the different periods considered. Lower panels (*d,e,f*): Probability distributions of spreaders involved in the cascades for the same periods. The exact periods considered in the analyses are indicated at the top of each panel. See the text for further details.

Table 1: Topological descriptors for both the static and dynamical view of the Twitter data. The information in this table for the activity network corresponds to the accumulation of directed (@) messages up to $D + 10$. Both networks are built from the same users, but descriptors diverge largely. Remarkably, although both networks are sparse (low average degree $\langle k \rangle$ with respect to the system’s size N), dynamic activity appears very scarce. Think, however, that many nodes act as information sinks –they never emit messages, and yet most messages are mentions to them [6]. The clustering coefficient C is significantly high in both networks, given their density, which, in combination to low average shortest path lengths L and diameter D suggests that the structure is small-world. Unlike other reported cases [15], assortativity r is negative for the static network, whereas degree appears to be uncorrelated in the case of the activity network. The giant strongly connected component N_{scgc} is comparable to the system’s size in the follower network, which means that almost every node in it is mutually reachable; that is not the case for the dynamical network, which has a relatively small strongly connected core. This is not surprising given the biased patterns observed in the emission of directed messages.

	Static network	Activity network
N (#nodes)	87,569	87,569
E (#links)	6,030,459	206,592
$\langle k \rangle$	69	2.36
C	0.22	0.034
L	3.24	1.7
D	11	4
r	-0.14	0.005
#strong comp	5,249	73,389
N_{scgc}	82,253	13,103
$max(k_{in})$	5,773	29,155
$max(k_{out})$	31,798	289

for short) from spreader-cascades. In information cascades we count any affected user (listeners and spreaders), whereas in spreader-cascades only spreaders are taken into account.

In the context of political protest, information diffusion plays a key role to coordinate action and to keep adherents informed and motivated. Understanding the dynamics of such diffusion is important to locate who has the capability to transform the emission of a single message into a global information cascade, affecting the whole system. We may name these special users as “privileged spreaders”. Some valuable lessons might be extracted from this knowledge beyond sociology. For instance viral marketing, which capitalizes on online social networks, can improve its strategies when encouraging customers to share product information with their partners. Since people tend to pay more attention to friends than to advertisers, targeting privileged spreaders at the right time may enhance their results.

We measure cascades and spreader-cascades size distributions for three different scenarios: one in which the information intensity is low (relaxed period, from $D - 20$ to $D - 10$), one in which activity is very high (bursty period, $D - 2$ to $D + 6$) and one that considers all available data (which spans a whole month, and includes the two previous scenarios plus the time in-between, $D - 20$ to $D + 10$). Figure 1 illustrates these different periods. The green line represents the cumulative proportion of nodes in the network that had shown some activity, i.e., had sent at least one message, measured by the hour. We tag the first 10 days of study as “relaxed” because, for that period, the amount of active people grew less than 5% of the total of users, indicating that recruitment for the protests was slow at that time. The opposite arguments apply in the case of the bursty period: in only 8 days the amount of active users grew from less than 10% up to over an 80%. The same can be said about global activity (in terms of the total number of emitted directed messages –the activity network), which shows an almost exact growth pattern.

Also, within the different time periods –relaxed, bursty and total–, different time windows have been set to assess the robustness of our results. Our proposed scheme relies on

the contagious effect of activity, thus large time windows, i.e., $\Delta t > 24$ hours, are not considered.

4.2 k -shell decomposition

The k -core decomposition of a network consists of identifying particular subsets of the network, called k -cores, each obtained by recursively removing all the vertices of degree less than k , where $k = k_{in} + k_{out}$ indicates the total number of in- and out-going links of a node, until all vertices in the remaining graph have degree at least k . In the end, each node is assigned a natural number (its coreness), the higher the coreness the closer a node is to the nucleus or core of the network. The main advantage of this centrality measure is, in front of other quantities, its low computational cost that scales as $O(N + E)$, where N is the number of vertices of the graph and E is the number of links it contains [2]. This decomposition has been successfully applied in the analysis of the Internet and the Autonomous Systems structure [2, 7]. In the following section, we will use the k -core decomposition as a means to identify influence in social media. In particular, we discuss which, degree or coreness, is a better predictor of the extent of an information cascade.

5. RESULTS

The upper panels (a,b,c) of Figure 3 reflect that an information cascade of the size of the system can be reached at any activity level (relaxed, bursty or both). As expected, these large cascades occur rarely as the power-law probability distributions evidence. This result is robust to different temporal windows up to 24h. In contrast, lower (d,e,f) panels *do* show significant differences between periods. Specifically, the distribution of involved spreaders in the different scenarios changes radically from the “bursty” period (Figure 3e) to the “relaxed” period (Figure 3d); the distribution that considers the whole period of study just reflects that the bursty period (in which most of the activity takes place) dominates the statistics. The importance of this difference is that one may conclude that, to attain similar results (a system-wide cascade) a proportionally much smaller amount of spreaders is needed in the “relaxed” period.

The previous conclusion raises further questions: is there a way to identify “privileged spreaders”? Are they placed randomly throughout the network’s topology? Or do they occupy key spots in the structure? And, will these influential users be more easily detected in a bursty period (where large cascades occur more often)? In what context will influential spreaders single out? To answer these questions, we capitalize on previous work suggesting that centrality (measured as the k -core) enhances the capacity of a node to be key in disease spreading processes [14]. In the latter work, it is discussed whether the degree of a node (its total number of neighbors, k) or its k -core (a centrality measure) can better predict the spreading capabilities of such node. Note that the k -shell decomposition splits a network in a few levels (over a hundred), while node degrees can range from one or two up to several thousands.

Figure 4 explores the same idea, but in relation to information cascades which are the object of interest here. The upper left panel of this Figure shows the spreading capabilities as a function of classes of k -cores. Specifically, we take the seed of each particular cascade and save its core-

ness and the final size of the cascade it triggers. Having done so for each cascade, we can average the success of cascades for a given core number. Remarkably, for every scenario under consideration (relaxed, bursty, whole), a higher core number yields larger cascades. Exactly the same conclusion (and even more pronounced) can be drawn when considering degree (lower left panel), which is seemingly in contradiction with the mentioned previous evidence [14].

The message seems clear, if one intends to find privileged spreaders one should simply identify those with higher degree. This conclusion might not, however, be the most useful. The right panels in Figure 4 show the k -core (upper) and degree (lower) distributions, indicating the number of nodes which are seeds at one time or another, classified in terms of their coreness or degree. Unsurprisingly, many nodes belong to low cores and have low degrees. The interest of these histograms lies however in the high-end regions, where one can see that, while there are a few hundred nodes in the high cores (and even over a thousand in the last core), highest degrees account only for a few dozen of nodes. In practice, this means that only extremely high degrees, which are very very rare, can produce large cascades. On the contrary, high cascading capabilities are distributed over a wider range of cores, which in turn contain a significant number of nodes. Focusing on Figure 4, note that triggering cascades affecting over 10^{-2} of the network’s population demands nodes with $k \geq 10^3$. Checking the distribution of degrees (right-hand side), it is easy to see that an insignificant amount of nodes display such degree range. In the same line, we may wonder what it takes to trigger cascades affecting over 10^{-2} of the network’s population, from the k -core point of view. In this case, nodes with k -core around 125 show such capability. A quick look at core distribution yields that over 1500 nodes accomplish these conditions, i.e., belonging to the 125th k -shell or more.

We may now distinguish between scenarios in Figure 4. While any of the analyzed periods (relaxed, bursty, whole) shows a growing tendency, i.e., cascades are larger the larger is the considered descriptor, we highlight that it is in the relaxed period (black circles) where the tendency is more clear, i.e., results are less noisy. Between the other two periods, the bursty one (red squares) is distinctly the less robust, in the sense that cascade sizes oscillate very much across k -cores, and the final plot shows smaller slope than the other two. This subtle fact is again of great importance: it means that during “information storms” a large cascade can be triggered from anywhere in the network (and, conversely, small cascades may have begun in important nodes). The reason for this is that in periods where bursty activity dominates the system suffers “information overflow”, the amount of noise flattens the differences between nodes. For instance, in these periods a node from the periphery (low coreness) may balance his unprivileged situation by emitting messages very frequently. This behavior yields a situation in which, from a dynamical point of view, nodes become increasingly indistinguishable. The plot corresponding to the whole period analyzed (green triangles) lies consistently between the other two scenarios, but closer to the relaxed period. This is perfectly coherent, the study spans for 30 days and the bursty period represents only 25% of it, whereas the relaxed period stands for over 33%. Furthermore, those days between




Figure 4: Left upper panel: average spreading capacity (with respect to the system size) of nodes grouped according to their k -core. $\frac{N_c}{N}$ grows with coreness, but the bursty period (red squares) evidences a much less clear tendency, with many fluctuations and a lower overall spreading capacity if compared to the relaxed period (black circles). Left lower panel: The same information is showed as a function of the degree. Again, the relaxed period is the best one at predicting the extent of a cascade. Interestingly, average cascades for highest degrees outperform those triggered by highest k -core nodes by an order of magnitude. See main text for discussion on this aspect. Right panels show the k -core and degree distributions, i.e., how many nodes belong to each class. Note that the highest core contains over 1000 users.

$D - 10$ and $D - 2$, and beyond $D + 6$, resemble the relaxed period from the point of view of information flow.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Online Social Networks are called to play an ever increasing role in shaping many of our habits (be them commercial or cultural) as well as in our position in front of political, economical or social issues not only at a local, country-wide level, but also at the global scale. It is thus of utmost importance to uncover as many aspects as possible about topological and dynamical features of these networks. One particular aspect is whether or not one can identify, in a network of individuals with common interests, those that are influential to the rest. Our results show that the degree of the nodes seems to be the best topological descriptor to locate such influential individuals. However, there is an important caveat: the number of such privileged seeds is very low as there are quite a few of these highly connected subjects. On the contrary, by ranking the nodes according to their k -core index, which can be done at a low computational cost, one

can safely locate the (more abundant in number) individuals that are likely to generate large (near to) system-wide cascades. The results here presented also lead to a surprising conclusion: periods characterized by bursty activity are not convenient for the spreading of information throughout the system using influential individuals as seeds. This is because in such periods, the high level of activity – mainly coming from users which are badly located in the network – introduces noise in the system. Consequently, influential individuals lose their unique status as generators of system wide cascades and therefore their messages are diluted. Finally, we point out that it would be of further interest to extend the kind of analysis here presented to geo-positioned data, so as to be able to test whether our conclusions hold when geography is taken into account.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been partially supported by MICINN through Grants FIS2008-01240 and FIS2009-13364-C02-01, and by Comunidad de Aragón (Spain) through a grant to FENOL

group.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] L. Adamic and N. Glance. The political blogosphere and the 2004 us election: divided they blog. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Link Discovery*, pages 36–43. ACM, 2005.
- [2] J. Alvarez-Hamelin, L. Dall’Asta, A. Barrat, and A. Vespignani. k-core decomposition of internet graphs: hierarchies, self-similarity and measurement biases. *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, 3(2):371–393, 2008.
- [3] A. Barabasi. The origin of bursts and heavy tails in human dynamics. *Nature*, 435(7063):1251–1251, 2005.
- [4] A. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286:509, 1999.
- [5] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D. Hwang. Complex networks: structure and dynamics. *Phys Rep*, 424(4-5):175–308, 2006.
- [6] J. Borge-Holthoefer, A. Rivero, I. García, E. Cauhé, A. Ferrer, D. Ferrer, D. Francos, D. Iñiguez, M. Pérez, G. Ruiz, et al. Structural and dynamical patterns on online social networks: the spanish may 15th movement as a case study. *PLoS One*, 6(8):e23883, 2011.
- [7] S. Carmi, S. Havlin, S. Kirkpatrick, Y. Shavitt, and E. Shir. A model of internet topology using k-shell decomposition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(27):11150, 2007.
- [8] D. Centola. The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment. *Science*, 329:1194–1197, 2010.
- [9] M. Cha, H. Haddadi, F. Benevenuto, and K. Gummadi. Measuring user influence in twitter: The million follower fallacy. In *4th International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM)*, 2010.
- [10] M. Conover, J. Ratkiewicz, M. Francisco, B. Gonçalves, A. Flammini, and F. Menczer. Political polarization on twitter. In *Proc. 5th Intl. Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2011.
- [11] S. Fortunato, A. Flammini, and F. Menczer. Scale-free network growth by ranking. *Physical Review Letters*, 96(21):218701, 2006.
- [12] B. Gonçalves, N. Perra, and A. Vespignani. Modeling users’ activity on twitter networks: Validation of dunbar’s number. *PLoS One*, 6(8):e22656, 2011.
- [13] M. Gupte, P. Shankar, J. Li, S. Muthukrishnan, and L. Iftode. Finding hierarchy in directed online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 557–566. ACM, 2011.
- [14] M. Kitsak, L. Gallos, S. Havlin, F. Liljeros, L. Muchnik, H. Stanley, and H. Makse. Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks. *Nature Physics*, 2010.
- [15] M. E. J. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Rev*, 45:167–256, 2003.
- [16] J. Onnela, J. Saramäki, J. Hyvönen, G. Szabó, D. Lazer, K. Kaski, J. Kertész, and A. Barabási. Structure and tie strengths in mobile communication networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(18):7332, 2007.
- [17] J. Ratkiewicz, M. Conover, M. Meiss, B. Gonçalves, A. Flammini, and F. Menczer. Detecting and tracking political abuse in social media. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, pages 297–304, 2011.
- [18] J. Ratkiewicz, M. Conover, M. Meiss, B. Gonçalves, S. Patil, A. Flammini, and F. Menczer. Truthy: Mapping the spread of astroturf in microblog streams. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference companion on World wide web*, pages 249–252. ACM, 2011.
- [19] J. Ratkiewicz, S. Fortunato, A. Flammini, F. Menczer, and A. Vespignani. Characterizing and modeling the dynamics of online popularity. *Physical Review Letters*, 105(15):158701, 2010.
- [20] D. Watts and S. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, 393:440, 1998.