

# Adaptive Differentially Private Structural Entropy Minimization for Unsupervised Social Event Detection

Zhiwei Yang  
Institute of Information Engineering,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, &  
School of Cyber Security, University  
of Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
Beijing, China  
yzw377986686@gmail.com

Yuecen Wei  
Beihang University  
Beijing, China  
weiyu@buaa.edu.cn

Haoran Li  
Hong Kong University of Science and  
Technology,  
Hongkong, China  
hlibt@connect.ust.hk

Qian Li  
Beijing University of Posts and  
Telecommunications,  
Beijing, China  
li.qian@bupt.edu.cn

Lei Jiang\*  
Institute of Information Engineering,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
Beijing, China  
jianglei@iie.ac.cn

Li Sun  
North China Electric Power  
University  
Beijing, China  
ccsunli@ncepu.edu.cn

Xiaoyan Yu  
Beijing Institute of Technology  
Beijing, China  
xiaoyan.yu@bit.edu.cn

Chunming Hu  
Beihang University  
Beijing, China  
hucm@buaa.edu.cn

Hao Peng  
Beihang University,  
Beijing, China  
penghao@buaa.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

Social event detection refers to extracting relevant message clusters from social media data streams to represent specific events in the real world. Social event detection is important in numerous areas, such as opinion analysis, social safety, and decision-making. Most current methods are supervised and require access to large amounts of data. These methods need prior knowledge of the events and carry a high risk of leaking sensitive information in the messages, making them less applicable in open-world settings. Therefore, conducting unsupervised detection while fully utilizing the rich information in the messages and protecting data privacy remains a significant challenge. To this end, we propose a novel social event detection framework, ADP-SEMEvent, an unsupervised social event detection method that prioritizes privacy. Specifically, ADP-SEMEvent is divided into two stages, i.e., the construction stage of the private message graph and the clustering stage of the private message graph. In the first stage, an adaptive differential privacy approach is used to construct a private message graph. In this process, our method can adaptively apply differential privacy based on the events occurring each day in an open environment to maximize the use of the privacy budget. In the second stage, to address the reduction in data utility caused by noise, a novel 2-dimensional structural entropy minimization algorithm based on optimal subgraphs is used to detect events in the message graph.

\*Corresponding author



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution International 4.0 License.

CIKM '24, October 21–25, 2024, Boise, ID, USA.  
© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).  
ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0436-9/24/10.  
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3627673.3679537>

The highlight of this process is unsupervised and does not compromise differential privacy. Extensive experiments on two public datasets demonstrate that ADP-SEMEvent can achieve detection performance comparable to state-of-the-art methods while maintaining reasonable privacy budget parameters.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Security and privacy** → *Social network security and privacy.*

## KEYWORDS


Social Event Detection, Adaptive Differentially Private, Structural Entropy, Mixed Sensitivity.

## ACM Reference Format:

Zhiwei Yang, Yuecen Wei, Haoran Li, Qian Li, Lei Jiang, Li Sun, Xiaoyan Yu, Chunming Hu, and Hao Peng. 2024. Adaptive Differentially Private Structural Entropy Minimization for Unsupervised Social Event Detection. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '24)*, October 21–25, 2024, Boise, ID, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3627673.3679537>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Social event detection refers to extracting relevant clusters of messages from social media message corpora or social message streams to represent specific events in the real world. Privacy leakage is a crucial concern today and also exists in social event detection tasks. Social events occur daily, often containing rich information regarding collective social behaviors that widespread public attention. Therefore, the task of social event detection holds significant implications for sentiment analysis [2], product recommendations, and decision-making [26], distinguishing between real and fake news [29], as well as monitoring and managing social crises [35].



**Figure 1: A toy example of an attack demonstrating the potential leakage of sensitive information such as persons or geopolitical entities.**

Most early methods for social event detection [1, 11, 12, 24, 30, 44, 46, 49] primarily relied on extracting attributes from text content and subsequently applying traditional statistical or machine learning methods for detection. However, these detection methods exhibited low accuracy and were not widely adopted due to limitations such as insufficient richness in extracted text features and inadequate interaction between different attributes. Later, with the development of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), GNN-based methods for social event detection gradually gained popularity. GNNs can effectively facilitate direct interactions between nodes and neighbors in a graph, leading many researchers to improve performance by leveraging GNN models [3, 32–34]. However, most methods have been tested under the supervised learning assumption that social event categories are predefined. The supervised assumption conflicts with the acquisition of social events in the real world, i.e., the total number of event categories in the real world frequently varies, making it impossible to predefine the total number of social event categories. Therefore, supervised GNN-based methods may not perform well in open environments. Recently, QSGNN [37] and HISEvent [4] proposed to enhance social event detection in open environments. QSGNN successfully implemented social event detection in open environments using a pseudo-labeling method. HISEvent achieved state-of-the-art (SOTA) unsupervised social event detection using Structural Entropy [19] (SE) combined with hierarchical clustering. Both of them can be applied effectively in the real world, but they still suffer from a serious problem, which is the potential leakage of sensitive private data due to their lack of protection for sensitive attributes within the data. Graph-based social event detection methods typically use various additional information to enrich the graph’s connectivity [4, 32, 37]. Though enriching edges can improve detection performance, it can also lead to unintentional privacy leakage of user privacy data through member inference attacks, attribute inference attacks, and other methods, Figure 1 shows a toy example of the attack. To the best of our knowledge, among all the methods mentioned above, there is no social event detection model that can handle both unsupervised learning and privacy protection. We believe that both aspects are necessary.

In this work, we propose a novel framework, *Adaptive Differentially Private Structural Entropy Minimization for Unsupervised Social Event Detection* (ADP-SEMEvent), which simultaneously achieves outstanding social event detection performance with privacy protection on unsupervised learning. **To respect privacy**, inspired by research on differential privacy [6] (DP), we implement an adaptive differentially private strategy in ADP-SEMEvent. We use a mixed sensitivity strategy to achieve adaptive DP, enabling our model to automatically select the most noise level based on different message sets on different days. This adaptive nature effectively balances

privacy protection and detection accuracy. Specifically, we calculate the similarity between nodes using the adaptive differentially private strategy. Then we explore the edges connectivity of the graph using 1-dimensional Structural Entropy (1D SE) and relevant attributes, ultimately obtaining a private message graph. **For unsupervised learning**, we employ SE from information theory as a crucial criterion during the clustering process, an indicator for evaluating the amount of information contained within a graph. Subsequently, to overcome the current 2-dimensional Structural Entropy (2D SE) minimization algorithm’s performance and efficiency limitations, we designed a 2D SE minimization method based on optimal subgraphs to cluster the message graph for social event detection. The source code is available on GitHub<sup>1</sup>.

Our experiments on two public Twitter datasets demonstrate that ADP-SEMEvent outperforms baselines for both open and closed set settings and remains competitive with state-of-the-art approaches within a certain range of privacy budget settings. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first study to implement unsupervised social event detection with differentially private guarantees. Our contributions are as follows: 1) We incorporate an adaptive differentially private strategy into the process of social event detection, striking a balance between privacy protection and detection accuracy. 2) We propose a novel 2D SE minimization algorithm based on optimal subgraphs to partition the graph and use it for clustering the message graph to conduct unsupervised social event detection. 3) Extensive experiments conducted on two public Twitter datasets demonstrate that ADP-SEMEvent, under a reasonable privacy budget, can achieve performance comparable to current state-of-the-art models while preserving privacy.

## 2 PRELIMINARY

### 2.1 Differentially Private Message Graph

The release of messages graph refers to the process of transforming a series of social messages set  $D = \{m_1, \dots, m_N\}$  (generally, using Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) to convert the message into embeddings) into a message graph  $G = (V, E)$  using an algorithm  $R$ .  $G$  is utilized for social event detection. Under the background of protecting privacy, we present the following definitions:

*Definition 2.1.* (Differential Privacy [6]). For algorithm  $R$ , given social message sets  $D$  and  $D'$  ( $D$  and  $D'$  are neighboring datasets that differ by only one message), and any output  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{range}(D)$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , if the algorithm  $R$  satisfies:


$$\Pr[R(D) \subseteq \mathcal{G}] \leq e^\epsilon \Pr[R(D') \subseteq \mathcal{G}] + \delta, \quad (1)$$

we say that the algorithm  $R$  satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, where  $\epsilon$  is the privacy budget. Particularly, if  $\delta = 0$ , the algorithm  $R$  satisfies  $\epsilon$ -DP.  $R$  can protect sensitive information contained in the messages during the release of the message graph.

*Definition 2.2.* (Sensitivity). Consider a function  $R$  whose input is a message set and whose output is in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . The sensitivity  $S_R$  of function  $R$  is defined as:

$$S_R = \max \|R(D) - R(D')\|_1. \quad (2)$$

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/SELGroup/ADP-SEMEvent>



**Figure 2: The proposed ADP-SEMEvent framework.** ADP-SEMEvent consists of two stages: the private message graph construction stage (stage 1) and the private message graph clustering stage (stage 2). Messages with the same color represent the same cluster according to the ground truth labels; orange edges  $E_s$  are derived from 1-dimensional structural entropy, and purple edges  $E_a$  are derived from relevant attributes; arrows of specific colors indicate specific operations.

Sensitivity is used to determine the magnitude of random perturbation noise to protect private information, and the sensitivity includes global sensitivity [9] ( $S_{global}$ ) and local sensitivity [31] ( $S_{local}$ ).

**Definition 2.3.** (Laplace Mechanism for Message Similarity). We measure the similarity between any two messages using the cosine similarity, then the Laplace mechanism [9] is applied to generate the noise and perturb the similarity as:

$$\text{Cos}_{Lap}(m_i, m_j) = \text{Cos}(m_i, m_j) + \text{Lap}\left(\frac{S}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (3)$$

where  $S$  is typically calculated using global sensitivity, but we designed a novel mixed sensitivity approach for  $S$ . (described in Section 3.3).  $\text{Lap}(S/\epsilon)$  denotes sampling from a Laplace distribution with mean 0 and scale factor  $S$ .

## 2.2 Structural Entropy

Social event detection can be conducted by constructing classification or clustering models on the messages graph. Consistent with Cao et al.'s [4] approach, we achieve unsupervised graph clustering using SE minimization. We provide the relevant definitions below:

**Definition 2.4.** (Encoding Tree of Messages Graph [18, 19]). The coding tree  $T$  of the messages graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a hierarchical clustering partition of  $G$  (illustrated as the blue rounded dashed line box in Figure 2). The coding tree  $T$  includes all message nodes as leaf nodes. Each node  $\alpha$  in  $T$  corresponds to a partitioning of message nodes, with the set  $T_\alpha = v_\alpha^1, \dots, v_\alpha^j$ , representing the successor nodes of  $\alpha$ . The root node  $\lambda$  of  $T$  has the set  $T_\lambda = V$ , indicating no partitioning. For each node  $\alpha$  in  $T$  (excluding  $\lambda$ ), the height  $h(\alpha)$  is one less than that of its parent node. The root node  $\lambda$  has a height of 0. The height of  $T$  is the maximum height among all nodes in  $T$ .

**Definition 2.5.** (1D SE). For a messages graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices, its 1D SE is defined as:

$$H^{(1)}(G) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{d_i}{2m} \log_2 \frac{d_i}{2m}, \quad (4)$$

where  $d_i$  represents the weighted degree of node  $i$ , and  $m$  denotes the sum of the weighted degrees of all nodes.

**Definition 2.6.** (2D SE). For a messages graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices,  $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_L\}$  is a partition of  $V$ ,  $p_j$  represents an event cluster in the message graph. The 2D SE is defined as:

$$H^{(2)}(G) = - \sum_{j=1}^L \frac{V_j}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \frac{d_i^j}{V_j} \log_2 \frac{d_i^j}{V_j} - \sum_{j=1}^L \frac{P_{cut_j}}{m} \log_2 \frac{V_j}{m}, \quad (5)$$

where  $n_j$  is the number of nodes in partition  $p_j$ ,  $d_i^j$  is the weighted degree of the  $i$ th node in  $p_j$ ,  $V_j$  is the sum of the weighted degrees of all nodes in partition  $p_j$ , and  $P_{cut_j}$  is the sum of the weights of the cut edges in  $p_j$ .

## 3 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we provide a detailed description of ADP-SEMEvent. The entire framework is illustrated in Figure 2. The private message graph construction stage primarily utilizes our proposed adaptive differentially private strategy (introduced in Section 3.2), combined with 1D SE and relevant attributes for constructing the private message graph (discussed in Section 3.3). The private message graph clustering stage involves a 2D SE minimization algorithm based on optimal subgraphs (explained in Section 3.4).

### 3.1 Problem Formalization

Given a series of social messages  $m_1, \dots, m_N$  forming a message graph  $G = (V, E)$ , where the node set  $V = \{m_1, \dots, m_N\}$  and the

**Algorithm 1:** Message Graph Synthesis under Adaptive Differentially Private Strategy

---

**Input:** social message embedding set  
 $M = \{m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots, m_N\}$ ; maximum number of neighbors  $k_{max}$ .

**Output:** a message graph  $G = (V, E)$ .

- 1 Set  $V = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, N\}$ ;
- 2 Get similarity  $\leftarrow$  Eq. (14);
- 3 Set  $k = 1, E_s = \emptyset, E'_s = \emptyset, SE = +\infty$ ;
- 4 **while** *True* **do**
- 5     initialize:  $G = (V, E_s), E'_s = \emptyset$ ;
- 6     **for** each  $v_i \in V$  **do**
- 7          $E'_s \xleftarrow{\text{add to}}$
- 7         Let  $v_i$  connect the  $k$  largest similarity nodes;
- 8      $H^{(1)}(G) \leftarrow$  Eq. (4);
- 9     **if**  $H^{(1)}(G) < SE$  **and**  $k < k_{max}$  **then**
- 10          $SE = H^{(1)}(G)$ ;
- 11          $E_s = E'_s$ ;
- 12          $k++$ ;
- 13     **else**
- 14         **break**;
- 15 Set  $E_a = \emptyset$ ;
- 16 **for** each  $i \in [1, \text{size}(V)]$  **do**
- 17     **for** each  $j \in [i + 1, \text{size}(V)]$  **do**
- 18         **if**  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  have shared attributes **then**
- 19              $E_a \xleftarrow{\text{add to}}$  similarity( $v_i, v_j$ );
- 20  $E = E_s + E_a$ ;
- 21  $G = (V, E)$ ;
- 22 **return**  $G$ .

---

edge set  $E$  represents the relevance between messages. The task of social event detection requires partitioning the message graph  $G$  into several partitions, denoted as  $\{e_1, \dots, e_M\}$ , where  $e_i \subset V$ ,  $e_i \cap e_j = \emptyset$ ,  $e_1 \cup \dots \cup e_M = V$ . The partitions represent  $M$  detected message clusters. Specifically, the message graph  $G$  contains private information and poses a risk of being attacked.

### 3.2 Adaptive Differentially Private Strategy

This section will introduce our mixed sensitivity differentially private strategy and provide proof that this strategy satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP in the worst-case scenario.

**3.2.1 Mixed Sensitivity Strategy.** To prevent the waste of privacy budget  $\epsilon$  caused by the global sensitivity being much greater than the local sensitivity in a specific data set, we design a mixed sensitivity strategy to prevent the waste of privacy budget and the addition of unnecessary noise.

In Equation 2,  $S_{global}$  refers to the maximum difference between the results of a query for any two different data records in any data set.  $S_{global}$  is independent of the data set and is related only to the calculation method itself.  $S_{local}$  removes the restriction of any data

set from the definition of global sensitivity and only considers the current data set.  $S_{local}$  can be obtained through a limited number of calculations. In general, we can not directly use  $S_{local}$  in the Laplace mechanism because if a malicious attacker knows the local sensitivity of a function  $f$  on a specific dataset, they can still infer some information about the dataset [31]. Therefore,  $S_{local}$  must be smoothed to prevent the malicious attacker from deducing the local sensitivity. This is achieved using smooth sensitivity [31], denoted as  $S_{smooth}$ , which is calculated as:

$$S_{smooth} = 2\exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)\right) \cdot S_{local}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\delta$  is typically set to  $1/|D|^2$  ( $|D|$  is the size of  $D$ ).

Then, we design the mixed sensitivity ( $S_{mixed}$ ) strategy.  $S_{mixed}$  is calculated as follows:

$$S_{mixed} = \min\{S_{global}, S_{smooth}\}. \quad (7)$$

With the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  unchanged, our strategy can automatically determine fitness sensitivity based on daily events to achieve adaptive noise perturbation.

**3.2.2 Differential Privacy Proof.** We prove that our strategy worst-case satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP. This entails demonstrating that global sensitivity satisfies  $\epsilon$ -DP and that smooth sensitivity satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP.

For  $S_{smooth}$ , Nissim et al. [31] have provided a rigorous proof that using  $S_{smooth}$  for the Laplace mechanism always satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP, regardless of whether global sensitivity can be found. Where  $\delta$  represents the probability of failure, and in our strategy,  $\delta = 1/|D|^2$ , is a small probability. For  $S_{global}$ , we provide the following proof:

**PROOF.** For  $D$  and  $D'$ ,  $P_D$  and  $P_{D'}$  represent the probability distributions of message similarities calculated on their respective datasets. For any two messages  $m_i$  and  $m_j$  in the dataset, the similarity is represented as  $z = \text{Cos}(m_i, m_j) + Y$ , where  $Y$  follows Laplace distribution with scale  $S_{mixed}/\epsilon$  and mean 0. Therefore, we have:

$$P_D(z) = \frac{\epsilon}{2S_{mixed}} \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon|\text{Cos}_D(m_i, m_j) - z|}{S_{mixed}}\right) \quad (8)$$

$$P_{D'}(z) = \frac{\epsilon}{2S_{mixed}} \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon|\text{Cos}_{D'}(m_i, m_j) - z|}{S_{mixed}}\right). \quad (9)$$

Next, verify whether it complies with differential privacy through distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_D(z)}{P_{D'}(z)} &= \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon|\text{Cos}_D(m_i, m_j) - z|}{S_{mixed}}\right)}{\exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon|\text{Cos}_{D'}(m_i, m_j) - z|}{S_{mixed}}\right)} \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon(|\text{Cos}_{D'}(m_i, m_j) - z| - |\text{Cos}_D(m_i, m_j) - z|)}{S_{mixed}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon(|\text{Cos}_{D'}(m_i, m_j) - \text{Cos}_D(m_i, m_j)|)}{S_{mixed}}\right) \quad (11)$$

$$\leq \exp(\epsilon). \quad (12)$$

□

In the process of proving, the last two steps follow from the triangle inequality. According to Equation 1, our strategy satisfies  $\epsilon$ -DP. In summary, our strategy worst-case satisfies  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -DP.

**Algorithm 2:** 2D SE Minimization Based on Optimal Sub-graphs

**Input:** message graph  $G = (V, E)$ ; Subgraph size  $q$ ; initial partition  $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ .  
**Output:** Clustering results  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ .

```

1  $C = P$ ;
2 while True do
  // Synthetic Super-graph based on partitions
   $C$ 
3  $V' \leftarrow$  The nodes in the same partition  $c_n$  are combined
  into a super-node;
4  $E' \leftarrow$  The edge weights between  $V'$  are summed by the
  original nodes;
5  $G' = (V', E') \leftarrow V', E'$ ;
  // Get the optimal subgraphs
6 Calculate the number of subgraphs  $k_{max} = \lceil \frac{|C|}{q} \rceil$ ;
7 for each  $k \in [1, k_{max}]$  do
8   Set  $g_{sub_k} = (V_{sub_k}, E_{sub_k})$ ,  $V_{sub_k} = \emptyset$ ,  $E_{sub_k} = \emptyset$ ;
9    $g_{sub_k} \xleftarrow{\text{add to}}$  The endpoint of the largest edge in  $G'$ ;
10  while  $|V_{sub_k}| < q$  do
11     $g_{sub_k} \xleftarrow{\text{add to}}$  The node with the highest cut
    weight to current  $g_{sub_k}$ ;
12   $G' = G' - g_{sub_k}$ ;
  // 2D SE minimization of optimal subgraphs
13 set  $C = \emptyset$ ,  $C_{last} = C$ ;
14 for each  $g_{sub_k} \in \{g_{sub_1}, \dots, g_{sub_k}\}$  do
15    $T \leftarrow$  Construct an initial coding tree according to
   definition 2.4;
16    $T_{best} \leftarrow$  Run vanilla 2D SE minimization to
   minimize 2D SE;
17    $C \xleftarrow{\text{add to}}$  The partition corresponding to  $T_{best}$ ;
18 if  $C = C_{last}$  then
19    $q = 2q$ ;
20 else if  $k_{max} = 1$  then
21   break;
22 else  $C_{last} = C$ ;
23 return  $C$ .


```

### 3.3 Private Message Graph Synthesis

To ensure the generation of rich and private message graphs, we propose a method of message graph synthesis with edges  $E_s$  based on SE and edges  $E_a$  based on attribute. We employ our proposed adaptive differentially private strategy to protect privacy while computing edge weights.

We summarize our method into **Algorithm 1**, termed *Message Graph Synthesis under Adaptive Differentially Private Strategy*. For  $E_s$  (lines 3–14), we link each message to its  $k$  nearest neighbors, where the distance utilizes cosine similarity under the adaptive differentially private strategy:

$$\text{Cos}_{Lap}(m_i, m_j) = \frac{m_i \cdot m_j}{|m_i| \cdot |m_j|} + \text{Lap}\left(\frac{S_{mixed}}{\epsilon}\right), \quad (14)$$



**Figure 3: The impact of different ways of initializing partitions on the results.**

where  $m_k$  represents the semantic vector corresponding to the message node, obtained through PLMs (SBERT [36]). It is worth noting that, due to the cosine similarity's range being  $[-1, 1]$ ,  $S_{global} = 2$ . We gradually increase the number of neighbors from  $k = 1$ , then compute the 1D SE under different  $k$  neighbors, selecting the linkage method with the smallest 1D SE as the final  $E_s$ . Specifically, to reduce algorithmic overhead, we greedily select the first occurrence of local minimum 1D SE as our target rather than using the globally optimal target. For  $E_a$  (lines 15–19), we draw inspiration from the majority of GNN-based social event detection methods [3, 32, 34, 37], extracting common attributes of social events such as entities, user mentions, and user IDs. We set the edge weight between nodes  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , sharing the same attributes to the cosine similarity  $\text{Cos}_{Lap}(m_i, m_j)$  corresponding to the nodes. Finally, we combine  $E_a$  and  $E_s$  as all edges of the final private graph.

### 3.4 Event Detection via 2D SE Minimization

To efficiently cluster on the noisy message graph  $G$ , we design an algorithm named *2D SE minimization based on optimal subgraphs*. Existing approaches used a greedy approach (*vanilla 2D SE minimization* [19]) to repeatedly merge any two nodes in the encoding tree  $T$  for 2D SE minimization, which is time-consuming on large graphs. Later, an incremental method reduces runtime overhead by sequentially dividing large message graphs into multiple sub-graphs [4]. Nevertheless, such methods addressed the problem of high time complexity, but simply dividing the sub-graphs is unwise. The initial partitioning is crucial because it may force strongly related message nodes to be divided into different parts, ultimately preventing them from merging into the same cluster, as shown in Figure 3 (a). So, we prevent strongly correlated message nodes from being forcibly separated by constructing optimal sub-graphs, as illustrated in Figure 3 (b).

Specifically, as shown in **Algorithm 2**, assuming a graph  $G = (V, E)$ , partition  $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$  (where  $p_m \subset V, p_i \cap p_j = \emptyset$ ), and subgraph size  $q$  as input. In each iteration, we first construct a super-graph based on the original graph and the initial partition (lines 3–5), treating nodes in the same partition as a single new node and using the sum of the cut edges between partitions as the edge weight between new nodes. Then, using a greedy approach, we obtain the optimal sub-graph (lines 6–12), attempting to include edges with higher weights in the same sub-graph as much as possible. Finally, we perform 2D SE minimization on each sub-graph (lines 13–17), achieving the final clustering result based on optimizing each encoding tree.

**Table 1: Open-set results on Event2012.**

Methods	$M_1$		$M_2$		$M_3$		$M_4$		$M_5$		$M_6$		$M_7$	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.35	0.03	0.76	0.65	0.72	0.45	0.58	0.19	0.67	0.36	0.75	0.45	0.50	0.07
SBERT	0.38	0.03	0.85	0.73	0.87	0.68	0.80	0.36	<b>0.85</b>	0.61	0.83	0.53	0.61	0.09
EventX	0.06	0.01	0.29	0.45	0.18	0.09	0.19	0.07	0.14	0.04	0.27	0.14	0.13	0.02
KPGNN	0.37	0.07	0.87	0.76	0.74	0.58	0.64	0.29	0.71	0.47	0.79	0.72	0.51	0.12
QSGNN	0.41	0.07	0.80	0.77	0.76	0.59	0.68	0.29	0.73	0.48	0.80	0.73	0.54	0.12
HISEvent	0.44	0.08	<b>0.88</b>	0.79	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.95</b>	0.84	0.50	<b>0.85</b>	0.62	<b>0.90</b>	0.86	<b>0.68</b>	0.27
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.18	0.05	0.72	0.72	0.64	0.69	0.37	0.21	0.61	0.58	0.66	0.67	0.34	0.20
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.33	0.07	0.81	0.84	0.81	0.85	0.40	0.50	0.79	0.78	0.80	0.80	0.54	0.23
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.08	0.02	0.10	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.11	0.12	0.07
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.08	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.11	0.02	<b>0.03</b>	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.13	0.09
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.22	0.08	0.77	0.80	0.73	0.73	0.51	<b>0.63</b>	0.62	0.59	0.80	0.83	0.35	0.25
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.35	<b>0.09</b>	0.87	<b>0.87</b>	0.89	0.91	0.73	0.49	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.85</b>	0.89	0.87	0.57	0.28
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.09</b>	0.87	<b>0.87</b>	0.92	0.91	<b>0.85</b>	0.55	<b>0.85</b>	0.62	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.93</b>	0.65	<b>0.35</b>

Methods	$M_8$		$M_9$		$M_{10}$		$M_{11}$		$M_{12}$		$M_{13}$		$M_{14}$	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.74	0.51	0.71	0.34	0.78	0.55	0.62	0.26	0.56	0.31	0.57	0.13	0.55	0.24
SBERT	0.86	0.65	0.83	0.47	0.85	0.62	<b>0.82</b>	0.49	0.85	0.63	0.70	0.24	0.77	0.40
EventX	0.21	0.09	0.19	0.07	0.24	0.13	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.07	0.16	0.04	0.14	0.10
KPGNN	0.76	0.60	0.71	0.46	0.78	0.70	0.71	0.49	0.66	0.48	0.67	0.29	0.65	0.42
QSGNN	0.75	0.59	0.75	0.47	0.80	0.71	0.72	0.49	0.68	0.49	0.66	0.29	0.66	0.41
HISEvent	<b>0.89</b>	0.74	0.88	0.65	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.82</b>	0.62	<b>0.90</b>	0.82	0.78	0.46	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.85</b>
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.33	0.14	0.35	0.32	0.76	0.80	0.59	0.48	0.46	0.38	0.56	0.36	0.51	0.49
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.78	0.61	0.60	0.45	0.80	0.80	0.77	0.0	0.64	0.57	0.65	0.39	0.65	0.50
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.10	0.03	0.09	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.13
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.14	0.05	0.01	0.02
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.69	0.60	0.57	0.47	0.77	0.80	0.69	0.56	0.56	0.42	0.55	0.35	0.51	0.44
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.73	0.53	0.85	0.76	0.88	0.85	0.81	0.64	0.74	0.74	0.72	0.43	0.71	0.58
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.51</b>	0.83	0.71

Methods	$M_{15}$		$M_{16}$		$M_{17}$		$M_{18}$		$M_{19}$		$M_{20}$		$M_{21}$	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.43	0.07	0.71	0.43	0.56	0.22	0.52	0.24	0.59	0.28	0.60	0.32	0.54	0.17
SBERT	0.67	0.17	0.78	0.50	0.77	0.35	0.81	0.52	0.83	0.54	0.80	0.52	0.70	0.24
EventX	0.07	0.01	0.19	0.08	0.18	0.12	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.07	0.18	0.11	0.10	0.10
KPGNN	0.54	0.17	0.77	0.66	0.68	0.43	0.66	0.47	0.71	0.51	0.68	0.51	0.57	0.20
QSGNN	0.55	0.17	0.76	0.65	0.69	0.44	0.68	0.48	0.70	0.50	0.69	0.51	0.58	0.21
HISEvent	0.72	0.27	0.87	0.83	<b>0.81</b>	0.56	0.80	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.87</b>	0.63	0.81	<b>0.69</b>	0.69	0.45
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.42	0.32	0.73	0.75	0.55	0.56	0.48	0.40	0.60	0.48	0.51	0.41	0.57	0.33
$DP_G$ -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.56	0.33	0.82	0.78	0.69	<b>0.58</b>	0.66	0.58	0.86	0.56	0.68	0.58	0.57	0.33
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.10	0.20	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.10	0.09	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.18	0.10	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.05
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.63	0.30	0.83	0.80	0.56	0.57	0.54	0.43	0.72	0.63	0.66	0.64	0.45	0.40
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.60	<b>0.35</b>	0.84	<b>0.84</b>	0.74	0.57	0.73	0.65	0.84	0.67	0.76	0.64	0.66	0.42
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	<b>0.75</b>	0.30	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.84</b>	0.79	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.70</b>	0.86	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.71</b>	<b>0.46</b>

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we evaluate the event detection and privacy protection capabilities of ADP-SEMEvent. Specifically, our goal is to answer the following questions: **Q1**: How does ADP-SEMEvent perform compared to other methods? **Q2**: What is the capability of ADP-SEMEvent in privacy protection? **Q3**: What is the impact of privacy budget  $\epsilon$  on ADP-SEMEvent’s results? **Q4**: How is the new 2D SE minimization algorithm executed? **Q5**: How does the adaptive differential privacy strategy work?

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We experiment on two large public Twitter datasets. **Event2012** [28] has 68,841 English messages, including 503 events; **Event2018** [27] has 64,516 French messages, including 257 events. We employ the time-splitting method proposed by Cao et al. [4] and Ren et al. [37] to partition the dataset. Specifically, Event2012 is divided into  $M_0, \dots, M_{21}$ , a total of 22 blocks; Event2018 is divided into  $M_0, \dots, M_{16}$ , a total of 17 blocks. Our model is unsupervised and does not require a training set, but some baselines are supervised, so the first day is the training set.

**Table 2: Open-set results on Event2018.**

Methods	$M_1$		$M_2$		$M_3$		$M_4$		$M_5$		$M_6$		$M_7$		$M_8$	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.42	0.16	0.44	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.41	0.17	0.56	0.31	0.49	0.23	0.49	0.23	0.50	0.24
SBERT	0.60	0.20	0.61	0.29	0.63	0.34	0.60	0.23	0.76	0.47	0.73	0.41	0.65	0.29	0.75	0.50
EventX	0.11	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.11	0.01	0.14	0.06	0.24	0.13	0.15	0.08	0.12	0.02	0.21	0.09
KPGNN	0.54	0.17	0.55	0.18	0.55	0.15	0.55	0.17	0.57	0.21	0.57	0.21	0.61	0.30	0.57	0.20
QSGNN	0.56	0.18	0.57	0.19	0.56	0.17	0.59	0.18	0.59	0.23	0.59	0.21	0.63	0.30	0.55	0.19
HISEvent	<b>0.78</b>	0.55	<b>0.78</b>	0.60	<b>0.75</b>	0.50	<b>0.73</b>	0.48	<b>0.79</b>	0.57	0.81	0.56	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.89</b>	0.80
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.40	0.35	0.45	0.43	0.36	0.24	0.40	0.23	0.39	0.40	0.44	0.42	0.41	0.35	0.30	0.26
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.52	0.47	0.55	0.53	0.51	0.38	0.52	0.38	0.55	0.47	0.57	0.63	0.60	0.53	0.52	0.44
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.08	0.02
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.04
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.48	0.41	0.57	0.55	0.45	0.38	0.53	0.26	0.56	0.44	0.56	0.51	0.58	0.41	0.41	0.37
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.56	0.49	0.68	0.65	0.61	0.45	0.62	0.43	0.73	<b>0.71</b>	0.67	0.71	0.66	0.55	0.66	0.59
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	0.75	<b>0.60</b>	0.77	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.51</b>	<b>0.79</b>	0.58	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.85</b>	0.65	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.82</b>

Methods	$M_9$		$M_{10}$		$M_{11}$		$M_{12}$		$M_{13}$		$M_{14}$		$M_{15}$		$M_{16}$	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.42	0.17	0.46	0.19	0.48	0.18	0.54	0.32	0.40	0.18	0.52	0.27	0.53	0.28	0.43	0.21
SBERT	0.63	0.23	0.72	0.39	0.70	0.31	0.76	0.54	0.65	0.34	0.68	0.43	0.71	0.40	0.65	0.25
EventX	0.16	0.07	0.19	0.07	0.18	0.06	0.20	0.09	0.15	0.06	0.22	0.11	0.22	0.11	0.10	0.01
KPGNN	0.46	0.10	0.56	0.18	0.53	0.16	0.56	0.17	0.60	0.28	0.65	0.43	0.58	0.25	0.50	0.13
QSGNN	0.46	0.13	0.58	0.19	0.59	0.20	0.59	0.20	0.58	0.27	0.67	0.44	0.61	0.27	0.50	0.13
HISEvent	0.76	0.52	<b>0.80</b>	<b>0.52</b>	0.81	0.50	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.89</b>	0.81	0.83	0.70	<b>0.68</b>	0.30
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.22	0.12	0.28	0.22	0.35	0.19	0.45	0.36	0.44	0.40	0.45	0.37	0.50	0.42	0.26	0.19
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.36	0.12	0.50	0.42	0.52	0.35	0.64	0.67	0.56	0.60	0.60	0.51	0.64	0.63	0.50	0.25
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.03
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.04	0.06
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.36	0.22	0.43	0.26	0.38	0.22	0.47	0.37	0.46	0.43	0.47	0.40	0.58	0.58	0.39	0.23
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.53	0.48	0.60	<b>0.52</b>	0.63	0.43	0.70	<b>0.73</b>	0.66	0.69	0.71	0.69	0.76	0.68	0.52	0.27
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.53</b>	0.75	0.50	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.72</b>	0.67	<b>0.32</b>

**Table 3: Close-set results on Event2012 and Event2018.**

Methods	Event2012		Event2018	
	AMI	ARI	AMI	ARI
BERT	0.43	0.12	0.34	0.05
SBERT	0.73	0.17	0.62	0.11
EventX	0.19	0.05	0.16	0.03
KPGNN	0.52	0.22	0.44	0.15
QSGNN	0.53	0.22	0.44	0.16
HISEvent	<b>0.81</b>	0.50	0.47	0.31
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.50	0.20	0.20	0.13
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.60	0.28	0.22	0.13
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.10	0.05	0.08	0.03
ADP-Spectral Clustering ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.09	0.04	0.08	0.02
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	0.51	0.41	0.20	0.14
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.65	0.49	0.25	0.15
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=None$ )	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.33</b>

**Baselines.** We select 8 baselines. **BERT** [5], and **SBERT** [36], which transform messages into message embeddings and then employ K-means clustering for social event detection, requiring the total number of events to be specified in advance; **EventX** [23], which utilizes community detection methods for unsupervised social event detection; **KPGNN** [3], a supervised GNN detection method; **QSGNN** [37], a supervised method based on pseudo labels, which performs well in open environments; **HISEvent** [4], which utilizes structural entropy for unsupervised clustering to achieve social event detection, is the current SOTA. Additionally,

**DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent**, a variant of our method, utilizes the Gaussian mechanism [25] for noise perturbation without employing a mixed sensitivity strategy; **ADP-Spectral Clustering**, running spectral clustering [43] directly on our published privacy graph. Our results are the average of 5 runs.

**Hyperparameters.** For ADP-SEMEvent, we set the  $\epsilon$  to three values: 10, 15, and None (indicating no privacy protection strategy). In open environments, the parameter  $q$  is set to 400, while in closed environments, it is set to 300, and the same applies to the HISEvent, DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent, and DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent. For KPGNN, QSGNN, and EventX, we adopt the settings reported in the original papers.

**Evaluation Metrics.** We measure adjusted mutual information (AMI) and adjusted rand index (ARI). Both metrics range from -1 to 1, where a value closer to 1 indicates better agreement between the predicted and true clustering.

## 4.2 Overall Performance (Q1)

Tables 1 and 2 present the evaluation results of Event2012 and Event2018 in an open environment, demonstrating the superior performance of ADP-SEMEvent. For instance, the results from Event2012 show that in most cases, when  $\epsilon = \text{None}$ , ADP-SEMEvent outperforms the current SOTA model HISEvent. Optimally, the ARI in  $M_9$  increases from 0.65 to 0.79, representing a 21.5% improvement. When  $\epsilon = 10$  or 15, compared to the privacy-preserving models DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent and ADP-Spectral Clustering, ADP-SEMEvent surpasses the baselines on all metrics. The comparison with DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent indicates that our adaptive differential privacy strategy

**Table 4: The results of attribute inference attack experiment.**

Methods	PERSON (SVM)		GPE (SVM)		PERSON (LR)		GPE (LR)		PERSON (MLP)		GPE (MLP)	
	F1	Precision	Accuracy	AUC	F1	Precision	Accuracy	AUC	F1	Precision	Accuracy	AUC
BERT	0.72	0.68	0.86	0.98	0.75	0.68	0.87	0.98	0.74	0.76	0.89	0.98
SBERT	0.71	0.78	0.76	0.96	0.68	0.70	0.83	0.97	0.73	0.69	0.81	0.97
HISEvent	0.42	0.40	0.34	0.36	0.41	0.40	0.32	0.58	0.29	0.56	0.31	0.56
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.34</b>	0.33	0.33	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.31</b>	0.50	0.25	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.21</b>	0.46
DP <sub>G</sub> -SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.39	0.39	0.30	<b>0.31</b>	0.38	0.40	0.33	0.52	<b>0.21</b>	0.51	0.22	0.51
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=10$ )	<b>0.33</b>	0.35	0.32	0.34	0.35	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.31</b>	0.49	<b>0.21</b>	0.46	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.45</b>
ADP-SEMEvent ( $\epsilon=15$ )	0.40	0.38	<b>0.29</b>	0.32	0.38	0.40	0.32	0.52	0.22	0.51	0.22	0.51

effectively controls noise, and the comparison with ADP-Spectral Clustering highlights that our Algorithm 2 can cluster private graphs more effectively, making it a more efficient unsupervised method. In summary, ADP-SEMEvent has three characteristics: 1) it does not require the specification of the total number of events, making it unsupervised; 2) it emphasizes privacy protection; 3) it exhibits excellent performance and robustness. No baseline simultaneously satisfies all of these criteria.


Table 3 shows the evaluation results for Event2012 and Event2018 in a closed environment. When  $\epsilon=$ None on large datasets, our ADP-SEMEvent achieves SOTA performance. Performance decreases for  $\epsilon=10$  and  $\epsilon=15$ , but it still outperforms DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent and ADP-Spectral Clustering. Test results for Event2012 indicate that ADP-SEMEvent remains competitive; however, the results for Event2018 show lower performance, possibly due to the closer proximity of local sensitivity and global sensitivity in the Event2018 dataset.

### 4.3 Security Analysis (Q2)

We conduct a security analysis for all models. For Eventx, KPGNN, and QSGNN, are supervised. Generally, machine learning models tend to exhibit memorization, enabling malicious attackers to leverage membership inference attacks to obtain data from the training set [40]. For ADP-SEMEvent and other baselines, unsupervised clustering methods are used, eliminating the need for training data. Consequently, the risk of membership inference attacks is greatly reduced. However, attackers can still design attribute inference attacks [13, 48] to deduce sensitive information about messages, such as relationships and locations.

To assess ADP-SEMEvent’s protection capabilities, we design attribute inference attack experiments, selecting \*Person\* and \*GPE\* (Geopolitical Entity) as the attack target. We manually select 535 pieces of data containing sensitive attributes from Event2012. To comprehensively assess security, we design binary and multi-class attack scenarios. Specifically, for \*Person\*, we only consider whether the data contains the \*Person\* attribute, making it a binary classification problem. We use F1 and precision as evaluation metrics. For \*GPE\*, which includes 8 categories, it is a multi-classification problem. We use accuracy and AUC as evaluation metrics. For BERT and SBERT, we directly use embeddings as features of the messages; for other models, we use a simple Node2Vec [14] model to obtain node embeddings from the graph; 30% of the data is used as the training set. We choose support vector product (SVM), logistic regression (LR), and multi-layer perceptron (MLP) as attack models

Our test results are shown in Table 4. Since BERT and SBERT directly convert messages into embeddings, sensitive information is

**Figure 4: Sensitivity analysis results of the model to privacy budget  $\epsilon$ .**

directly exposed in the embeddings, leading to the worst evaluation metrics. Although HISEvent’s probability of a successful attack is lower than that of directly using embeddings, its privacy protection capabilities remain limited due to a lack of further processing of sensitive information. For ADP-SEMEvent and DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent, the attack model’s effectiveness on these models is relatively low, indicating that the noise provided some degree of protection. However, ADP-SEMEvent outperforms DP<sub>G</sub>-SEMEvent in event detection tasks, demonstrating its higher application value.


### 4.4 Hyperparameter Sensitivity (Q3)

To validate the sensitivity of ADP-SEMEvent to the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  parameter, we conduct tests using Event2012 in an open environment. We incrementally increase the value of the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  from 1 to 10 with a step size of 1, then run the ADP-SEMEvent to observe its final performance. This test is essential as it provides a straightforward reflection of the relationship between the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  and the model performance, aiding algorithm users in balancing privacy protection levels with detection performance in practical applications. Our test results are illustrated in Figure 4. Analysis of the 4 cases indicates that the privacy budget  $\epsilon$  effectively controls the noise level. A smaller  $\epsilon$  adds more noise, resulting in lower data utility, while a larger  $\epsilon$  results in less noise and higher model performance.

### 4.5 Ablation Study (Q4)

We compare the model’s performance before and after optimization to validate the effectiveness of the 2D SE minimization algorithm





**Figure 5: Validity verification results of Optimized Hierarchical 2D SE Minimization. ( $\epsilon = \text{None}$ )**

based on optimal subgraphs. As illustrated in Figure 5, in most cases, the algorithm’s performance after optimization surpasses that of the unoptimized method. This demonstrates that a well-initialized partition aids the subsequent iterative process.

#### 4.6 Noise Analysis (Q5)

To verify the noise level control by the adaptive sensitivity strategy, we use sensitivity as an indicator of noise level, where a higher sensitivity indicates greater perturbation to the original data. We conduct statistical analyses of noise levels under different privacy budgets and across different datasets. The results are shown in Figure 6. We find that when the privacy budget  $\epsilon \geq 5$ , our mixed sensitivity begins to take effect, avoiding noise waste. In a continuous 21-day simulation, the mixed sensitivity can determine the most appropriate sensitivity based on the current day’s situation, balancing performance and privacy.


### 5 RELATED WORK

#### 5.1 Differential Privacy

Differential privacy was first introduced by Dwork et al. [6]. The most commonly used method of differentially private is the Laplace mechanism [9], which adds appropriate noise to meet  $\epsilon$ -DP by analyzing the global sensitivity of the query function. Subsequently, Dwork et al. [7] proposed approximate differential privacy, which relaxes the strict requirement of  $\epsilon$ -DP by using the Gaussian mechanism to add noise, improving the applicability. To address the challenge of computing global sensitivity, Dwork et al. [8] proposed the Propose-Test-Release framework, while Nissim et al. [31] introduced the smooth sensitivity and Sample and Aggregate frameworks. Nowadays, due to the growing problem of privacy data leakage, many scholars utilize differential privacy to protect data. For example, in private clustering [16, 17], private PageRank [10], private data release or synthesis [22, 38, 47], and application in recommender system [45], among others. However, existing DP methods do not effectively adapt to the addition of noise based on each day’s events.

#### 5.2 Social Event Detection

Existing research [4, 32, 34, 38] typically formalizes the task of social event detection as clustering relevant messages from social



**Figure 6: The results of the noise analysis. Above: The impact of privacy budget on noise (Tested on M16, Event2012). Below: The impact of blocks on noise (Privacy budget is set to 15).**

media sequences to represent events. We divide social event detection methods into three categories based on the model input, i.e., attribute-based, content-based, and Hybrid methods. 1) Attribute-based methods [15, 42] require predefined rules or patterns and then identify events by matching rules. Their drawback is the inability to capture complex event features accurately, and updating rules for newly emerged event types may be required, resulting in lower performance and robustness. 2) Content-based methods [41, 44] mostly rely on natural language processing to model and analyze content. Their detection performance heavily depends on content modeling. However, due to the complexity and variability of real-world content, methods relying solely on content modeling have not shown good robustness. 3) Hybrid methods [3, 20, 21, 32, 34, 37, 39] utilize GNNs for modeling, effectively combining content and attributes into heterogeneous graphs to achieve better performance. However, since GNNs contain rich node information, they may inevitably include sensitive data that attackers should not be able to access, making privacy protection crucial for the models.

### 6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we recognize the importance of privacy protection and have explored how to conduct social event detection under the requirements of privacy protection. We propose a novel unsupervised social event detection framework, ADP-SEMEvent, implementing adaptive privacy protection. The adaptive differentially private strategy we proposed maximizes the utilization of the privacy budget and achieves a good balance between privacy and accuracy. At the same time, the unsupervised approach eliminates the need to determine the number of events in advance, providing better robustness in real-world applications. Experiments show that ADP-SEMEvent can protect privacy while achieving satisfactory results. Since PLMs have a significant impact on both performance and privacy, we will explore efficient and private PLMs in future work.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China through grant 2023YFC3303800, NSFC through grant 62322202, Shijiazhuang Science and Technology Plan Project through grant 231130459A, and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation through grant 2023B1515120020.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hadi Amiri and Hal Daume III. 2016. Short text representation for detecting churn in microblogs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 30.
- [2] Tilman Beck, Ji-Ung Lee, Christina Viehmann, Marcus Maurer, Oliver Quiring, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Investigating label suggestions for opinion mining in German Covid-19 social media. (2021).
- [3] Yuwei Cao, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Yingdong Dou, Jianxin Li, and Philip S Yu. 2021. Knowledge-preserving incremental social event detection via heterogeneous gnn. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 3383–3395.
- [4] Yuwei Cao, Hao Peng, Zhengtao Yu, and S Yu Philip. 2024. Hierarchical and incremental structural entropy minimization for unsupervised social event detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 8255–8264.
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. 4171–4186.
- [6] Cynthia Dwork. 2006. Differential privacy. In *International colloquium on automata, languages, and programming*. Springer, 1–12.
- [7] Cynthia Dwork, Krishnamurthy Kenthapadi, Frank McSherry, Ilya Mironov, and Moni Naor. 2006. Our data, ourselves: Privacy via distributed noise generation. In *Advances in Cryptology-EUROCRYPT 2006: 24th Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, St. Petersburg, Russia, May 28–June 1, 2006. Proceedings 25*. Springer, 486–503.
- [8] Cynthia Dwork and Jing Lei. 2009. Differential privacy and robust statistics. In *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 371–380.
- [9] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. 2006. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4–7, 2006. Proceedings 3*. Springer, 265–284.
- [10] Alessandro Epasto, Vahab Mirrokni, Bryan Perozzi, Anton Tsitsulin, and Peilin Zhong. 2022. Differentially private graph learning via sensitivity-bounded personalized pagerank. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 22617–22627.
- [11] Wei Feng, Chao Zhang, Wei Zhang, Jiawei Han, Jianyong Wang, Charu Aggarwal, and Jianbin Huang. 2015. STREAMCUBE: Hierarchical spatio-temporal hashtag clustering for event exploration over the Twitter stream. In *2015 IEEE 31st international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 1561–1572.
- [12] Li Gao, Jia Wu, Zhi Qiao, Chuan Zhou, Hong Yang, and Yue Hu. 2016. Collaborative social group influence for event recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*. 1941–1944.
- [13] Neil Zhenqiang Gong and Bin Liu. 2018. Attribute inference attacks on online social networks. *ACM Transactions on Privacy and Security (TOPS)* 21, 1 (2018), 1–30.
- [14] Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. 2016. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 855–864.
- [15] Xiangyu Hu, Wanlun Ma, Chao Chen, Sheng Wen, Jun Zhang, Yang Xiang, and Gaolei Fei. 2022. Event detection in online social network: Methodologies, state-of-art, and evolution. *Computer Science Review* 46 (2022), 100500.
- [16] Zhiyi Huang and Jinyan Liu. 2018. Optimal differentially private algorithms for k-means clustering. In *Proceedings of the 37th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*. 395–408.
- [17] Jacob Imola, Alessandro Epasto, Mohammad Mahdian, Vincent Cohen-Addad, and Vahab Mirrokni. 2023. Differentially private hierarchical clustering with provable approximation guarantees. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 14353–14375.
- [18] Angsheng Li, Jiankou Li, and Yicheng Pan. 2015. Discovering natural communities in networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 436 (2015), 878–896.
- [19] Angsheng Li and Yicheng Pan. 2016. Structural information and dynamical complexity of networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 62, 6 (2016), 3290–3339.
- [20] Qian Li, Shu Guo, Jia Wu, Jianxin Li, Jiawei Sheng, Hao Peng, and Lihong Wang. 2023. Event extraction by associating event types and argument roles. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2023).
- [21] Qian Li, Jianxin Li, Lihong Wang, Cheng Ji, Yiming Hei, Jiawei Sheng, Qingyun Sun, Shan Xue, and Pengtao Xie. 2023. Type information utilized event detection via multi-channel gnn in electrical power systems. *ACM Transactions on the Web* 17, 3 (2023), 1–26.
- [22] Zening Li, Rong-Hua Li, Meihao Liao, Fusheng Jin, and Guoren Wang. 2023. Locally Differentially Private Graph Embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11060* (2023).
- [23] Bang Liu, Fred X Han, Di Niu, Linglong Kong, Kunfeng Lai, and Yu Xu. 2020. Story forest: Extracting events and telling stories from breaking news. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 14, 3 (2020), 1–28.
- [24] Chun-Yi Liu, Chuan Zhou, Jia Wu, Hongtao Xie, Yue Hu, and Li Guo. 2017. CPMF: A collective pairwise matrix factorization model for upcoming event recommendation. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 1532–1539.
- [25] Fang Liu. 2018. Generalized gaussian mechanism for differential privacy. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 31, 4 (2018), 747–756.
- [26] Zhiwei Liu, Yang Yang, Zi Huang, Fumin Shen, Dongxiang Zhang, and Heng Tao Shen. 2017. Event early embedding: Predicting event volume dynamics at early stage. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 997–1000.
- [27] Béatrice Mazoyer, Julia Cagé, Nicolas Hervé, and Céline Hudelot. 2020. A french corpus for event detection on twitter. (2020).
- [28] Andrew J McMinn, Yashar Moshfeghi, and Joemon M Jose. 2013. Building a large-scale corpus for evaluating event detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 409–418.
- [29] Nikhil Mehta, María Leonor Pacheco, and Dan Goldwasser. 2022. Tackling fake news detection by continually improving social context representations using graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1363–1380.
- [30] Keval Morabia, Neti Lalita Bhanu Murthy, Aruna Malapati, and Surender Samant. 2019. SEDTWik: segmentation-based event detection from tweets using Wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*. 77–85.
- [31] Kobbi Nissim, Sofya Raskhodnikova, and Adam Smith. 2007. Smooth sensitivity and sampling in private data analysis. In *Proceedings of the thirty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. 75–84.
- [32] Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Qiran Gong, Yangqiu Song, Yuanxing Ning, Kunfeng Lai, and Philip S Yu. 2019. Fine-grained event categorization with heterogeneous graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 3238–3245.
- [33] Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Yangqiu Song, Renyu Yang, Rajiv Ranjan, Philip S Yu, and Lifang He. 2021. Streaming social event detection and evolution discovery in heterogeneous information networks. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 15, 5 (2021), 1–33.
- [34] Hao Peng, Ruitong Zhang, Shaoning Li, Yuwei Cao, Shirui Pan, and S Yu Philip. 2022. Reinforced, incremental and cross-lingual event detection from social messages. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45, 1 (2022), 980–998.
- [35] Daniela Pohl, Abdelhamid Bouchachia, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2015. Social media for crisis management: clustering approaches for sub-event detection. *Multimedia tools and applications* 74 (2015), 3901–3932.
- [36] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 3982–3992.
- [37] Jiaqian Ren, Lei Jiang, Hao Peng, Yuwei Cao, Jia Wu, Philip S Yu, and Lifang He. 2022. From known to unknown: quality-aware self-improving graph neural network for open set social event detection. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 1696–1705.
- [38] Jiaqian Ren, Lei Jiang, Hao Peng, Lingjuan Lyu, Zhiwei Liu, Chaochao Chen, Jia Wu, Xu Bai, and Philip S Yu. 2022. Cross-network social user embedding with hybrid differential privacy guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 1685–1695.
- [39] Jiaqian Ren, Hao Peng, Lei Jiang, Jia Wu, Yongxin Tong, Lihong Wang, Xu Bai, Bo Wang, and Qiang Yang. 2021. Transferring knowledge distillation for multilingual social event detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03084* (2021).
- [40] Ahmed Salem, Yang Zhang, Mathias Humbert, Pascal Berrang, Mario Fritz, and Michael Backes. 2018. ML-leaks: Model and data independent membership inference attacks and defenses on machine learning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01246* (2018).
- [41] Samir Elloumi Sihem Sahnoun and Sadok Ben Yahia. 2020. Event detection based on open information extraction and ontology. *Journal of Information and Telecommunication* 4, 3 (2020), 383–403. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24751839.2020.1763007>
- [42] Tajinder Singh and Madhu Kumari. 2021. Burst: real-time events burst detection in social text stream. *The Journal of Supercomputing* 77, 10 (2021), 11228–11256.
- [43] Ulrike Von Luxburg. 2007. A tutorial on spectral clustering. *Statistics and computing* 17 (2007), 395–416.
- [44] Zhongqing Wang and Yue Zhang. 2017. A Neural Model for Joint Event Detection and Summarization. In *IJCAI*. 4158–4164.
- [45] Yuecen Wei, Xingcheng Fu, Qingyun Sun, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Jinyan Wang, and Xianxian Li. 2022. Heterogeneous graph neural network for privacy-preserving recommendation. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 528–537.

- [46] Xiaohui Yan, Jiafeng Guo, Yanyan Lan, Jun Xu, and Xueqi Cheng. 2015. A probabilistic model for bursty topic discovery in microblogs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 29.
- [47] Quan Yuan, Zhikun Zhang, Linkang Du, Min Chen, Peng Cheng, and Mingyang Sun. 2023. {PrivGraph}: Differentially Private Graph Data Publication by Exploiting Community Information. In *32nd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 23)*. 3241–3258.
- [48] Benjamin Zi Hao Zhao, Aviral Agrawal, Catisha Coburn, Hassan Jameel Asghar, Raghav Bhaskar, Mohamed Ali Kaafar, Darren Webb, and Peter Dickinson. 2021. On the (in) feasibility of attribute inference attacks on machine learning models. In *EuroS&P*. IEEE, 232–251.
- [49] Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Jiang, Jianshu Weng, Jing He, Ee-Peng Lim, Hongfei Yan, and Xiaoming Li. 2011. Comparing twitter and traditional media using topic models. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 33rd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2011, Dublin, Ireland, April 18-21, 2011. Proceedings 33*. Springer, 338–349.