

Interest Maximization in Social Networks

Rahul Kumar Gautam, Anjeneya Swami Kare, and S. Durga Bhavani

School of Computer and Information Sciences,
University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad, India

19mcpc06@uohyd.ac.in, askcs@uohyd.ac.in, sdbcs@uohyd.ac.in

Abstract. Nowadays, organizations use viral marketing strategies to promote their products through social networks. It is expensive to directly send the product promotional information to all the users in the network. In this context, Kempe et al. [10] introduced the Influence Maximization (IM) problem, which identifies k most influential nodes (spreader nodes), such that the maximum number of people in the network adopts the promotional message.

Many variants of the IM problem have been studied in the literature, namely, Perfect Evangelising Set (PES), Perfect Awareness Problem (PAP), etc. In this work, we propose a maximization version of PAP called the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem. Different people have different levels of interest in a particular product. This is modeled by assigning an interest value to each node in the network. Then, the problem is to select k initial spreaders such that the sum of the interest values of the people (nodes) who become aware of the message is maximized.

We study the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem under two popular diffusion models: the Linear Threshold Model (LTM) and the Independent Cascade Model (ICM). We show that the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem is NP-Hard under LTM. We give linear programming formulation for the problem under LTM. We propose four heuristic algorithms for the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem: Level Based Greedy Heuristic (LBGH), Maximum Degree First Heuristic (MDFH), Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (PBGH), and Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (MPBGH). Extensive experimentation has been carried out on many real-world benchmark data sets for both the diffusion models. The results show that among the proposed heuristics, MPBGH performs better in maximizing the interest value.

1 Introduction

Due to the increasing use of smartphones, people are connected to their friends, family, or customers through the internet. We call the network of people a social network (SN). People on social media look at the information sent by their friends and either use the information for their interest, forward it to their friends, or do both. In this way, the information propagates in the network. Social networks become very important for marketing, political campaigns, and promoting products through e-commerce platforms.

E-commerce business is growing very fast across the world in urban as well as rural areas [9]. Small businesses use social media to grow and compete by advertising their products on social media. Social media networks help companies to attract customers without much physical effort. When someone gets information from an important person, they start believing in the information and may forward the same to their friends. Hence, companies select a few highly influential people on social media to advertise their products. Identifying influential people in social networks is known as the Influence Maximization (IM) problem.

The diffusion model is the process by which information propagates in social networks. There are two fundamental diffusion models: the Linear Threshold Model (LTM) and the Independent Cascade Model (ICM). Kempe et al. [10] propose the Influence Maximization (IM) problem in social networks. The IM problem is also known as the Target Set Selection problem. Two versions of the IM problem exist under the LTM. Maximization version: The input for the IM problem is a graph G and a positive integer k . The objective is to find a set of at most k highly influential nodes $S \subseteq V$ that maximize the number of influenced nodes in the network. In the minimization variant, for a given graph G and a positive integer l where $l \leq |V|$, we need to find a seed set $S \subseteq V$ with minimum cardinality that influences at least l vertices.

Cordasco et al. [4] propose a variant of the minimization version of the IM problem under the LTM where $l = |V|$. The problem is the Perfect Evangelising Set (PES) in social networks. The PES problem has two thresholds for each vertex: influence threshold t_I and activation threshold t_A . The influence threshold is always less than or equal to the activation threshold. A vertex has three states: *non-aware*, *influenced*, and *activated (spreader)*. Initially, all the vertices of the graph are non-aware. We select some set of initial spreaders $S \subseteq V$, which are assumed to be active vertices. A vertex with sufficient active neighbors becomes influenced or activated when the vertex satisfies the respective influence or activation threshold. An influenced node is assumed to believe the information but does not forward the information. On the other hand, an activated node is an influenced node that forwards (spreads) the information to its neighbors. The objective is to find the minimum number of initial spreaders that influence all the nodes of the graph. Later, Cordasco et al. [5] present the Perfect Awareness Problem (PAP), which is a specialization of the PES problem where $t_I(v) = 1, \forall v \in V$. Here, as the influence threshold is 1, the influenced nodes are also termed as *aware* nodes.

We propose a maximization version of the PAP problem, which we call the *INTEREST MAXIMIZATION* problem. The motivation for the problem is that a small company, compared to a blue-chip company, can compete by giving discounts on products and providing quality and indigenous products but may not be able to advertise in a big way due to financial constraints. The idea for small firms is to try to target highly interested buyers while advertising the product. This strategy improves the chances of selling a product by companies at low resources.

Inputs for the *INTEREST MAXIMIZATION* problem are a graph $G(V, E, t, \eta)$ and a positive integer k denoting the size of the seed set, where V is the set of vertices, E the set of edges, $t : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the threshold function and $\eta : V \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is the interest function, and we know that a node having more interest value resists less in spreading of the information. Note that, like in PAP, this problem also has $t_I(u) = 1$ for all $u \in V$. The goal is to find a seed set of size at most k that maximizes the sum of interest values associated with all the influenced (aware) vertices. Throughout the paper, we use the words influenced and aware synonymously; activated and spreader are also synonymously used.

Initially, all the vertices of the graph G are in a non-aware state. A vertex changes its state from non-aware to aware or aware to the spreader in only one direction. A seed set $S \subseteq V$ is a set of initially activated vertices which are called the initial spreaders. The vertex $u \in S$ spreads information immediately to its neighbors. In the spreading process, a vertex $v \notin S$ can be a spreader with the condition $t(v) \leq |N(v) \cap S|$ where $N(v)$ is a set of neighbors of the vertex v . The spreading process stops when there is no change in the status of the number of aware/influenced nodes. The *INTEREST MAXIMIZATION* problem aims to find a set $S \subseteq V$ that maximizes the sum of the interest values of the influenced vertices.

In this paper, we first prove that under LTM, the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem is NP-Hard. We provide an LP formulation for INTEREST MAXIMIZATION under LTM. Further, four heuristic algorithms for INTEREST MAXIMIZATION are proposed. The proposed heuristics are tested on real-world benchmark data sets for both the diffusion models LTM and ICM.

The paper is organized as follows: The recent studies on information spreading in social networks are discussed in Section 2. The problem definition, NP-Hard reduction from max-coverage-problem to INTEREST MAXIMIZATION, and LP formulation for INTEREST MAXIMIZATION under the linear threshold model are discussed in Section 3. In Section 4, we propose heuristics: Level Based Greedy Heuristic, Maximum Degree First Heuristic, Profit Based Greedy Heuristic, and Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic. The heuristics are tested on real-world data sets. The analysis of the outcome of heuristics is discussed in Section 5. The paper is finalized with the conclusion in Section 6.

2 Related Work

Information spreading is a trending area for research in this digital world, where people are connected through social media. Kempe et al. [10] proposed Influence Maximization (IM) problem in social networks. Inputs for the IM problem are graph G and $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. The objective is to select a set of initial spreaders $S \subseteq V(G)$ (seed set) of size k that maximizes influenced people in the network. Another variant of IM is to find the minimum size of the seed set that influences the whole graph. Kempe et al. [11] also propose a greedy algorithm with an approximation factor $(1 - 1/e - \epsilon)$ for Decreasing Cascade Model. Chen [3] shows the Target Set Selection problem is hard to approximate less than the poly-logarithmic factor. Cordasco et al. [4] propose Perfect Evangelising Set (PES) in social networks where each vertex changes its state among three states: non-influenced (non-aware), influenced, and spreader. We need to find the minimum size of the seed set that influences the whole graph under the Linear Threshold Model. A similar problem is the Perfect Awareness Problem [5] (PAP). The difference between PAP and PES is that an influenced node must have sufficient spreader neighbors in PES. On the other hand, an influenced node must have at least one spreader in the PAP problem. For the Perfect Awareness Problem, Cordasco et al. [5] propose an exact algorithm for trees and a heuristic for the general graphs. Recently, Pereira et al. [16] and Gautam et al. [7] proposed heuristics which improve results for general graphs. In the real-life scenario, the information originating from a vertex does not keep spreading continuously. The information may spread up to some hops from the source of the information. Recently, Qiang et al. [17] addressed this issue and introduced a variant of the Target Set Selection problem called target set selection in social networks with tiered influence and activation thresholds.

Opinion maximization is a variant of the IM problem. In the opinion maximization (OM) problem, initially, all vertices are inactive. The task is to pick highly influential people who maximize the sum of people's opinions [8]. The difference between OM and INTEREST MAXIMIZATION is that in OM, a vertex has two states, active and inactive, but in INTEREST MAXIMIZATION, a vertex has three states: non-aware, aware, and spreader. In the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION, the interest value of the vertices is part of the input, but opinion is calculated for each vertex. In other words, we can say that the interest values of the vertices are independent of each other. Alla and Kare [1] proposed heuristics for the OM problem based on centrality measures and clustering.

Some of the related problems to information spreading are Graph Burning [6], k -center [2], the Target Influence Maximization problem in competitive networks (TIMC) based on the Independent Cascade Model proposed by Liang et al. in [13], and Rumor Minimization [20]. Based on centrality

measures, Gautam et al. [6] propose three heuristics for the Graph Burning problem, and very recently, Nazeri et al. [14] give a genetic algorithm for Graph Burning based on centrality measure. In the k -center problem, we need to establish a k warehouses that minimize the maximum distance from people to warehouses. Rumor Minimization is just stopping rumors by spreading truths among rumor-adopted vertices in the networks.

We study INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem under Linear Threshold (LT) and Independent Cascade (IC) models. Under LTM, we prove that the problem is NP-Hard, and we provide a linear programming formulation for the problem. We propose four heuristics for the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem. The heuristics are tested on real-world datasets under the diffusion models LTM and ICM.

3 Interest Maximization

We study the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem for the diffusion models: Linear Threshold Model (LTM) and Independent Cascade Model (ICM). We show that the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem under the LTM is NP-Hard and propose the linear programming formulation. We propose four heuristics for the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem. The proposed heuristics are tested on real-world data sets for both the diffusion models LTM and ICM.

3.1 Interest Maximization under LTM

An LTM generally has the following parameters: A weighted directed graph $G = (V, E)$, vertex threshold values $0 \leq t(u) \leq 1$ for all $u \in V(G)$. In the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem under LTM, apart from the LTM parameters for each vertex, we have the interest value $\eta(u)$, where $0 < \eta(u) \leq 1$. The value $\eta(u)$ shows how much the vertex u is interested in the product's advertisement.

The diffusion process for the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION [5] under LTM is as follows:

1. Initially, all vertices are non-aware, i.e., the aware set $A = \phi$.
2. Select a set of vertices S as initial spreaders to start spreading the information.
3. A non-aware vertex gets aware when it is a neighbor of at least one spreader vertex. When a vertex gets aware, it is added to the aware set A .
4. A non-spreader vertex u becomes a spreader when it is a neighbor of at least $t_A(u)$ number of spreaders.
5. The diffusion process is repeated until no more vertices change their state from non-spreader to spreader.

The objective is to find a seed set S of size k that maximizes the sum of the interest values $I = \sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$ under the Linear Threshold Model, where A is the final set of aware (influenced) vertices for the seed set S .

3.1.1 Interest Maximization is NP-hard

We reduce the decision version of the Maximum Coverage Problem (MCP) to the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem. The decision version of the Maximum Coverage Problem is as follows:

Input: Universe of elements U , m subsets $S = \{S_1, S_2, S_3 \dots S_m\}$, and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
Question: Are there k subsets that cover at least l elements?

For a given instance of the Maximum Coverage Problem (MCP), we construct an instance of the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem as follows:

1. For each element $u_i \in U$, introduce a vertex labeled u_i .
2. For each subset S_i , introduce a vertex labeled S_i .
3. If $u_i \in S_j$ add an edge between the vertices labeled u_i and S_j .

Note that the constructed graph G' is bipartite. We set the influence and interest values of all the vertices of G' to one. The activation threshold is set as $t_A(u) = \deg(u)$ and $\eta(u) = 1$ for all $u \in V(G')$.

Lemma 1. *There exist k subsets that covers at least l elements if and only if there is a seed set of size k that influences at least $k + l$ vertices.*

Proof. In the forward direction, if there are k subsets that cover at least l elements, the vertices in G' corresponding to the selected k sets will be chosen as seed set in G' . As all these k vertices influence at least l vertices, we can say that a seed set of size k influences at least $k + l$ elements.

In the backward direction, suppose we have a seed set S containing elements of type S_i and u_i that influence at least $k + l$ vertices. But our goal is to obtain a seed set having vertices of only S_i type. Let the seed set S contain some vertices S_i from S and vertices u_i in U as shown in the Fig. 1. For example, seed set is $S = \{S_1, S_3, S_4, u_2, u_5\}$. A vertex $u_i \in S$ can be swapped with one of its neighbors which are of S_i type as shown in Fig. 1. So, all vertices u_i type can be swapped with neighboring S_j type vertices, and it does not affect the optimality of the solution because the graph is bipartite. The seed set S contains only the top vertices of the bipartite graph, as shown in Fig. 1, and influences at least $k + l$ vertices. So, the seed set S is the solution having k subsets that cover at least l elements.

3.1.2 LP-formulation

We propose the LP formulation of the INTEREST MAXIMIZATION problem under the linear threshold model. $G(V, E, t, \eta)$ is a given graph, where V denotes the set of vertices, E is the set of edges, $t(u)$ is the threshold value of vertex u , and $\eta(u)$ is the interest value of vertex u . For all $u \in V$, if u is influenced in at most r rounds, $I_{u,r} = 1$; otherwise, $I_{u,r} = 0$. Similarly, for all $u \in V$, if u becomes a spreader by r rounds, then $A_{u,r} = 1$; otherwise, $A_{u,r} = 0$.

$$\text{Objective : Maximize } \sum_{u \in V} I_{u,n} * \eta(u) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{subject to the constraints } \sum_{u \in V} A_{u,0} \leq k, \quad (2)$$

$$t(u) * A_{u,r} \leq \sum_{v \in N(u)} A_{v,r-1}, \quad \forall u \in V, r \in [1, n] \quad (3)$$

$$I_{v,n} \geq A_{u,n}, \quad \forall u \in V \text{ and } v \in N[u] \quad (4)$$

The objective is to maximize the objective function (1). Equation (2) forces to select at most k vertices as initial spreaders. As and when the vertex u has $t(u)$ number of spreader neighbors, Equation (3) forces $A_{u,r}$ to be 1, thus making u a spreader node in the r^{th} iteration where $r \in [1, n]$. If at least a neighbor of v is active till n rounds, then equation (4) forces the $I_{v,n} = 1$.




Fig. 1. The sets $S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5, S_6$, and S_m cover elements u_1, u_2, u_3, \dots and u_n . The figure shows that each set $S_j (1 \leq j \leq m)$ covers neighboring vertices (depicted by edges of the same color).

3.2 Interest Maximization under the ICM

We have a directed graph $G(V, E)$ with weights on edges and interest value $\eta(u)$ is associated with each node u . A vertex u activates vertex v with probability $p(u, v)$, where $p(u, v)$ is the weight on edge (u, v) . Once a vertex v becomes active (spreader), v can try to activate its neighbors once, and the spreader vertex does not change its state again.

The diffusion under ICM model is as follows:

- Initially, all vertices $u \in V$ are in an inactive state (non-spreader vertex).
- Select seed set $S \subseteq V$ of given size k and all the vertices in S are assumed to be in active state. Initialize the set of active vertices A as $A = S$.
- An active vertex u activates its out-neighbors v with probability $p(u, v)$. Once a vertex u changes the state from inactive to active, add u to A . A vertex can activate another vertex only once.
- The diffusion process stops when no more vertices change their state from inactive to active.

The objective is to find a seed set S of size k that maximizes the interest value $\sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$, where A is the set of final active vertices.

4 Proposed Heuristics

We discuss four heuristics in this Section. The level-based greedy and degree-based heuristics select initial spreaders based on the maximum number of neighbors and degrees, respectively. The rest of the heuristics select the spreader vertex with the highest profit iteratively. The heuristic algorithms are discussed below.




Fig. 2. Level-wise, select highly influenced vertices from the graph.

4.1 Level Based Greedy Heuristic (LBGH)

The Level Based Greedy Heuristic (LBGH) in turn calls three procedures: the LEVEL-BASED-INFLUENCE, SPREADER and DIFFUSION. LEVEL-BASED-INFLUENCE procedure (as shown in Algorithm 3) computes and returns a specific list L^* , which is a permutation of the vertex set $V(G)$. The permutation is generated by considering the degree and the interest values of the vertices as described below.

Let $L_0 = L[0, 1, 3 \cdots n/2]$ be the first half of the vertices of the list L , where L is the sorted list of the vertex set $V(G)$ in decreasing order of interest values. We consider L_0 to be core vertices that are at level zero. As shown in Fig. 3, we do a level order traversal of the graph G based on the distance of the vertices from level zero. For $1 \leq i \leq e(L_0)$, $L_i = N(L_i) \setminus \cup_{j=i-1}^{j=0} L_j$, where $N(L_i)$ is the set of the open neighborhood of the vertices in L_i and $e(L_0)$ is the maximum eccentricity of the vertices in the list L_0 . The leveling of the graph G continues till all the vertices of the graph G are covered. These levels of G are depicted in Fig. 2 as concentric circles with the innermost circle representing level L_1 and center with core vertices in list L_0 .

Now, we sort the list of L_i in decreasing order according to the degree of the vertices. For each index $j = 0, 1, 2, 3 \cdots$, we pick the vertices located at the index j of each list L_i , and these vertices are sorted in decreasing order of the degree and appended to the list L^* . The same process is repeated for each index $i = 1, 2, 3 \cdots$. As the lists may not be of $j + 1$ length, only if the vertex is available at an index j the vertex is picked. This process aims to give equal importance to high-degree vertices at each level.

The SPREADER function, as given in the Algorithm 2, takes as input an ordered list of vertices L^* and $G(V, E, \eta, t)$. A and S are the aware and seed sets, respectively. Initially, the seed set and aware set are empty. For each vertex $u \in L^*$, if DIFFUSION results in an increase in the number of influenced vertices with the seed set $S \cup \{u\}$, add u to S and decrease the number of required initial spreaders or seeds k by one. Otherwise, ignore vertex u . The SPREADER procedure returns a seed set S .

The DIFFUSION function, as given in the Algorithm 1 under LTM, returns a set of aware nodes A . The inputs for the DIFFUSION function are graph $G(V, E, \eta, t)$ and the seed set S . The DIFFUSION function diffuses the information using the LTM or ICM and returns the set of aware nodes.

Time Complexity Analysis: The diffusion function takes time $O(|V| + |E|)$, and the time complexity of sorting the vertices in decreasing order is $O(|V| \log(|V|))$. To find the eccentricity of the vertices in L_0 is computed in time at most $O(|V| + |E|)$ because we marge all vertices of L_0

into a single vertex and run a single breath first search. The leveling visits each vertex at once from the source vertices in L_0 . It is equivalent to running a breadth-first search algorithm. The rest of the algorithm sorts and prepares a list L^* which is at most $O(|V| + |E|)$. The spreader function prepares the seed set by calling the diffusion function at most $|V|$ times. So, the time complexity of the heuristic is $O(|V| * (|V| + |E|))$.




Fig. 3. The vertices at level-0 $L_0 = [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]$, at level-1 $L_1 = [8, 9, 10, 12]$, and at level-2 $L_2 = [11, 13, 14, 15]$.

4.2 Maximum Degree First Heuristic (MDFH)

A vertex having a higher degree can activate or influence more vertices. So, we sort the vertices in decreasing order of degree. Let the sorted array be L . Initially, all the vertices of the graph are non-aware. The aware set A and the seed set S are empty. For each vertex $u \in L$, if the DIFFUSION function influences more additional vertices with seed set $S \cup \{u\}$, then add u to S . Otherwise, ignore the vertex u . Once the size of the seed set reaches k , the process stops, and the set of influenced nodes A for seed set S is recorded. The Max-Degree First function returns $\sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$.

Time Complexity Analysis: The two major tasks of MDFH are sorting the vertices in decreasing order which takes $(O(|V| \log(|V|)))$ time and preparation of the seed set S takes $(O(|V| * (|V| + |E|)))$ time. So, the time complexity of the heuristic is $O(|V| * (|V| + |E|))$.

4.3 Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (PBGH)

In this approach, before selecting the seed node u , compute the profit of the vertex u . The procedure for computing the profit of the vertices is: $N[u]$ is the set of closed neighbors of the vertex u , and the profit is $\sum_{v \in N[u] \setminus A} \eta(v)$, where A is the current set of influence nodes. The non-activated vertex $v_p \in V$ with the maximum profit is added to the seed set S .

As given in the Algorithm 5, the input parameters are graph $G(V, E, \eta, t)$ and positive integer k . The objective is to select a k -size seed set S that maximizes the sum of interest of influenced

Algorithm 1: Diffusion Function under LTM.

Input : Graph $G(V, E, \eta, t)$ and Seed set S .

Output: The aware or influenced set A .

```
1 DIFFUSION( $G, S$ ) begin
2    $Q \leftarrow []$ 
3    $A \leftarrow \phi$ 
4   for  $v \in S$  do
5     append( $Q, v$ )
6   while empty( $Q$ ) = False do
7      $v = \text{removeFirst}(Q)$ 
8     for  $w \in N[v]$  do
9       //  $N[v]$  is the set of all neighbors of  $v$  including  $v$ .
10      if  $w \notin A$  then
11        append( $A, w$ )
12         $S' \leftarrow \{x | x \in N[w] \cap S\}$ 
13        if  $t(w) \leq |S'|$  and  $w \notin S$  then
14          append( $S, w$ )
15          //  $w$  becomes the spreader.
16          append( $Q, w$ )
17   return  $A$ 
```

Algorithm 2: Spreader function finds the seed set S .

Input : $G(V, E, \eta, t)$.

Output: The seed set S .

```
1 Spreader( $G, L, k$ ) begin
2    $S \leftarrow \phi$ 
3    $A \leftarrow \phi$ 
4    $A \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, S)$ 
5   for  $u \in L$  do
6     // DIFFUSION function returns the set of aware vertices  $A$  with the seed set
7     //  $S \cup \{u\}$ .
8      $A' \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, (S \cup \{u\}))$ 
9     if  $|A'| > |A|$  then
10      append( $S, u$ )
11       $A \leftarrow A'$ 
12       $k \leftarrow k - 1$ 
13   if  $k < 0$  then
14     return  $S$ 
```

Algorithm 3: Level-Based-Influence.

Input : Graph $G(V, E, \eta, t)$
Output: A list of vertices in decreasing order of influential strength.

```
1 LEVEL-BASED-INFLUENCE( $G$ ) begin
2    $L \leftarrow$  list of vertices of  $V(G)$  in decreasing order of interest values
3    $L_0 \leftarrow L[0, \dots, n/2]$ 
4    $L_1 \leftarrow L[n/2 + 1, \dots, n]$ 
5   for  $i = 1$  to  $e(L_0)$  do
6     //  $e(L_0)$  is the eccentricity of the vertices in  $L_0$  by merging all vertices
7     into the single vertex.
8      $L_i \leftarrow N(L_i) \setminus \bigcup_{l=i-1}^0 L_l$ 
9      $L_i \leftarrow \text{sort\_by\_degree\_dec}(G, L_i)$ 
10     $l \leftarrow \max(\{|L_i| : i \in [0, e(L_0)] \text{ and } i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\})$ 
11     $L^* \leftarrow []$ 
12    for  $j = 0$  to  $j = l - 1$  do
13       $temp \leftarrow \phi$ 
14      for  $i = 0$  to  $i = e(L_0)$  do
15        if  $j < |L_i|$  then
16           $temp \leftarrow temp \cup L_i[j]$ 
17       $temp \leftarrow \text{sort\_by\_degree\_dec}(G, temp)$ 
18      foreach  $u \in temp$  do
19         $L^*.append(u)$ 
20  return  $L^*$ 
```

Algorithm 4: Level Based Greedy Heuristic.

Input : $G(V, E, \eta, t)$, and the positive integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
Output: The sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices with seed set S .

```
1 Level-Based-Greedy( $G, k$ ) begin
2    $L^* \leftarrow$  LEVEL-BASED-INFLUENCE( $G$ )
3    $S \leftarrow$  SPREADER( $G, L^*$ )
4    $A \leftarrow$  DIFFUSION( $G, S$ )
5   return  $S, \sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$ 
```

vertices. Initially, all the vertices of graph G are in the non-aware state. The aware set A and the seed set S are empty. The algorithm iterates k times for finding k seeds. In each iteration, the profit on each vertex u is calculated as $p(u) = \sum_{v \in N[u] \setminus A} \eta(v)$, where $p(u)$ is the profit on vertex u , and $N[u]$ is the set of closed neighbors of the vertex u . The maximum profitable vertex is selected as the seed node and added to the seed set S . The DIFFUSION function diffuses the information with the seed set S and appends all the influenced or aware vertices to A . We repeat the above steps up to k times and find the seed set of size k . The Profit Based Greedy Heuristic returns the seed set as well as the sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices as $\sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$.

Time Complexity Analysis: For each vertex $u \in V$, calculate the profit, find the maximum profitable vertex, and run diffusion. The profit formula is $\forall u \in V, p(u) = \sum_{v \in N(u) \setminus A} \eta(v)$. Profit calculation takes time at most $O(|V| * \Delta(G))$ time, where $\Delta(G)$ is the maximum degree of the graph G . These three tasks are completed in time $(|V| * \Delta(G))$, $(|V|)$, and $(|V| + |E|)$. The total time consumed by the algorithm is $O(|V| * (|V| + |E|))$.

Algorithm 5: Profit Based Greedy Heuristic

Input : $G(V, E, \eta, t)$ and positive integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
Output: The seed set S and the sum of interest of aware/influenced vertices.

```

1 PROFIT-BASED-GREEDY( $G, k$ ) begin
2    $S \leftarrow \phi$ 
3    $A \leftarrow \phi$ 
4   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
5      $A \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, S)$ 
6      $v_p \leftarrow -1$ 
7     for  $u \in V$  do
8       // DIFFUSION function returns set of aware vertices  $A$  with seed set  $S$ .
9        $p(u) \leftarrow \sum_{v \in N(u) \text{ and } v \notin A} \eta(v)$ 
10      if  $m > p(u)$  then
11         $v_p \leftarrow u$ 
12         $m \leftarrow p(u)$ 
13       $S \leftarrow S \cup \{v_p\}$ 
14    $A \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, S)$ 
15   return  $S, \sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$ 

```

4.4 Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (MPBGH)

As seen in the Algorithm 5, the highest profitable vertex is selected as a seed node in the Profit-Based Greedy Heuristic. The Profit-Based Greedy computes the incremental sum of interest in the neighborhood. The formula for the profit is $p(u) = \sum_{v \in N[u] \setminus A} \eta(v)$ in the Profit Based Greedy Heuristic. $p(u)$ is the profit up to one hop. But we know when the seed set S size is increased by adding a vertex u , the vertices that are more than one hop can be influenced. So, we extend the formula for the profit. For each $u \in V$, the DIFFUSION function is run with the seed set $S \cup \{u\}$ to obtain the set of influenced vertices A and $p(u) = \sum_{v \in A} \eta(v)$. The maximum profitable vertex u_p

is selected as the seed node and is added to S . The seed set S of size k is obtained by repeating the above process k times. The MAX-PROFIT-BASED procedure returns a seed set and $\sum_{v \in A} \eta(v)$.

Time Complexity Analysis: To select a seed vertex, the time taken by the MPBGH is $O(|V| * (|V| + |E|))$ and moreover for k seed vertices, the time complexity is $O(k * (|V| * (|V| + |E|)))$.

Algorithm 6: Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic

Input : $G(V, E, \eta, t)$ and positive inter k .
Output: The seed set S and the sum of interest of aware/influenced vertices.

```

1 MAX-PROFIT-BASED( $G, k$ ) begin
2    $S \leftarrow \phi$ 
3    $A \leftarrow \phi$ 
4   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
5      $v_p \leftarrow -1$ 
6      $m \leftarrow 0$ 
7     for  $u \in V$  do
8       // DIFFUSION function returns a set of aware vertices  $A$  by seed set  $S$ .
9        $A \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, S \cup \{u\})$ 
10       $p(u) \leftarrow \sum_{v \in A} \eta(v)$ 
11      if  $m < p(u)$  then
12         $v_p \leftarrow u$ 
13         $m \leftarrow p(u)$ 
14       $S \leftarrow S \cup \{v_p\}$ 
15   $A \leftarrow \text{DIFFUSION}(G, S)$ 
16  return  $S, \sum_{u \in A} \eta(u)$ 

```

5 Results and Discussion

We implement the Level Based Greedy Heuristic (LBGH), Maximum Degree First Heuristic (MDFH), Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (PBGH), and Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (MPBGH) in the programming language Python. The system specifications are Macbook Pro (2016) with 8GB RAM, 2.7Hz processor speed, and a hard disk space of 256GB. The datasets obtained from the different sources are power [15], BlogCatalog [18], CA-HepTh [19], facebook [12], CA-GrQc [19], and CA-HepPh [19]. We test all the heuristics on these data sets and tabulate the results.

The basic details of the data sets, along with their properties like the number of nodes, number of edges, density, average degree, and average clustering coefficient, are given in Table 1.

We run all our heuristic algorithms with the diffusion models LTM and ICM. The interest values η of the nodes of the graph are generated randomly in the range $(0, 1]$.

5.1 Interest Maximization under the Linear Threshold Model

The LTM is implemented with two thresholding mechanisms : (i) $t_A(u) = \lceil \text{deg}(u) * 0.5 \rceil$, and (ii) $t_A(u) = \lceil \text{deg}(u) * (1 - \eta(u)) \rceil$, where $\eta(u)$ is the interest value of u . The results of the proposed algorithms under (i) are compared with CBH [7] by adapting the heuristic CBH to INTEREST

Table 1. Data sets [15, 12, 18, 19] and their network properties.

| Network | Nodes | Edges | Density | Avg-Degree | Avg-CC |
|-------------|-------|--------|---------|------------|--------|
| power | 4941 | 6594 | 0.0005 | 2.66 | 0.08 |
| BlogCatalog | 10312 | 333983 | 0.0063 | 64.77 | 0.46 |
| CA-HepTh | 9877 | 25998 | 0.0005 | 5.26 | 0.47 |
| facebook | 4039 | 88234 | 0.0108 | 43.69 | 0.60 |
| CA-GrQc | 5242 | 14496 | 0.0011 | 5.53 | 0.53 |
| CA-HepPh | 12008 | 118521 | 0.0016 | 19.74 | 0.61 |

MAXIMIZATION problem, and the results are tabulated in Table 2 which are also plotted in Fig. 4. Similarly, the results of the proposed algorithms under mechanism (ii) are shown in the Table 3, which are plotted in Fig. 5.

The Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic (MPBGH) outperforms the remaining heuristics for all the real-world datasets. Note that MPBGH is computationally expensive. The other heuristic that competes well with MPBGH on all the data sets under both the threshold mechanisms is PBGH, as can be seen in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5. Note that PBGH is computationally much faster compared to MPBGH. For dense networks like BlogCatalog and Facebook, it can be seen that PBGH comes much closer in performance to MPBGH. For the three datasets CA-HepPh, CA-GrQc, CA-HepTh, the MPBGH and PBGH are giving almost similar performance. The node u selected by MPBGH has high diffusion strength, which may have a high-profit value. So u is also picked by PBGH. As PBGH is computationally much faster than MPBGH, this would turn out to be an advantage for PBGH. But MPBGH’s performance is better than PBGH for other datasets.

For the threshold mechanism (ii), in the case of BlogCatalog and Facebook networks, the entire vertex set is influenced by $k > 20$ for all heuristics. Hence, they produce the same interest value as seen in Table 3. Only in the case of Power data set, which has lower density and lower average degree, MPBGH outperforms all the other heuristics with a big gap in the interest value achieved as shown in Table 3 and PBGH does not compete well for datasets with the low average degree and density.

Fig. 5 gives the results obtained for LTM under the threshold mechanism (ii), in which, the threshold values are derived from the interest values of the vertices that influence or affect the propagation of the information in the networks. For all the networks, MPBGH outperforms all the other heuristics. MPBGH selects a seed vertex based on the diffusion strength of the vertex. Hence, heuristic benefits from highly interested nodes located at more than one hop from the selected seed vertices. All the heuristics PBGH, CBH [7], MDFH, and LBGH work well for the graphs with high average degree like BlogCatalog and facebook.

5.2 Interest Maximization under the Independent Cascade Model

The ICM is implemented with two different settings: (i) $p(u, v) = 0.5$, and (ii) $p(u, v) = 0.5 * \eta(u)$. As ICM is a probabilistic model, the heuristics are run ten times, and the average results are tabulated.

Table 2. The sum of interest values associated with influenced vertices with mechanism $t_A(u) = \lceil deg(u) * 0.5 \rceil$ (setting (i)) under the LTM model.

| Dataset | ALGO | Seed Set Size 10 – 100 | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| BlogCatalog | CBH [7] | 4358.3 | 4734.6 | 4852.0 | 4900.9 | 4961.6 | 5010.5 | 5029.5 | 5041.7 | 5071.9 | 5081.8 |
| | LBGH | 4058.0 | 4523.7 | 4715.5 | 4773.2 | 4849.0 | 4899.1 | 4919.5 | 4935.9 | 5020.4 | 5035.1 |
| | MDFH | 4288.3 | 4666.6 | 4769.1 | 4811.2 | 4848.7 | 4881.8 | 4921.3 | 5008.3 | 5024.2 | 5035.0 |
| | PBGH | 4356.4 | 4774.8 | 4923.7 | 4995.1 | 5034.5 | 5065.0 | 5086.1 | 5103.7 | 5119.1 | 5132.3 |
| | MPBGH | 4356.4 | 4774.8 | 4923.7 | 4995.1 | 5034.8 | 5065.0 | 5086.6 | 5104.7 | 5119.7 | 5132.7 |
| CA-GrQc | CBH [7] | 183.8 | 306.4 | 406.6 | 500.5 | 577.3 | 636.9 | 687.0 | 743.6 | 795.3 | 848.6 |
| | LBGH | 89.5 | 178.1 | 265.6 | 343.8 | 433.8 | 501.4 | 571.7 | 637.1 | 687.2 | 737.2 |
| | MDFH | 105.8 | 156.0 | 240.7 | 309.5 | 409.8 | 504.9 | 567.3 | 654.0 | 737.1 | 788.5 |
| | PBGH | 221.3 | 363.0 | 482.2 | 582.0 | 669.1 | 745.6 | 816.8 | 881.5 | 945.3 | 999.0 |
| | MPBGH | 222.0 | 366.9 | 483.4 | 585.8 | 674.6 | 754.2 | 826.8 | 893.5 | 954.8 | 1012.6 |
| CA-HepPh | CBH [7] | 599.6 | 938.1 | 1172.0 | 1330.4 | 1457.7 | 1605.1 | 1728.0 | 1804.8 | 1884.5 | 1952.7 |
| | LBGH | 536.4 | 681.6 | 781.6 | 859.0 | 903.2 | 947.8 | 1011.7 | 1096.3 | 1175.4 | 1198.8 |
| | MDFH | 499.7 | 633.0 | 730.5 | 789.4 | 835.0 | 883.8 | 925.1 | 941.5 | 970.2 | 1036.4 |
| | PBGH | 815.2 | 1147.2 | 1404.8 | 1604.3 | 1772.1 | 1922.1 | 2051.5 | 2168.1 | 2279.8 | 2381.3 |
| | MPBGH | 815.6 | 1147.2 | 1404.8 | 1605.5 | 1775.3 | 1922.3 | 2054.6 | 2173.2 | 2283.9 | 2387.3 |
| CA-HepTh | CBH [7] | 224.1 | 373.4 | 515.3 | 627.3 | 732.7 | 817.5 | 898.9 | 975.4 | 1061.7 | 1136.6 |
| | LBGH | 217.9 | 361.1 | 480.1 | 575.3 | 663.2 | 755.7 | 827.2 | 879.0 | 920.2 | 956.7 |
| | MDFH | 233.6 | 364.3 | 465.0 | 566.1 | 676.0 | 735.0 | 828.3 | 872.9 | 931.3 | 993.4 |
| | PBGH | 257.5 | 434.0 | 578.3 | 709.4 | 824.4 | 933.2 | 1035.1 | 1129.5 | 1220.6 | 1306.2 |
| | MPBGH | 257.5 | 436.7 | 582.2 | 709.4 | 826.1 | 935.8 | 1039.3 | 1137.0 | 1229.1 | 1315.2 |
| facebook | CBH [7] | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | LBGH | 1883.3 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | MDFH | 1938.2 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | PBGH | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | MPBGH | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| power | CBH [7] | 90.5 | 158.8 | 223.4 | 285.9 | 350.0 | 406.4 | 470.9 | 523.4 | 569.5 | 612.5 |
| | LBGH | 84.3 | 155.8 | 209.1 | 260.6 | 304.7 | 353.5 | 413.7 | 462.2 | 505.7 | 552.8 |
| | MDFH | 96.5 | 160.0 | 229.3 | 291.4 | 342.9 | 395.5 | 451.2 | 505.2 | 538.2 | 606.5 |
| | PBGH | 106.3 | 182.0 | 247.1 | 325.9 | 387.4 | 449.4 | 503.6 | 557.3 | 608.8 | 663.4 |
| | MPBGH | 122.4 | 220.7 | 307.3 | 384.9 | 465.5 | 542.1 | 614.5 | 687.9 | 761.3 | 825.6 |




Fig. 4. The sum of interest values associated with influenced vertices with mechanism $t_A(u) = \lceil \deg(u) * 0.5 \rceil$ (setting (i)) under the LTM model.

Table 3. The sum of interest values associated with influenced vertices with mechanism $t_A(u) = \lceil \deg(u) * (1 - \eta(u)) \rceil$ (setting (ii)) under the LTM model.

| Name | ALGO | Seed Set Size 10 – 100 | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| BlogCatalog | CBH [7] | 5175.3 | 5189.8 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 |
| | LBGH | 5175.8 | 5192.1 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 |
| | MDFH | 5175.2 | 5190.4 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 |
| | PBGH | 5184.0 | 5191.8 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 |
| | MPBGH | 5184.3 | 5192.9 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 | 5193.7 |
| CA-GrQc | CBH [7] | 409.8 | 695.6 | 822.7 | 923.3 | 985.5 | 1033.2 | 1093.9 | 1165.4 | 1226.8 | 1274.0 |
| | LBGH | 353.7 | 629.4 | 770.0 | 860.3 | 929.7 | 992.2 | 1039.3 | 1101.7 | 1134.6 | 1183.1 |
| | MDFH | 289.2 | 563.1 | 770.2 | 936.8 | 1023.3 | 1091.1 | 1164.0 | 1232.2 | 1282.4 | 1323.9 |
| | PBGH | 479.4 | 806.7 | 922.7 | 1021.7 | 1119.0 | 1197.5 | 1260.4 | 1313.5 | 1372.6 | 1428.2 |
| | MPBGH | 641.8 | 863.0 | 1013.5 | 1119.9 | 1212.2 | 1291.4 | 1360.5 | 1423.5 | 1479.9 | 1531.7 |
| CA-HepPh | CBH [7] | 2361.5 | 2963.1 | 3281.7 | 3448.9 | 3697.0 | 3893.7 | 3960.5 | 4080.2 | 4158.2 | 4257.1 |
| | LBGH | 2753.6 | 3044.4 | 3245.9 | 3370.0 | 3491.2 | 3694.3 | 3838.4 | 3894.9 | 3949.9 | 4013.3 |
| | MDFH | 2692.1 | 2855.4 | 3229.2 | 3325.4 | 3438.7 | 3506.7 | 3661.1 | 3772.2 | 3922.8 | 4067.5 |
| | PBGH | 2547.1 | 2812.2 | 3325.6 | 3462.0 | 3624.0 | 3752.2 | 3860.2 | 3950.3 | 4072.9 | 4130.1 |
| | MPBGH | 3225.9 | 3500.7 | 3685.5 | 3834.4 | 3966.1 | 4108.7 | 4216.0 | 4314.0 | 4409.2 | 4493.1 |
| CA-HepTh | CBH [7] | 723.1 | 1143.7 | 1351.7 | 1491.7 | 1601.6 | 1826.2 | 1944.1 | 2078.4 | 2158.9 | 2229.3 |
| | LBGH | 685.3 | 932.3 | 1214.0 | 1366.3 | 1635.3 | 1764.1 | 1854.6 | 1922.0 | 2000.1 | 2144.6 |
| | MDFH | 772.6 | 1086.3 | 1205.8 | 1510.9 | 1702.5 | 1819.4 | 1891.0 | 1953.9 | 2041.3 | 2136.8 |
| | PBGH | 776.7 | 1058.2 | 1323.7 | 1512.5 | 1714.8 | 1858.8 | 1981.3 | 2090.3 | 2184.7 | 2341.4 |
| | MPBGH | 943.0 | 1349.8 | 1638.3 | 1843.2 | 2001.5 | 2139.1 | 2267.5 | 2388.7 | 2498.5 | 2593.4 |
| facebook | CBH [7] | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | LBGH | 1938.8 | 1985.9 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | MDFH | 1939.3 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | PBGH | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | MPBGH | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| power | CBH [7] | 97.0 | 169.1 | 250.4 | 320.1 | 393.3 | 463.4 | 537.0 | 604.3 | 656.0 | 697.1 |
| | LBGH | 102.5 | 187.6 | 244.0 | 315.3 | 372.1 | 423.3 | 500.6 | 571.6 | 623.6 | 663.2 |
| | MDFH | 119.5 | 199.3 | 292.9 | 359.7 | 407.6 | 453.9 | 521.4 | 583.0 | 648.9 | 712.5 |
| | PBGH | 126.3 | 246.1 | 342.1 | 443.5 | 532.7 | 612.2 | 693.1 | 759.3 | 830.7 | 896.4 |
| | MPBGH | 189.5 | 336.4 | 459.5 | 570.8 | 671.4 | 761.2 | 847.3 | 927.9 | 1003.7 | 1072.9 |




Fig. 5. The sum of interest values associated with influenced vertices with mechanism $t_A(u) = \lceil deg(u) * (1 - \eta(u)) \rceil$ (setting (ii)) under the LTM model.

The results of the proposed algorithms under (i) are shown in Table 4, which are plotted in the Fig. 6. Similarly, the results under setting (ii) are depicted on Table 5, which are plotted in the Fig. 7.

For datasets like BlogCatalog and facebook which are dense and have higher average degrees, the MPBGH outperforms the other heuristics. Additionally, for sparse graphs like power, the gap between MPBGH and others increases with seed size until convergence. The PBGH is in second place after MPBGH, but PBGH is faster than MPBGH from the running time perspective.

Under mechanism (ii), the activation probability $p(u, v) = 0.5 * \eta(u)$ is in the range $(0, 0.5]$; So, the information diffusion or the interest value achieved after diffusion is less than the first setting. In this case, also, MPBGH outperforms all the other heuristics.

Table 4. The sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices under the ICM where the weight on each edge is considered 0.5.

| Name | ALGO | Seed Set Size 10 – 100 | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| BlogCatalog | LBGH | 5025.6 | 5028.4 | 5031.1 | 5034.2 | 5037.3 | 5040.0 | 5043.2 | 5045.6 | 5047.8 | 5049.4 |
| | MDFH | 5030.8 | 5037.4 | 5041.4 | 5045.7 | 5050.5 | 5054.8 | 5060.0 | 5065.9 | 5071.1 | 5076.0 |
| | PBGH | 5039.9 | 5049.3 | 5058.4 | 5067.3 | 5075.9 | 5084.3 | 5092.2 | 5100.0 | 5107.5 | 5114.8 |
| | MPBGH | 5068.7 | 5077.9 | 5086.7 | 5095.2 | 5103.3 | 5111.1 | 5118.6 | 5125.8 | 5132.8 | 5139.3 |
| CA-GrQc | LBGH | 1550.9 | 1576.2 | 1605.0 | 1623.0 | 1644.4 | 1659.7 | 1684.4 | 1701.9 | 1718.2 | 1736.2 |
| | MDFH | 1559.7 | 1595.4 | 1615.6 | 1637.1 | 1656.9 | 1677.4 | 1693.8 | 1704.4 | 1717.1 | 1737.0 |
| | PBGH | 1569.7 | 1603.3 | 1629.1 | 1647.2 | 1667.2 | 1691.0 | 1710.2 | 1732.4 | 1749.5 | 1766.7 |
| | MPBGH | 1647.0 | 1687.3 | 1723.0 | 1755.0 | 1784.5 | 1811.9 | 1837.7 | 1861.9 | 1884.6 | 1906.0 |
| CA-HepPh | LBGH | 4791.6 | 4803.4 | 4808.3 | 4818.7 | 4825.0 | 4835.4 | 4842.0 | 4844.7 | 4855.2 | 4866.8 |
| | MDFH | 4825.0 | 4846.1 | 4864.2 | 4877.4 | 4888.0 | 4909.7 | 4922.7 | 4932.7 | 4937.8 | 4957.2 |
| | PBGH | 4856.0 | 4889.2 | 4917.0 | 4937.1 | 4960.3 | 4980.8 | 4996.1 | 5013.9 | 5024.5 | 5036.5 |
| | MPBGH | 4917.5 | 4957.4 | 4991.7 | 5022.2 | 5050.6 | 5076.6 | 5100.0 | 5121.7 | 5141.9 | 5160.9 |
| CA-HepTh | LBGH | 3261.0 | 3276.1 | 3304.4 | 3313.0 | 3328.2 | 3336.1 | 3349.8 | 3357.6 | 3366.0 | 3372.5 |
| | MDFH | 3300.7 | 3324.7 | 3345.1 | 3369.1 | 3393.0 | 3405.7 | 3422.1 | 3442.6 | 3457.0 | 3466.0 |
| | PBGH | 3278.8 | 3316.8 | 3348.9 | 3377.3 | 3406.3 | 3431.0 | 3454.7 | 3477.5 | 3494.7 | 3509.9 |
| | MPBGH | 3412.8 | 3459.4 | 3500.5 | 3537.3 | 3570.5 | 3600.4 | 3628.7 | 3655.2 | 3680.0 | 3703.4 |
| facebook | LBGH | 1944.3 | 1946.4 | 1949.1 | 1950.9 | 1952.7 | 1955.8 | 1960.8 | 1969.4 | 1977.0 | 1984.8 |
| | MDFH | 1943.8 | 1949.4 | 1954.7 | 1959.2 | 1963.7 | 1971.3 | 1977.3 | 1981.9 | 1986.6 | 1987.5 |
| | PBGH | 1956.5 | 1964.7 | 1971.5 | 1976.7 | 1981.1 | 1984.1 | 1986.2 | 1987.3 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| | MPBGH | 1967.6 | 1974.8 | 1980.4 | 1984.3 | 1986.6 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 | 1987.5 |
| power | LBGH | 588.8 | 690.9 | 776.5 | 810.2 | 846.6 | 899.9 | 918.0 | 945.4 | 960.5 | 990.5 |
| | MDFH | 549.7 | 664.1 | 758.9 | 833.7 | 896.7 | 948.6 | 982.1 | 1020.1 | 1052.8 | 1070.4 |
| | PBGH | 538.9 | 648.3 | 749.2 | 910.9 | 962.2 | 1015.7 | 1053.6 | 1094.0 | 1121.9 | 1155.3 |
| | MPBGH | 955.9 | 1176.3 | 1308.0 | 1406.9 | 1484.6 | 1547.4 | 1606.2 | 1651.7 | 1695.7 | 1733.7 |




Fig. 6. The sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices under the ICM setting (i)

Table 5. The sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices under the ICM where the weight on each edge is considered $p(u, v) = 0.5 * \eta(u)$ (setting (ii)).

| Name | ALGO | Seed Set Size 10 – 100 | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |
| BlogCatalog | LBGH | 4707.8 | 4710.5 | 4713.1 | 4715.1 | 4718.1 | 4721.0 | 4722.6 | 4725.3 | 4726.8 | 4729.3 |
| | MDFH | 4727.5 | 4733.1 | 4738.9 | 4745.1 | 4751.9 | 4756.6 | 4762.4 | 4768.3 | 4774.9 | 4779.9 |
| | PBGH | 4716.8 | 4726.7 | 4736.6 | 4746.3 | 4755.9 | 4765.4 | 4774.8 | 4784.2 | 4793.4 | 4802.6 |
| | MPBGH | 4783.7 | 4793.7 | 4803.4 | 4813.1 | 4822.6 | 4831.9 | 4841.2 | 4850.5 | 4859.6 | 4868.6 |
| CA-GrQc | LBGH | 864.3 | 920.8 | 945.6 | 962.3 | 985.7 | 1003.0 | 1028.7 | 1051.9 | 1071.2 | 1094.8 |
| | MDFH | 870.3 | 894.9 | 912.7 | 934.3 | 960.9 | 972.0 | 989.2 | 997.7 | 1009.1 | 1025.1 |
| | PBGH | 866.0 | 915.1 | 948.4 | 968.8 | 1000.7 | 1020.2 | 1033.4 | 1054.5 | 1073.5 | 1085.6 |
| | MPBGH | 1020.5 | 1085.2 | 1135.8 | 1182.2 | 1224.5 | 1262.6 | 1298.3 | 1331.4 | 1363.4 | 1392.2 |
| CA-HepPh | LBGH | 3551.3 | 3553.3 | 3555.7 | 3574.8 | 3577.6 | 3586.7 | 3597.2 | 3603.8 | 3607.8 | 3611.9 |
| | MDFH | 3572.1 | 3580.8 | 3604.2 | 3634.7 | 3652.3 | 3659.2 | 3671.0 | 3676.8 | 3689.3 | 3700.3 |
| | PBGH | 3594.3 | 3619.9 | 3644.3 | 3672.0 | 3693.0 | 3713.3 | 3734.8 | 3754.4 | 3771.2 | 3792.9 |
| | MPBGH | 3725.0 | 3785.2 | 3838.9 | 3887.8 | 3931.8 | 3970.9 | 4008.2 | 4044.0 | 4077.4 | 4110.0 |
| CA-HepTh | LBGH | 1857.2 | 1861.9 | 1881.3 | 1886.7 | 1888.9 | 1894.9 | 1916.6 | 1922.5 | 1927.9 | 1935.8 |
| | MDFH | 1925.6 | 1955.8 | 1983.6 | 2030.3 | 2063.0 | 2087.3 | 2096.5 | 2113.0 | 2120.1 | 2131.7 |
| | PBGH | 1851.6 | 1877.5 | 1902.3 | 1936.2 | 1958.7 | 1978.9 | 2002.5 | 2031.0 | 2053.0 | 2079.5 |
| | MPBGH | 2101.2 | 2204.7 | 2268.9 | 2334.2 | 2388.9 | 2438.4 | 2485.4 | 2530.2 | 2570.1 | 2609.0 |
| facebook | LBGH | 1822.7 | 1834.3 | 1836.2 | 1837.9 | 1841.0 | 1843.6 | 1847.9 | 1850.4 | 1853.2 | 1855.5 |
| | MDFH | 1824.3 | 1831.3 | 1844.4 | 1853.3 | 1860.5 | 1868.8 | 1874.7 | 1879.5 | 1886.2 | 1891.6 |
| | PBGH | 1851.9 | 1860.7 | 1870.1 | 1875.6 | 1883.9 | 1891.2 | 1899.9 | 1907.5 | 1915.5 | 1922.6 |
| | MPBGH | 1874.6 | 1886.2 | 1895.7 | 1904.7 | 1913.2 | 1921.4 | 1928.9 | 1936.0 | 1942.7 | 1948.9 |
| power | LBGH | 35.4 | 38.4 | 42.2 | 57.8 | 84.8 | 88.2 | 92.7 | 104.9 | 109.1 | 115.2 |
| | MDFH | 50.9 | 91.4 | 120.6 | 136.0 | 160.4 | 174.4 | 199.9 | 228.8 | 256.6 | 279.4 |
| | PBGH | 32.5 | 72.8 | 102.7 | 132.1 | 161.2 | 181.1 | 214.4 | 249.2 | 274.4 | 288.7 |
| | MPBGH | 201.4 | 354.7 | 469.9 | 579.8 | 667.9 | 743.0 | 815.9 | 879.9 | 935.2 | 988.9 |




Fig. 7. The sum of interest value associated with influenced vertices under the ICM, setting (ii).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose the problem of INTEREST MAXIMIZATION on social networks. The impact of people's interest in information propagation is studied. Small firms or companies can reach their highly interested customers through social media. The chances of selling products of the company get higher than randomly introducing products to all. We know a small company can not influence all people on social networks or does not need to influence all due to a limited product supply. Therefore, in this problem, for the given seed set size, the target is to maximize the sum of interest of influenced people. NP-Hardness and LP-formulation are proposed for INTEREST MAXIMIZATION. From the experimental point of view, four heuristics (LBGH, MDFH, PBGH, MPBGH) are presented in the paper and tested on 6 data sets. We compare our heuristics to recent work [7] under LTM and ICM. The Maximum Profit Based Greedy Heuristic outperforms all datasets. For dense graphs, the performance of PBGH under LTM, which is computationally faster, is close to MPBGH.

References

1. Leela Srija Alla and Anjeneya Swami Kare. Opinion maximization in signed social networks using centrality measures and clustering techniques. In *Distributed Computing and Intelligent Technology: 19th International Conference, ICDCIT 2023, Bhubaneswar, India, January 18–22, 2023, Proceedings*, pages 125–140. Springer, 2023.
2. Binay Bhattacharya, Sandip Das, and Subhadeep Ranjan Dev. The weighted k-center problem in trees for fixed k. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 906:64–75, 2022. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2022.01.005>.
3. Ning Chen. On the approximability of influence in social networks. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 23(3):1400–1415, 2009.
4. Gennaro Cordasco, Luisa Gargano, Adele Anna Rescigno, and Ugo Vaccaro. Evangelism in social networks: Algorithms and complexity. *Networks*, 71(4):346–357, 2018.
5. Gennaro Cordasco, Luisa Gargano, and Adele A Rescigno. Active influence spreading in social networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 764:15–29, 2019.
6. Rahul Kumar Gautam, Anjeneya Swami Kare, and S. Durga Bhavani. Faster heuristics for graph burning. *Applied Intelligence*, pages 1–11, 2022.
7. Rahul Kumar Gautam, Anjeneya Swami Kare, and S. Durga Bhavani. Centrality measures based heuristics for perfect awareness problem in social networks. In Raghava Morusupalli, Teja Santosh Dandibhotla, Vani Vathsala Atluri, David Windridge, Pawan Lingras, and Venkateswara Rao Komati, editors, *Multi-disciplinary Trends in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 91–100, Cham, 2023. Springer Nature Switzerland.
8. Aristides Gionis, Evimaria Terzi, and Panayiotis Tsaparas. *Opinion maximization in social networks*, pages 387–395. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2013. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611972832.43.
9. Times Of India. For the first time, india has more rural net users than urban, 2020. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/india-business/for-the-first-time-india-has-more-rural-net-users-than-urban/articleshow/75566025.cms>.
10. David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 137–146, 2003.

11. David Kempe, Jon M Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks. In *ICALP*, volume 5, pages 1127–1138. Springer, 2005.
12. Jure Leskovec and Andrej Krevl. SNAP Datasets: Stanford large network dataset collection. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>, June 2014.
13. Ziwei Liang, Qiang He, Hongwei Du, and Wen Xu. Targeted influence maximization in competitive social networks. *Information Sciences*, 619:390–405, 2023.
14. Mahdi Nazeri, Ali Mollahosseini, and Iman Izadi. A centrality based genetic algorithm for the graph burning problem. *Applied Soft Computing*, 144:110493, 2023. ISSN 1568-4946. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2023.110493>.
15. Mark Newman. Network data. <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mejn/netdata/>, 2015.
16. Felipe de C Pereira, Pedro J de Rezende, and Cid C de Souza. Effective heuristics for the perfect awareness problem. *Procedia Computer Science*, 195:489–498, 2021.
17. Zhecheng Qiang, Eduardo L Pasiliao, and Qipeng P Zheng. Target set selection in social networks with tiered influence and activation thresholds. *Journal of combinatorial optimization*, 45:117, 2023. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10878-023-01023-8>.
18. Zafarani Reza and Liu Huan. Social computing data repository. <http://datasets.syr.edu/pages/datasets.html>, 2009.
19. Ryan A. Rossi and Nesreen K. Ahmed. The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization. In *AAAI*, 2015. <https://networkrepository.com>.
20. Lan Yang, Zhiwu Li, and Alessandro Giua. Containment of rumor spread in complex social networks. *Information Sciences*, 506:113–130, 2020.