

Sybil-Proof Mechanism for Information Propagation with Budgets

Junjie Zheng¹, Xu Ge¹, Bin Li², Dengji Zhao^{1*}

¹ShanghaiTech University

²Nanjing University of Science and Technology

{zhengjj, gexu, zhaodj}@shanghaitech.edu.cn, cs.libin@njust.edu.cn

Abstract

This paper examines the problem of distributing rewards on social networks to improve the efficiency of crowdsourcing tasks for sponsors. To complete the tasks efficiently, we aim to design reward mechanisms that incentivize early-joining agents to invite more participants to the tasks. Nonetheless, participants could potentially engage in strategic behaviors, e.g., not inviting others to the tasks, misreporting their capacity for the tasks, or creating fake identities (aka Sybil attacks), to maximize their own rewards. The focus of this study is to address the challenge outlined above by designing effective reward mechanisms. To this end, we propose a novel reward mechanism, called Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism (PRDM), for the general information propagation model with limited budgets. It is proved that the PRDM can not only incentivize all agents to contribute their full efforts to the tasks and share the task information to all their neighbors in the social networks, but can also prevent them from Sybil attacks.

1 Introduction

The widespread availability of mobile Internet devices has fostered greater interconnectedness among individuals via social networks and amplified the impact of information spread through social connections. In certain fields, including viral marketing [Leskovec *et al.*, 2006], crowdsourcing distribution [Singer and Mittal, 2011; Doan *et al.*, 2011], answer querying [Kleinberg and Raghavan, 2005], sponsors frequently incentivize participants with monetary rewards to gather as much data or sell as many products as possible. In 2005, Amazon launched a crowdsourcing platform called Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to gather data from non-professionals. On the MTurk platform, the sponsors can post tasks and rewards, and then the workers claim the tasks and receive payments accordingly based on the quantity and quality of their completed tasks. Many studies requiring extensive data started collecting data through MTurk [Sorokin and Forsyth, 2008]. One study in 2019 showed that more

than 250,000 people have completed at least one task on MTurk [Robinson *et al.*, 2019]. However, a large percentage of these workers are fixed, which is mainly because that inviting new people to join is not beneficial. Making existing workers invite more people to participate can significantly improve efficiency.

In this paper, we aim to adequately utilize people’s connections in the network to design a reward distribution mechanism [Zhang and Zhao, 2022]. This mechanism incentivizes agents to invite more people to participate by the reward distribution, which eventually improves the overall completion efficiency. The first difficulty is distributing the rewards within a constrained budget. The mechanism should motivate agents to spread the information in their social network as much as possible. In the DARPA network challenge [Pickard *et al.*, 2010; Tang *et al.*, 2011], the winning team from MIT used a pioneering mechanism to effectively motivate people to spread information and quickly found all ten red balloons. In multi-level marketing [Emek *et al.*, 2011a; Drucker and Fleischer, 2012], the seller expects to sell more products by attracting more people to purchase. In our problem setting, we also need to properly allocate the limited budget to participants.

Another difficulty is resolving Sybil attacks in social networks. A Sybil attack is when participants create multiple false identities to accomplish specific purposes. Sybil attacks are widespread and easily performed, affecting eventual results and harming others [Alothali *et al.*, 2018; Yu *et al.*, 2006; Zhang *et al.*, 2014]. Traditional defense approaches are mainly focused on the communication domain [Chen *et al.*, 2021; Jamshidi *et al.*, 2019; Zhang and Lee, 2019]. Scholars have extensively studied this phenomenon in various domains, such as the Vickrey-Clarke-Groves process in auction theory is vulnerable to Sybil attacks [Yokoo *et al.*, 2004], and Yokoo *et al.* [Yokoo *et al.*, 2001] developed a new protocol against false-name bids. In Bitcoin transactions, Babaioff *et al.* [Babaioff *et al.*, 2012] devised a scheme that rewards information propagation to prevent Sybil attacks to make more revenue. In crowdsourcing, individuals have different abilities, such as computing power, purchasing advertising, or providing data. Emek *et al.* [Emek *et al.*, 2011b] solved the problem of Sybil attacks in viral marketing by rewarding propagation behavior based on the size of a maximum perfect binary tree. We aim to use this authentic contribution information to

*Corresponding Author.

design an information propagation mechanism that defends against Sybil attacks.

In this paper, our mechanism drives improvements in the following dimensions.

- We propose a model that quantifies an agent’s contribution by introducing the concept of capacity. The model considers the general setting of Sybil attacks.
- We propose a novel natural mechanism to allocate rewards that maximize information propagation within a limited budget while resisting Sybil attacks.

Related work. With a fixed budget, Shi et al. [Shi et al., 2020] devised a mechanism that maximizes information propagation but is not resistant to Sybil attacks. Chen et al. [Chen and Li, 2021] designed a special scenario of a free market with lotteries, where participants have a strong incentive to maximize the diffusion of information, and false-name manipulations fail to yield excessive rewards. In the answer querying problem, Zhang et al. [Zhang et al., 2020] designed a mechanism that incentivizes the agents to propagate the requestor’s query information while making the Sybil attack unavailable for additional gain. However, their mechanism only solves the scene of a single problem query in a tree. Hong et al. [Chen et al., 2022] solved the problem of Sybil attacks in diffusion auctions by removing possible fake agents by graph-structured methods, providing a new approach to tackle similar issues.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the fundamental setup and definition of the model. Section 3 shows our mechanism and an example of running the mechanism. Section 4 shows the properties of our mechanism. In Section 5, we discuss these properties. In Section 6, we summarize our work and discuss possible future directions.

2 The Model

We consider the crowdsourcing problem powered by social networks, where a sponsor expects to leverage the social connections to recruit more participants (or agents) to some crowdsourcing task, e.g., data collecting. For convenience, we model the social connections of all agents as a directed graph $G = (V, E)$, where V represents the set of vertices and E denotes the edge set. Except for the sponsor s , the graph G consists of a set $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ of agents who can contribute to the task, i.e., $V = \{s\} \cup N$. For each agent $i \in N$, we denote by c_i the maximum contribution capacity (or simply, capacity) of i for the task, e.g., c_i can denote the affordable number of pictures that need to be labeled. For any two agents $i, j \in V$, there is an edge $(i, j) \in E$ if and only if agent i can invite agent j . Given an edge $(i, j) \in E$, we say j is a child of i and use n_i to denote the set of i ’s children in G . Without promotions, the sponsor can only recruit her direct children n_s to the task, and within such small number of participants the task may fail to be accomplished. To attract more agents, the sponsor plans to reward the participants to incentivize them to further spread the task information to their children, under a total budget of B , and the amount of each participant’s reward is determined by her reports, including her performance on the task and her diffusion efforts.

As usual, let $t_i = (n_i, c_i)$ be agent i ’s private type, where n_i denotes the set of her children and $c_i > 0$ is her capacity. In addition, denote by $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ the type profile of all agents, and \mathbf{t}_{-i} the type profile of all agents except agent i , i.e., $\mathbf{t} = (t_i, \mathbf{t}_{-i})$. For convenience’s sake, we use $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{P}(N) \times \mathbb{R}^+$ to denote the type space of agent i where $\mathcal{P}(N)$ is the power set of the set N , and $\mathcal{T} = \times \mathcal{T}_i$ to denote the space of all type profiles. As t_i is private information, agent i can cheat the sponsor to benefit herself. Let $t'_i = (n'_i, c'_i)$ be the type reported by agent i , i.e., i diffused information to n'_i and contributed c'_i to the task. Since agent i is unaware of other agents in the graph who are not her children and cannot contribute more than her capacity, we require that $n'_i \subseteq n_i$ and $c'_i \in (0, c_i]$. Similarly, let $\mathbf{t}' = (t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i})$ denote the report profile of all agents, where \mathbf{t}'_{-i} represents the report profile of all agents except agent i . Accordingly, we use $\mathcal{T}'_i = \mathcal{P}(n_i) \times (0, c_i]$ to denote the space of t'_i , $\mathcal{T}' = \times \mathcal{T}'_i$ the space of \mathbf{t}' , and $\mathcal{T}'_{-i} = \times_{j \neq i} \mathcal{T}'_j$ the space of \mathbf{t}'_{-i} .

Definition 1. Given a report profile \mathbf{t}' , we say agent i is active if there exists a sequence of agents $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$, where $i_1 \in n_s, i \in n_{i_k}$ and $i_j \in n_{i_{j-1}}$ holds for any $1 < j \leq k$.

That is, an agent is an active agent if there is a “diffusion path” from the sponsor to her. Note that only active agents are real participants of the crowdsourcing task. Based on the definition of active agents, we next introduce the concept of active network.

Definition 2. Given a report profile \mathbf{t}' , we use $G(\mathbf{t}') = (V(\mathbf{t}'), E(\mathbf{t}'))$ (or $G' = (V', E')$ for short) to denote the active network generated by \mathbf{t}' , where V' is the set of all active agents and $E' = \{(i, j) | (i \in V', j \in n'_i) \vee (i = s, j \in n_s)\}$.

The active network represents all agents that do participate in the task. Given any report profile \mathbf{t}' , the sponsor only need to reward agents in the active networks.

Definition 3. A reward distribution mechanism $M = (r_i)_{i \in N}$ on the social network consists of a set of reward functions, where $r_i : \mathcal{T}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the reward function for i and $r_i(\mathbf{t}') = 0$ for an inactive agent i .

Given any report profile $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathcal{T}'$, $r_i(\mathbf{t}')$ outputs the reward to i . If an agent is not in the active network, her reward is always zero as she does not participate in the task and contributes nothing. When \mathbf{t}' is clear from the context, we write as \mathbf{r} and r_i for short. In the following, we define some desirable properties that a reward mechanism should satisfy. First, the reward mechanism should be individually rational, which guarantees that each participant is willing to stay in the mechanism.

Definition 4. A reward distribution mechanism M is *individually rational (IR)* if $r_i(\mathbf{t}') \geq 0$ for all graph G , all $i \in N$ and all report profile $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathcal{T}'$.

If a reward mechanism is not individually rational, then in certain cases some participants will pay to the sponsor and the best reply is leaving the mechanism. Therefore, the individually rational property is also known as the participation constraint. Besides the IR property, the sponsor also expects an agent to authentically contribute all her abilities and invite all her children to the task.

Definition 5. A reward distribution mechanism M is **incentive compatible (IC)** if the following inequality

$$r_i(t_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \geq r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \quad (1)$$

holds for all graph G , all $i \in N$, all $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, all $t'_i \in \mathcal{T}'_i$ and all $\mathbf{t}'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$.

Incentive compatibility implies that diffusing the task information to all children and contributing all her efforts to the task is a dominant strategy for all agents. As the sponsor is endowed with a fixed budget, the total rewards to agents are limited.

Definition 6. A reward distribution mechanism M is **budget balanced (BB)** if

$$\sum_{i=1}^n r_i(\mathbf{t}') = B \quad (2)$$

for all graph G , all $i \in N$ and all report profile $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathcal{T}'$.

Definition 7. A reward distribution mechanism M is **asymptotically budget balanced (ABB)** if

$$\lim_{\sum_{i \in N} c'_i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in N} r_i(\mathbf{t}') = B \quad (3)$$

for all graph G , all $i \in N$ and all report profile $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathcal{T}'$.

The ABB property requires the sponsor's budget to be fully distributed to agents when the sum of all agents' contributions goes to infinity. If a reward mechanism is IR and IC, then agents are motivated to contribute all their capacities and propagate the task information to all their children. However, as the agents are individuals distributed in the network, they can easily create fake identities or even fake social networks to gain more reward. Such behaviors are called Sybil attack or false-name attack, and a good reward mechanism should prevent such kind of behavior. Next, we give a formal definition of Sybil attacks.

Definition 8. A **Sybil attack** of agent i is denoted by an attacking type report $a_i = (\nu_i, \tau_i) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, where $\nu_i = \{i, i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ is a set of fake identities and accordingly $\tau_i = \{t'_i, t'_{i_1}, \dots, t'_{i_m}\}$ are their reports, where

- $\sum_{j \in \nu_i} c'_j \leq c_i$;
- $n'_j \subseteq n_i \cup \nu_i$ for all $j \in \nu_i$.

In other words, agent i can create arbitrary number of fake identities and arbitrary social connections between these identities. Let us consider a special case of Sybil attack: all the fake nodes are invited by the inviters of node i .

Definition 9. A **parallel Sybil attack** of agent i is a special kind of Sybil attack, where $\nu_i = \{i, i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ is a set of fake identities invited by the parents of i .

A Parallel Sybil attack implies only fake in parallel, where the fake participants are all invited by at least one inviter of the agent committing the attack. With the definition of Sybil attacks, we intend to design reward mechanisms that can defend against Sybil attacks.

Definition 10. A reward distribution mechanism M is **Sybil-proof (SP)**, if the inequality

$$\sum_{j \in \nu_i} r_j(a_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \leq r_i(t_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \quad (4)$$

holds for all graph G , all $i \in N$, all $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, all $\mathbf{t}'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$ and $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$, where $(a_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) = (t'_i, t'_{i_1}, \dots, t'_{i_m}, \mathbf{t}'_{-i})$ is the report profile of all agents under Sybil attack a_i . The mechanism is **parallel Sybil-proof (PSP)** if the Sybil attacks satisfy the situation of parallel Sybil attacks.

The SP property may be too strong to be held, and we next introduce a mild condition for Sybil-proofness, called γ -SP.

Definition 11. A reward distribution mechanism M is **γ -Sybil-proof (γ -SP)**, if the inequality

$$\sum_{j \in \nu_i} r_j(a_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \leq \gamma r_i(t_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \quad (5)$$

holds for all graph $G = (V, E)$, all $i \in N$, all $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, all $\mathbf{t}'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$ and $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$.

In the following contents, we focus on designing reward mechanisms that satisfy IR, IC and other expected properties.

3 Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism

This section introduces a novel reward distribution mechanism called *Reward Distribution Mechanism (PRDM)*. PRDM starts by layering a given network and then determines the final rewards for each agent by the contribution phase and propagation phase.

The goal of all agents is to get more rewards except that the sponsor wants to maximize the information propagation instead of receiving a reward. Sponsor s will always diffuse the information to all the children. For a given report profile \mathbf{t}' , we generate the active network $G(\mathbf{t}') = (V(\mathbf{t}'), E(\mathbf{t}'))$. In G' , define the depth of agent i as the length of the shortest path from s to i , written as $dep(i)$. Therefore, different agents can be divided into different layers based on their depths, and define the k -th layer $l_k = \{i \in V' | dep(i) = k\}$ as the set of all agents with depth k .

Since we only allow information to be propagated from the previous layer to the next layer, for all $i \in l_k$, only the edges from agent i to the agents in the $(k+1)$ -th layer are retained. By the above processing, we construct a layered directed graph based on \mathbf{t}' . Figure 1 shows an example of how to get the corresponding layered graph from an active network. In the obtained layered graph, for any $i \in l_k$, define p_i as the set of all parents of i in $(k-1)$ -th layer.

PRDM is divided into a *contribution phase* and a *propagation phase*. In the contribution phase, the corresponding weight is determined by each agent's depth and contribution. In the propagation phase, the weight is redistributed according to agents' propagation and output agents' final reward. In PRDM, the parameter c_s is a virtual capacity of the sponsor, which is utilized to deliver the budget to the following layers. The parameter β measures what proportion of the rewards an agent gives her invitees. With the above definitions, the general procedure of PRDM is shown in Algorithm 1.




Figure 1: An example of transforming an active network (a) into a layered graph (b).

3.1 An Example of PRDM

In this subsection, we show an example of the mechanism in operation. An instance is shown in Figure 2 to give an illustration of PRDM. The sponsor transmits the information to the first layer $l_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$. After that, $l_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}$ and $l_3 = \{7, 8\}$. The invitation relationships among all the agents are presented in Figure 2(a).

Assuming a budget $B = 100$, we set $\beta = 0.2$ and $c_s = 20$, all agents report a contribution of 10. The process of distributing rewards using PRDM is as follows.

Contribution phase:

- **Step 1:** C'_1 is the total contribution of sponsor s and agents 1, 2, and 3. We can calculate $C'_1 = 20 + 3 * 10 = 50$ and the budget $B_1 = B = 100$, so that each of them has weight

$$w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = \frac{10}{50} * 100 = 20$$

- **Step 2:** Calculate the budget $B_2 = B_1 - w_1 - w_2 - w_3 = 40$ and $C'_2 = C'_1 + 3 * 10 = 80$. Then we obtain the weight of the agent 4, 5, and 6 as

$$w_4 = w_5 = w_6 = \frac{10}{80} * 40 = 5$$

- **Step 3:** Similarly, $B_3 = B_2 - w_4 - w_5 - w_6 = 25$, $C'_3 = C'_2 + 2 * 10 = 100$, so the weight of agents 7 and 8 is

$$w_7 = w_8 = \frac{10}{100} * 25 = 2.5$$

Propagation phase:

- **Step 4:** The initial reward for agents is the weight calculated in the contribution phase

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= r_2 = r_3 = 20; \\ r_4 &= r_5 = r_6 = (1 - \beta) * 5 = 4; \\ r_7 &= r_8 = (1 - \beta) * 2.5 = 2 \end{aligned}$$

- **Step 5:** Agent 4 and agent 5 transfer 0.2 of their weights to agent 1 respectively as rewards; agent 6 transfers $\frac{\beta}{2} =$

Algorithm 1: Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism

Input: A report profile \mathbf{t}' , a fixed budget B and parameters $c_s > 0$ and $\beta \in [0, 1/2]$

- 1 Construct the active network $G(\mathbf{t}') = (V(\mathbf{t}'), E(\mathbf{t}'))$;
- 2 Compute the depth of each agent who is on the graph $G(\mathbf{t}')$ to obtain the layer sets l_1, l_2, \dots, l_d ;
- 3 For $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$, let $C'_k = c_s + \sum_{i \in V(\mathbf{t}'), \text{dep}(i) \leq k} c'_i$ be the total contribution of s and layer l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k ;
- 4 **Contribution phase:** Initialize each agent's weight $w_i = 0$ for $i \in N$, and the initial budget of the first layer is $B_1 = B$;
- 5 **for** $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$ **do**
- 6 **for each agent** $i \in l_k$ **do**
- 7 $w_i = \frac{c'_i}{C'_k} B_k$;
- 8 $B_{k+1} = B_k - \sum_{i \in l_k} w_i$;
- 9 **Propagation phase:** Initialize each agent's reward $r_i = w_i$ for all $i \in l_1$, and $r_i = (1 - \beta)w_i$ for $i \in N \setminus l_1$;
- 10 **for** $k = 2, 3, \dots, d$ **do**
- 11 **for each agent** $i \in l_k$ **do**
- 12 **for each agent** $j \in p_i$ **do**
- 13 $r_j = r_j + \frac{c'_j}{\sum_{m \in p_i} c'_m} \beta w_i$;

Output: the reward vector $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{t}')$

$\frac{0.2}{2} = 0.1$ of her weights to agent 2 and agent 3

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow r_1 &= r_1 + \beta * w_4 = 21; \\ \rightarrow r_1 &= r_1 + \beta * w_5 = 22; \\ \rightarrow r_2 &= r_2 + \beta/2 * w_6 = 20.5, \\ r_3 &= r_3 + \beta/2 * w_6 = 20.5 \end{aligned}$$

- **Step 6:** Similarly, we consider the transfer of agent 7 and agent 8

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow r_4 &= r_4 + \beta * w_7 = 4.5; \\ \rightarrow r_6 &= r_6 + \beta * w_8 = 4.5 \end{aligned}$$

The final reward is $\mathbf{r} = (22, 20.5, 20.5, 4.5, 4, 4.5, 2, 2)$ according to PRDM. Each component of \mathbf{r} represents the reward of the corresponding agent. Note that we still have $B_4 = B_3 - w_7 - w_8 = 20$ available for further propagation.

4 Properties of PRDM

In this section, we show several properties of PRDM. We start by discussing the straightforward properties of PRDM, and then we illustrate how PRDM maximizes information propagation and defends against Sybil attacks.

For the convenience contents of the following formulation, denote C'_S as the sum of the contributions of the set S , e.g., C'_{l_k} is the total contribution of k -th layer. Recall that when k is an integer, C'_k denotes the total contribution of the first k layers.




Figure 2: An example of PRDM on input $B = 100$, $c_s = 20$, $\beta = 0.2$, each agent has a contribution of 10. (a) the invitation relationship among the sponsor and each agent. (b) each layer's initial budget B_k and each agent's weight w_i in contribution phase. (c) the transfer of reward during propagation phase and each agent's final reward r_i .

Theorem 1. *The Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism is asymptotically budget balanced.* □

Proof. In PRDM, the division of the initial budget B is performed only in the contribution phase, which implies $\sum_{i \in N} r_i = \sum_{i \in N} w_i$. Recall that for an active network $G' = (V', E')$, the sponsor s has a virtual contribution $c_s > 0$ and $C'_k = c_s + \sum_{i \in V(t'), \text{dep}(i) \leq k} c'_i$ is the total contribution of s and all the agents in layer l_1, \dots, l_k .

According to PRDM, each layer can only divide a part of the remaining reward from the previous layer. Suppose that there are d layers. We focus on B_k , which is the residual budget of layer l_k inherited from the upper layer. Generally, for $k = 1, \dots, d-1$, we have $B_{k+1} = B_k - \sum_{i \in l_k} w_i$. Specially, let $B_{d+1} = B_d - \sum_{i \in l_d} w_i$ be the budget that has not been distributed. Then, we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n w_i = \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{i \in l_k} w_i \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d (B_k - B_{k+1}) = B - B_{d+1} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that B_{d+1} converges to 0 when the total contribution goes to infinity. Starting from the first layer, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= B \\ B_2 &= B_1 - \sum_{i \in l_1} w_i = B_1 - \sum_{i \in l_1} \frac{c'_i}{C'_1} B_1 = \frac{c_s}{C'_1} B \\ B_3 &= B_2 - \sum_{i \in l_2} w_i = B_2 - \sum_{i \in l_2} \frac{c'_i}{C'_2} B_2 = \frac{c_s}{C'_2} B \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $k = 2, \dots, d$, we have $B_k = \frac{c_s}{C'_{k-1}} B$. Then, when the total contribution goes to infinity, $C'_d = \sum_{i=1}^n c'_i \rightarrow \infty$, hence $B_{d+1} = \frac{c_s}{C'_d} B \rightarrow 0$.

The above theorem indicates that PRDM will allocate all of the sponsor's budget to the agents when the total contribution is large enough. Meanwhile, the sponsor does not need to pay extra budgets for the contributions of extra participants.

Theorem 2. *The Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism is individually rational.*

Proof. Intuitively, any agent i in a social network G , at any stage of PRDM, does not need to pay a fee, so $r_i \geq 0$ holds. □

Actually, for any agent $i \in G(t')$ of the active network, they always have a positive reward $r_i > 0$. Furthermore, Theorem 3 shows that an agent maximize the reward when she truthfully report her type.

Theorem 3. *The Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism is incentive compatible.*

Proof. By the definition of incentive compatible, PRDM needs to satisfy that for any agent $i \in N$, for any report profile \mathbf{t}'_{-i} of others, truthfully reporting her private type t_i is a dominant strategy. The report \mathbf{t}'_i of agent i consists of the contributions c'_i and the set of children n'_i . Hence for any agent $i \in N$, we need to prove the following two parts

- Agent i contributes as much as she is capable $c'_i = c_i$ to maximize her reward.
- Agent i invites all her children $n'_i = n_i$ to maximize her reward.

Part 1: if agent i is not in the active network $G(t') = (V(t'), E(t'))$, the reward is zero regardless of how much she contributes, so $c'_i = c_i$ maximizes her reward. For any $i \in V(t')$, assume that agent i is in the k -th layer ($1 < k < d$) in the layered graph with d layers and agent i is the only parent of her children in $(k+1)$ -th layer. Thus for any $0 < c'_i \leq c_i$,

any $n'_i \subseteq n_i$ and $0 \leq \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) = (1 - \beta) \frac{c'_i}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}} B_k + \beta \frac{C'_{l_{k+1} \cap n'_i}}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1}}} \frac{C'_{k-1}}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}} B_k \quad (6)$$

where $C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}$ is the total contribution in k -th layer except i , $C'_{l_{k+1} \cap n'_i}$ is the total contribution of i 's children in $(k+1)$ -th layer. The first term of $r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i})$ in Equation (6) is the reward reserved by i . The second term is the reward coming from the next layer. All quantities except c'_i are fixed, so the first term increases as c'_i increases and the second term decreases as c'_i increases. Consider the worst case: $C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} = 0$, $C'_{l_{k+1} \cap n'_i} = C'_{l_{k+1}}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$ when the first term decreases the fastest while the second term increases the slowest, $r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i})$ can be reduced as

$$\begin{aligned} & r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{C'_{k-1}} \left(c'_i + \frac{C'_{k-1} C'_{l_{k+1}}}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}}} \right) B_k \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i} \frac{c'_i C'_{k-1} + c'_i c'_i + c'_i C'_{l_{k+1}} + C'_{k-1} C'_{l_{k+1}}}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}}} B_k \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{(C'_{k-1} + c'_i)(c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}})}{(C'_{k-1} + c'_i)(C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}})} B_k \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}}}{C'_{k-1} + c'_i + C'_{l_{k+1}}} B_k \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Since $r_i(t'_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i})$ is a monotonically increasing function of c'_i , agent i receives the highest reward when $c'_i = c_i$. Furthermore, if $k = 1$, agent i is in the first layer and is not required to distribute rewards to the previous layer, the first term in Equation (6) will be larger. If $k = d$, agent i is in the last layer and has no rewards from the next layer, so the second term in Equation (6) is 0. If agent i is not the only parent of her children in $(k+1)$ -th layer, the second term in the equation (6) decreases more slowly. All of these cases will be better than the worst case we discussed in Equation (7). Therefore $c'_i = c_i$ maximizes the reward of agent i .

Part 2: if agent i is not in the active network $G(\mathbf{t}') = (V(\mathbf{t}'), E(\mathbf{t}'))$, again her reward is always equal to 0. If $i \in V(\mathbf{t}')$, for all $n'_i \subset n_i$, she add one more child $j \in n_i$ into n'_i . Suppose agent j is already in $V(\mathbf{t}')$. In that case, we consider that j is in the layer below i , i gets an additional reward without affecting the existing reward, and i 's reward remains unchanged if j is in other layers. Alternatively j is a new agent in the active network, then j must be in the next layer of i , the reward of i changes from $(1 - \beta) \frac{c'_i}{C'_k} B_k + \beta \frac{C'_{l_{k+1} \cap n'_i}}{C'_{k+1}} B_{k+1}$ to $(1 - \beta) \frac{c'_i}{C'_k} B_k + \beta \frac{c'_j + C'_{l_{k+1} \cap n'_i}}{c'_j + C'_{k+1}} B_{k+1}$, which is obviously increased. Hence when agent i invites all her children, she maximizes the reward.

In conclusion, PRDM is incentive compatible, which indicates that truthful report is the dominant strategy for all

agents. In other words, all agents will maximize information propagation while making the largest contributions within their capacity. \square

Next, we will discuss the property of Sybil-proofness.

Theorem 4. *The Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism is parallel Sybil-proof.*

Proof. Suppose agent $i \in l_k$ ($1 \leq k \leq d$). When agent i does commit a parallel Sybil attack to be $\nu_i = \{i, i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. It can be simply deduced from the proof of incentive compatible that for all nodes in the set ν_i , their dominant strategy is making the largest contributions within their capacity and invites all their children. However, their capacity is limited by $\sum_{j \in \nu_i} c'_j \leq c_i$, which means that truthful reports without creating fake nodes will maximize the benefit of agent i . \square

Then we discuss the more general situation of Sybil attacks. Before giving the main conclusion, we first present two lemmas. Lemma 1 concludes that an agent cannot increase her weight in contribution phase by making fake nodes.




Figure 3: (a) is the case where agent i does not commit Sybil attacks, the black node represents agent i , and the white nodes represent real participants that i invites. (b) shows the situation where i conducts fake nodes one layer down in which the dashed node represent all the nodes generated by i . (c) is the most general form of a Sybil attacks.

Lemma 1. *Each agent $i \in V(\mathbf{t}')$ cannot increase the total weight in contribution phase by committing Sybil attack $a_i = (\nu_i, \tau_i)$.*

Proof. Suppose agent $i \in l_k$ ($1 \leq k \leq d$). When agent i does not commit a Sybil attack, the network is shown in Figure 3(a), the weight of i is $w_i = \frac{c'_i}{C'_k} B_k$. Let us first show that an agent cannot increase her weight by making several fake nodes as her own children. For convenience, we denote $\nu_{-i} = \nu_i \setminus \{i\}$.

Without loss of generality, let $c'_i = c_i$. After committing Sybil attack $a_i = (\nu_i, \tau_i)$, agent i can transfer part of her contribution δ to her fake nodes ($0 < \delta < c_i$) and $\sum_{j \in \nu_i} c'_j = \delta$. Let $\mathcal{W}_i(\delta) = \sum_{j \in \nu_i} w_j$ be the total weight of i and all her fake nodes. According to PRDM, as shown in Figure 3(b), when all the fake nodes are in the next layer of i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_i(0) &= \frac{c_i}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}} B_k \\ \mathcal{W}_i(\delta) &= \frac{c_i - \delta}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} - \delta} B_k \\ &+ \frac{\delta}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1} \setminus \nu_i}} \frac{C'_{k-1}}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} - \delta} B_k \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that for any δ , there is $\mathcal{W}_i(0) - \mathcal{W}_i(\delta) = \frac{P}{Q}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \delta C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \left(C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1} \setminus \nu_i} + C'_{k-1} + c_i \right) \\ &+ \delta C'_{k-1} C'_{l_{k+1} \setminus \nu_i} \geq 0 \\ Q &= \left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right) \left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} - \delta \right) \\ &\left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1} \setminus \nu_i} \right) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $\mathcal{W}_i(0) \geq \mathcal{W}_i(\delta)$, agent i cannot increase the total weight by committing Sybil attacks in Figure 3(b). Let us consider the case $\mathcal{W}_i(0) = \mathcal{W}_i(\delta)$, which implies that $P = 0$. Then it can be obtained $C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} = 0$ and $C'_{l_{k+1} \setminus \nu_i} = 0$, which shows that there are no other agents in the k -th and $k+1$ -th layers. Recursively, the most general case in Figure 3(c) can be generated by repeating the above steps. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{W}_i(0) \geq \mathcal{W}_i(\delta)$ for any Sybil attack a_i , agent i cannot increase her total weight by committing Sybil attacks. \square

The conclusion of the Lemma 2 is that an agent cannot make her reward from non-fake-node children (not i 's fake nodes) too much by creating fake nodes. Here we give the majority assumption: $c_i \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{1-\beta}} - 1 \right) \left(C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)$ which implies that agent i 's capacity cannot take up $\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{1-\beta}} - 1 \right)$ times the sum of the capacity of i 's layer and above which is similar to Bitcoin's 51% attack [Nakamoto, 2008].

Lemma 2. For $0 < \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, each agent $i \in V(\mathbf{t}')$ cannot increase $\frac{1}{1-\beta}$ times the reward received from her non-fake-node children by any Sybil attack $a_i = (\nu_i, \tau_i)$ under the majority assumption.

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $c'_i = c_i$. After committing Sybil attack $a_i = (\nu_i, \tau_i)$, agent i can transfer part of her contribution δ to her fake nodes ($0 < \delta < c_i$). Let $\mathcal{R}_i(\delta)$ be the reward received from her non-fake-node children. If i does not commit a Sybil attack, the network is as shown in

Figure 3(a) such that the reward is $\mathcal{R}_i(0)$. We have

$$\mathcal{R}_i(0) = \beta \frac{\sum_{j \in l_{k+1} \cap n'_i} \frac{c_i}{\sum_{m \in p_j} c'_m}}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1}}} \frac{C'_{k-1}}{C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}} B_k$$

For a fixed δ , in Figure 3(c), transferring more of δ to $(k+1)$ -th layer of lower makes i receive more rewards from her non-fake-node children. Thus

$$\mathcal{R}_i(\delta) < \beta \frac{\sum_{j \in l_{k+1} \cap n'_i} \frac{c_i}{\sum_{m \in p_j} c'_m}}{C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1}}} \frac{C'_{k-1}}{C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}}} B_k$$

If $c_i \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{1-\beta}} - 1 \right) \left(C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)$, which is the majority assumption, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{R}_i(\delta)}{\mathcal{R}_i(0)} &< \frac{\left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1}} \right) \left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)}{\left(C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} + C'_{l_{k+1}} \right) \left(C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)} \\ &\leq \frac{\left(C'_{k-1} + c_i + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)^2}{\left(C'_{k-1} + C'_{l_k \setminus \{i\}} \right)^2} \leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Theorem 5. The Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism is $\frac{1}{1-\beta}$ -Sybil-proof with $0 < \beta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ under the majority assumption.

Proof. For an agent not in the active network, her reward is always 0, and Theorem 5 holds. For any agent $i \in V(\mathbf{t}')$, the reward of i has two parts, the first part comes from her weight, and the second part comes from her non-fake-node children. For all $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$, all $\mathbf{t}'_{-i} \in \mathcal{T}'_{-i}$ and $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$, combine Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in \nu_i} r_j(a_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) &< \mathcal{W}_i(\delta) + \mathcal{R}_i(\delta) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} (1-\beta) \mathcal{W}_i(0) + \frac{1}{1-\beta} \mathcal{R}_i(0) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\beta} r_i(t_i, \mathbf{t}'_{-i}) \end{aligned}$$

\square

When $\beta = 0$, there is no reward for propagating information in this situation, and the mechanism is SP. When $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$, PRDM is 2-SP, which indicates an agent who commits any Sybil attack will not receive twice the reward she truthfully reports.

4.1 Example

Then we give an example to illustrate the incentive compatibility and Sybil-proofness below.

Example 1. The original active network is the same as Figure in paper. Consider the following two strategies that agent 1 may adopt respectively:

1. Agent 1 creates a fake node 9 as her children, and transfers δ of her contribution to 9.




Figure 4: The strategies agent 1 may adopt: agent 1 can transfer δ ($0 < \delta < 10$) of her contribution to agent 9 and she can disinvite agent 4.

2. Agent 1 does not invite agent 4.

The active network under agent 1’s manipulation is shown in Figure 4. In this case, agent 1’s utility is the total reward of agent 1 and agent 9. The relationship between her utility and δ is shown in Figure 5. From this figure, we can obtain the following conclusions.

1. Creating fake node 9 reduces agent i ’s utility.
2. Agent 1’s utility decreases when she does not invite agent 4.




Figure 5: Relationship between agent 1’s total utility ($r_1 + r_9$) when agent 1 transfers δ of her contribution to her fake nodes ($0 < \delta < 10$), under both conditions whether she invites agent 4.

5 Discussion

Intuitively, there are somewhat conflicts between IC and SP. To satisfy incentive compatibility, we should give an extra reward to those agents who invite more participants. On the other hand, we should reduce the reward of agents who make fake identities to satisfy Sybil-proofness. In the scenario where capacity is not introduced, we define strong IC and strong SP as invitations that necessarily increase agent’s

reward and falsifications that necessarily decrease agent’s reward. The following is an impossibility result.

Proposition 1. *If a reward distribution mechanism M satisfies both IC and SP, then it must be neither strong IC nor strong SP.*

Proof. In mechanism M , for any agent i , assume that the original reward is r_i^1 and the reward for inviting one more person j is r_i^2 . Since it is impossible to distinguish whether the invited extra person is fake, IC requires $r_i^1 \leq r_i^2$ and SP requires $r_i^1 \geq r_i^2 + r_j$. Clearly we can obtain $r_j = 0$ and $r_i^1 = r_i^2$, which suggests that the mechanism M must be neither strong IC nor strong SP. □

Here, we briefly describe another mechanism which is IC and SP.

Mechanism 1. *Each agent $i \in n_s$ gets a reward of $B/|n_s|$, other agents have no reward.*

$|n_s|$ denotes the number of the sponsor’s children. Obviously, the above mechanism satisfies the IC and SP but cannot incentivize agents to propagate, so we need extra information.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we design a novel reward distribution mechanism for information propagation in social networks with limited budgets called Propagation Reward Distribution Mechanism. PRDM can achieve maximum information propagation and motivate all participants to contribute their maximum capacities while resisting Sybil attacks. PRDM is also asymptotically budget balanced.

At the same time, in addition to creating fake nodes alone, agents can collude (multiple individuals cooperating in manipulation) [Marshall and Marx, 2007]. There is a trade-off among the aspects of Sybil attacks, collusion problem and incentive effect. Requiring all these properties leaves us with very limited design space. It is also an interesting topic to consider the trade-offs between these limitations.

References

[Alothali *et al.*, 2018] Eiman Alothali, Nazar Zaki, Elfadil A. Mohamed, and Hany Al Ashwal. Detecting social bots on twitter: A literature review. In *2018 International Conference on Innovations in Information Technology (IIT)*, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates, November 18-19, 2018, pages 175–180. IEEE, 2018.

[Babaioff *et al.*, 2012] Moshe Babaioff, Shahar Dobzinski, Sigal Oren, and Aviv Zohar. On bitcoin and red balloons. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, EC 2012*, pages 56–73, 2012.

[Chen and Li, 2021] Jing Chen and Bo Li. Maximal information propagation via lotteries. In *WINE 2021*, volume 13112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 486–503, 2021.

- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Songlin Chen, Zhibo Pang, Hong Wen, Kan Yu, Tengyue Zhang, and Yueming Lu. Automated labeling and learning for physical layer authentication against clone node and sybil attacks in industrial wireless edge networks. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, 17(3):2041–2051, 2021.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2022] Hongyin Chen, Xiaotie Deng, Ying Wang, Yue Wu, and Dengji Zhao. Sybil-proof diffusion auction in social networks. *CoRR*, abs/2211.01984, 2022.
- [Doan *et al.*, 2011] AnHai Doan, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Alon Y. Halevy. Crowdsourcing systems on the worldwide web. *Commun. ACM*, 54(4):86–96, 2011.
- [Drucker and Fleischer, 2012] Fabio Drucker and Lisa Fleischer. Simpler sybil-proof mechanisms for multi-level marketing. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce, EC 2012*, pages 441–458, 2012.
- [Emek *et al.*, 2011a] Yuval Emek, Ron Karidi, Moshe Tennenholtz, and Aviv Zohar. Mechanisms for multi-level marketing. In *Proceedings 12th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2011)*, pages 209–218, 2011.
- [Emek *et al.*, 2011b] Yuval Emek, Ron Karidi, Moshe Tennenholtz, and Aviv Zohar. Mechanisms for multi-level marketing. In Yoav Shoham, Yan Chen, and Tim Roughgarden, editors, *Proceedings 12th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2011), San Jose, CA, USA, June 5-9, 2011*, pages 209–218. ACM, 2011.
- [Jamshidi *et al.*, 2019] Mojtaba Jamshidi, Ehsan Zangeneh, Mehdi Esnaashari, Aso Mohammad Darwesh, and Mohammad Reza Meybodi. A novel model of sybil attack in cluster-based wireless sensor networks and propose a distributed algorithm to defend it. *Wirel. Pers. Commun.*, 105(1):145–173, 2019.
- [Kleinberg and Raghavan, 2005] Jon M. Kleinberg and Prabhakar Raghavan. Query incentive networks. In *46th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2005)*, pages 132–141, 2005.
- [Leskovec *et al.*, 2006] Jure Leskovec, Lada A. Adamic, and Bernardo A. Huberman. The dynamics of viral marketing. In *Proceedings 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2006)*, pages 228–237, 2006.
- [Marshall and Marx, 2007] Robert C. Marshall and Leslie M. Marx. Bidder collusion. *J. Econ. Theory*, 133(1):374–402, 2007.
- [Nakamoto, 2008] Satoshi Nakamoto. Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system. *Decentralized Business Review*, page 21260, 2008.
- [Pickard *et al.*, 2010] Galen Pickard, Iyad Rahwan, Wei Pan, Manuel Cebrián, Riley Crane, Anmol Madan, and Alex Pentland. Time critical social mobilization: The DARPA network challenge winning strategy. *CoRR*, abs/1008.3172, 2010.
- [Robinson *et al.*, 2019] Jonathan Robinson, Cheskie Rosenzweig, Aaron J Moss, and Leib Litman. Tapped out or barely tapped? recommendations for how to harness the vast and largely unused potential of the mechanical turk participant pool. *PloS one*, 14(12):e0226394, 2019.
- [Shi *et al.*, 2020] Haomin Shi, Yao Zhang, Zilin Si, Letong Wang, and Dengji Zhao. Maximal information propagation with budgets. In *ECAI 2020 - 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 325 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 211–218, 2020.
- [Singer and Mittal, 2011] Yaron Singer and Manas Mittal. Pricing tasks in online labor markets. In *Human Computation, Papers from the 2011 AAAI Workshop, San Francisco*, volume WS-11-11 of *AAAI Technical Report*, 2011.
- [Sorokin and Forsyth, 2008] Alexander Sorokin and David A. Forsyth. Utility data annotation with amazon mechanical turk. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR Workshops 2008*, pages 1–8, 2008.
- [Tang *et al.*, 2011] John C. Tang, Manuel Cebrián, Nicklaus A. Giacobe, Hyun-Woo Kim, Taemie Kim, and Douglas “Beaker” Wickert. Reflecting on the DARPA red balloon challenge. *Commun. ACM*, 54(4):78–85, 2011.
- [Yokoo *et al.*, 2001] Makoto Yokoo, Yuko Sakurai, and Shigeo Matsubara. Robust combinatorial auction protocol against false-name bids. *Artif. Intell.*, 130(2):167–181, 2001.
- [Yokoo *et al.*, 2004] Makoto Yokoo, Yuko Sakurai, and Shigeo Matsubara. The effect of false-name bids in combinatorial auctions: new fraud in internet auctions. *Games Econ. Behav.*, 46(1):174–188, 2004.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2006] Haifeng Yu, Michael Kaminsky, Phillip B. Gibbons, and Abraham Flaxman. Sybilguard: defending against sybil attacks via social networks. pages 267–278, 2006.
- [Zhang and Lee, 2019] Shijie Zhang and Jong-Hyouk Lee. Double-spending with a sybil attack in the bitcoin decentralized network. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informatics*, 15(10):5715–5722, 2019.
- [Zhang and Zhao, 2022] Yao Zhang and Dengji Zhao. Incentives to invite others to form larger coalitions. In Piotr Faliszewski, Viviana Mascardi, Catherine Pelachaud, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS 2022, Auckland, New Zealand, May 9-13, 2022*, pages 1509–1517. IFAAMAS, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2014] Kuan Zhang, Xiaohui Liang, Rongxing Lu, and Xuemin Shen. Sybil attacks and their defenses in the internet of things. *IEEE Internet Things J.*, 1(5):372–383, 2014.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] Yao Zhang, Xiuzhen Zhang, and Dengji Zhao. Sybil-proof answer querying mechanism. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2020*, pages 422–428, 2020.