

Continuous-Time Influence Maximization for Multiple Items

Nan Du, Yingyu Liang, Maria Florina Balcan, Le Song
 College of Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology
 {dunan,yliang39}@gatech.edu, {ninamf,lsong}@cc.gatech.edu

Abstract

The goal of influence maximization is to recommend items (*e.g.*, news and products) to a selected set of users such that the overall spread of the items are maximized. Practical influence maximization problems often involve multiple types of items that need to be spread in the presence of both user and item constraints: each user can only be recommended to a small number of items and each item can be displayed a limited number of times. In this paper, we study this problem under continuous-time diffusion networks, and provide a novel formulation as a submodular maximization under an intersection of matroid constraints. Furthermore, we also design an efficient adaptive threshold greedy algorithm with provable theoretical approximation guarantees. We show that the proposed algorithm perform significantly better than other scalable alternatives in both synthetic and real world datasets.

1 Introduction

Online social networks play an important role in the spread of news, the diffusion of technological innovations, and the promotion of products via online advertisements. In these contexts, the influence maximization problem (or viral marketing problem) typically has the following flavor: select a set of source nodes to initiate the information diffusion process for a particular item such that the expected number of follow-ups is maximized. This problem has been studied extensively in the literature from both modeling point of view and algorithmic point of view, including great examples such as [20, 3, 2, 16, 6].

However, previous studies have not sufficiently addressed two important practical aspects of the influence maximization problem:

- First, multiple items, each of which can be displayed a limited number of times, can spread simultaneously across the same set of social entities through different diffusion channels.
- Second, social entities, each of which can be a potential source, can be selected as sources for only a small number of times.

For instance, in Facebook, the system can display a small number of advertisements (typically less than 5) in the side-bar to each user; and then the user can like these advertisements and influence his(her) followers. Due to the constraint that each user has only a limited number of slots for displaying advertisements, the system can not assign all advertisements to a few highly influential users. Furthermore, each advertisement can be displayed a limited number of times, reflecting the advertiser’s budget in buying the number of slots for displaying the ads. Thus, the goal of this




Figure 1: Multiple items can spread across their respective diffusion networks over the same set of users. Each user j can be chosen as the source for at most u_j times, and each item i is allowed to be displayed for at most b_i times. The goal is to smartly assign items to users in order to maximize the overall spread of the items given these constraints.

paper is to model these user and item constraints, and to design an algorithm to maximize the overall influence of multiple items under these constraints. See Figure 1 for an illustration.

We note that many previous work on influence maximization are most based on static graph structures, and discrete-time diffusion models [20, 3, 2]. These models are missing an important characteristic of the observed continuous-time data: each event in cascade data is associated with a continuous time-stamp and very often occurs asynchronously. Artificially discretizing the time axis into bins introduces additional tuning parameters, like the bin size, which are not easy to choose optimally. A sequence of recent works argued that modeling cascade data and information diffusion using *continuous-time* models can provide significantly improved performance than their discrete-time counterparts in recovering hidden diffusion networks and predicting the timing of events [7, 8, 11, 14, 13, 27, 28]. In our paper, we will also use continuous-time diffusion models which provide us more accurate influence predictions [6].

The main contributions of this paper are a novel formulation of a real world problem of significant practical interest, a new efficient algorithm with provable theoretical guarantees, and strong empirical results. More specifically:

- Unlike prior work that considers an a-priori described simplistic discrete-time diffusion model, we first *learn* the diffusion pattern from data by using continuous-time diffusion models.
- We formulate the influence maximization problem with user and item constraints as a submodular maximization under the intersection of matroid constraints. The submodular function we use is based on the actual diffusion model learned from data. This novel formulation provides us a firm theoretical foundation for designing greedy algorithm with provable approximation guarantees.
- We propose an efficient adaptive threshold greedy algorithm for constrained influence maxi-

mization in continuous-time diffusion networks. The runtime of the algorithm is linear in the number of items, and proportional to $\tilde{O}(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}^*|)$ where $|\mathcal{V}|$ is the number of nodes (users) and $|\mathcal{E}^*|$ is the number of edges in the largest diffusion network. We prove that this algorithm is guaranteed to find a solution with an overall influence of at least $\frac{1-2\delta}{3}$ of the optimal value, where $\delta > 0$ is any arbitrarily small value.

- We evaluate our algorithm over large synthetic and real world datasets. In terms of maximizing overall influence of all items, our algorithm achieves much better performance than other scalable alternatives.

A particularly nice feature of our approach is that it can be readily generalized to capture additional resource constraints. In particular, our algorithms and theoretical guarantees apply to any submodular maximization problem under an intersection of matroid constraints and thus it can be used to capture significantly more general scenarios than the practical problem we address in this paper — see Section 8 for further discussion.

Structure of the Paper. In the remainder of the paper, we will review continuous-time diffusion models and the computation of influence function in this case. Then we will present our formulation of the problem as submodular maximization under an intersection of matroid constraints. Section 5 will be our adaptive threshold greedy algorithm, and Section 6 includes the formal approximation guarantees for our algorithm. Experimental results on both synthetic and real world data are reported in Section 7.

2 Related Work

While social influence maximization has been extensively studied in viral marketing [5, 20, 19, 3, 18, 2], our modeling using continuous-time diffusion networks, formulation using submodular maximization under matroid constraints, greedy algorithm with decreasing thresholds, and formal guarantee of the algorithm are new. Most previous work focused on maximizing the influence of one item, i.e. how to allocate b copies of the item to b selected nodes. They did not consider the competition among multiple items imposed by the limited capacity of the user. None of the previous work consider constrained influence maximization for multiple items in continuous-time models.

Diffusion Model. Two common models for social influence are the Independent Cascade and Linear Threshold models [20, 4, 2]. Most previous work focused on the discrete time versions of these models. Only recently researchers start to realize the advantage of continuous-time diffusion networks [11, 13, 7, 8]. However, the usage of these models are largely restricted to the problem of selecting nodes for one item.

Submodular Maximization. As shown in [20], the influence in several common diffusion network models is submodular, and thus submodular maximization has been extensively used in influence maximization. [21] provided a nice survey on this topic. For submodular maximization over subsets of size at most k , there exists a greedy algorithm that achieves $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation [24]. For submodular maximization over intersection of P matroids, the greedy algorithm achieves a $\frac{1}{P+1}$ -approximation ratio. However, adaptive threshold greedy algorithm with inexact function evaluation has not been explored before.

Maximization with User Constraints. Two recent papers [17, 26] studied how to select b items (memes/threads) for each user so that the overall activity in the network is maximized.

They addressed the limited attention effect but disregarded the item constraints during the initial assignment.

3 Continuous-Time Diffusion Networks

A continuous-time diffusion model associates each edge, $e := (j, i)$, in a directed diffusion network, $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, with a transmission function, $f_e(\tau_e)$. The transmission function is a density over time, in contrast to previous discrete-time models where each edge is associated with a fixed infection probability [20]. Moreover, it also differs from discrete-time models in the sense that events in a cascade are not generated iteratively in rounds, but event timings are sampled directly from the transmission function in the continuous-time model. This difference in the generative process for the information diffusion also makes subsequent influence estimation in continuous-time models different from that of discrete models.

In our setting, we may have multiple diffusion networks on the same set of nodes \mathcal{V} , each for one item. The diffusion network for item i is denoted as $\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i)$, and the set of nodes (or users) we can choose as the information source for it will be denoted by \mathcal{R}_i , which is a subset of \mathcal{V} .

3.1 Continuous-Time Independent Cascade Model

The diffusion process begins with a set of infected source nodes, \mathcal{R} , initially adopting certain *contagion* (idea, meme or product) at time zero. The contagion is transmitted from the sources along their out-going edges to their direct neighbors. Each transmission through an edge entails a *random* transmission time, τ , drawn independently from a density over time, $f_e(\tau)$. Then, the infected neighbors transmit the contagion to their respective neighbors, and the process continues. Furthermore, an infected node remains infected for the entire diffusion process. Thus, if a node i is infected by multiple neighbors, only the neighbor that first infects node i will be the *true parent*. As a result, although the contact network can be an arbitrary directed network, each cascade (a list of event timing information from the spread of a contagion) induces a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). The independent cascade model has a useful property: given a sample of transmission times of all edges, the time t_i taken to infect a node i is the length of the shortest path in \mathcal{G} from the sources to node i , where the edge weights correspond to the associated transmission times τ_e .

3.2 Influence Estimation

Intuitively, given a time window, the wider the spread of infection, the more influential the set of sources. We define influence as the average number of infected nodes given a set of source nodes and a time window, as in previous work [16]. More formally, consider a set, $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, of source nodes which gets infected at time zero, then, given a time window T , a node i is infected in the time window if $t_i \leq T$. The expected number of infected nodes (or **the influence**) given the set of transmission functions $\{f_e\}_{(j,i) \in \mathcal{E}}$ are defined as

$$\sigma(\mathcal{R}, T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{I}\{t_i \leq T\} \right], \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbb{I}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function and the expectation is taken over the the set of *dependent* variables $\{t_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$. By Theorem 4 in [16], the influence function $\sigma(\mathcal{R}, T)$ is submodular in \mathcal{R} .

Essentially, the influence estimation problem is an inference problem for graphical models, where the probability of event $t_i \leq T$ given sources in \mathcal{R} can be obtained by summing out the possible configuration of other variables $\{t_j\}_{j \neq i}$. This is a very challenging problem in general. [6] proposed an efficient randomized algorithm, CONTINEST (**C**ontinuous-**T**ime **I**nfluence **E**stimation) for the task. It can estimate the influence of an arbitrary set of source nodes to an accuracy of ϵ using $r = \mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ randomizations and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(r|\mathcal{E}| + r|\mathcal{V}|)$ computations.

4 Constrained Influence Maximization for Multiple Items

Suppose we have a set, \mathcal{L} , of different items that propagate on the same set of nodes \mathcal{V} with different diffusion dynamics (see Figure 1 for an illustration). The diffusion network for item i is denoted as $\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i)$. For each item i , we want to assign it to a set, $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, of users (source nodes), while at the same time taking into account that

- **Item Constraint:** each item i can be displayed to at most b_i nodes;
- **User Constraint:** each user j can be assigned to at most u_j items.

Given a time T , let $\sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T)$ denote the influence of item i , *i.e.*, the expected number of nodes it can reach before time T . Our goal is to maximize the **Overall Influence**

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T) \tag{2}$$

subject to the above item and user constraints.

Formally, the item and user constraints can be captured by an assignment matrix $A \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{L}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$ as follows: $A_{ij} = 1$ if $j \in \mathcal{R}_i$ and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Then the item constraint requires that $\sum_j A_{ij} \leq b_i$ for each $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and the user constraint constrains that $\sum_i A_{ij} \leq u_j$ for each $j \in \mathcal{V}$ (see Figure 2 for an illustration). In the following, we show that the two sets of constraints correspond to the intersection of two partition matroids. We also show that the overall influence function is a submodular function when the influence obeys continuous-time diffusion model, so the constrained influence maximization problem for multiple items can be formulated as submodular maximization under matroid constraints.

4.1 Matroids

Matroids are combinatorial structures that generalize the notion of linear independence in matrices [25, 10]. Formulating our constrained influence maximization using matroids allow us to design a greedy algorithm with provable guarantees. Formally,

Definition 1. A matroid is a pair, $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I})$, defined over a finite set, \mathcal{Z} (the ground set), and \mathcal{I} contains a family of sets (the independent sets) which satisfy three axioms

1. **Non-emptiness:** The empty set $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.
2. **Heredity:** If a set $Y \in \mathcal{I}$, then $X \in \mathcal{I}$ for any subset $X \subseteq Y$.
3. **Exchange:** If $X \in \mathcal{I}, Y \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|Y| > |X|$, then there exists $z \in Y \setminus X$ such that $X \cup \{z\} \in \mathcal{I}$.




Figure 2: Illustration of an assignment matrix A . Here each item i can be assigned to at most $b_i = 2$ nodes, and each node j can be assigned at most $u_j = 2$ items. To construct a matroid for the item budget constraint, define the ground set \mathcal{Z} to be the entries of the matrix, and an assignment (the non-zero entries in the matrix colored red) can be considered as a set S . An assignment is feasible if and only if it has at most b_i non-zero entries in each row i , *i.e.*, it is an independent set S in the matroid \mathcal{M}_1 defined based on the partition of rows with parameters b_i . Similarly, a partition matroid \mathcal{M}_2 can be defined for the user budget constraints based on the partition of columns with parameters u_j .

An important type of matroids are the partition matroids in which the ground set \mathcal{Z} is partitioned into disjoint subsets $\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_t$ for some t and

$$\mathcal{I} = \{S \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } |S \cap \mathcal{Z}_i| \leq k_i, \forall i = 1, \dots, t\}$$

for some given parameters k_1, \dots, k_t .

4.2 Constrained Assignment as Intersection of Matroids

In the language of matroids, the constraints in our influence maximization problem can be stated as follows

- **Ground set:** Based on the sets of items \mathcal{L} and nodes \mathcal{V} , we define a new ground set $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{V}$ of size $N = |\mathcal{L}| \times |\mathcal{V}|$. Each element of \mathcal{Z} corresponds to the index (i, j) of an entry of the assignment matrix A .
- **Matroid \mathcal{M}_1 :** For the item constraints, partition the ground set into $\mathcal{Z}_{i*} = \{i\} \times \mathcal{V}$ each of which corresponds to one row of A . Then define a partition matroid $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I}_1\}$ where $\mathcal{I}_1 = \{S \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } |S \cap \mathcal{Z}_{i*}| \leq b_i, \forall i\}$.
- **Matroid \mathcal{M}_2 :** Similarly, for the user constraints, partition the ground set into $\mathcal{Z}_{*j} = \mathcal{L} \times \{j\}$ each of which corresponds to a column of A . Then define a second partition matroid $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I}_2\}$ where $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{S \mid S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } |S \cap \mathcal{Z}_{*j}| \leq u_j, \forall j\}$.

Essentially, we can treat each feasible assignment matrix A as an independent set S , and the elements of S are the indices of the non-zero entries in A , *i.e.*, $S := \{(i, j) \mid A_{ij} \neq 0\}$. Then the set of nodes \mathcal{R}_i where item i is assigned to is $\mathcal{R}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (i, j) \in S\}$. Furthermore, S has to satisfy the constraints imposed by matroid \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 . That is,

$$S \in \mathcal{F} := \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$$

Algorithm 1 Adaptive Threshold Greedy Algorithm

- 1: Set $d = \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} f(\{z\})$. Set $w_t = \frac{d}{(1+\delta)^t}$ for $t = 0, \dots, L = \operatorname{argmin}_i [w_i \leq \frac{\delta d}{N}]$, and $w_{L+1} = 0$.
 - 2: Set $G = \emptyset$.
 - 3: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, L, L + 1$ **do**
 - 4: **for** each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $G \cup \{z\} \in \mathcal{F}$ **do**
 - 5: **if** $f(G \cup \{z\}) - f(G) \geq w_t$ **then**
 - 6: Set $G \leftarrow G \cup \{z\}$.
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Output G .
-

is an element from the intersection of two matroids. (See Figure 2 for an illustration.)

4.3 Constrained Submodular Maximization

We can show that the overall influence function satisfies the submodular property when each item spreads according to the continuous-time independent cascade model.

Lemma 2. *Under the continuous-time independent cascade model in Section 3, $f(S) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T)$ is a normalized monotone submodular function of S .*

Proof. By definition, $f(\emptyset) = 0$ and $f(S)$ is monotone. By Theorem 4 in [16], the component influence function $\sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T)$ for item i is submodular in $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, and thus $f_i(S) := \sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T)$ where $\mathcal{R}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} : (i, j) \in S\}$ is also submodular in $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{V}$. Since $f(S) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} f_i(S)$, the lemma follows from the fact that non-negative linear combinations of submodular functions are still submodular. \square

Therefore, our constrained influence maximization problem can be formulated as a submodular maximization problem under matroid constraints, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}} \quad & f(S) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \sigma_i(\mathcal{R}_i, T) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & S \in \mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{p=1}^P \mathcal{I}_p. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The case in our current paper corresponds to $P = 2$, but our algorithm and analysis apply to more general cases (See discussion section). Solving the above problem to optimality is difficult in general. In the following sections, we will design an efficient greedy algorithm to solve the above optimization problem with approximation guarantee.

5 Adaptive Threshold Greedy Algorithm

It is well-known that a greedy algorithm can achieve $\frac{1}{1+P}$ -approximation for maximizing a normalized monotone submodular function subject to P matroid constraints, and the dependence

on P is optimal [24]. Note that a straightforward implementation of the greedy algorithm can be expensive: it needs $\mathcal{O}(KN)$ submodular function evaluations, where K , the size of the greedy solution, and N , the size of the ground set, can be very large.

Inspired by the lazy evaluation heuristic, we design an algorithm which performs only a small number of submodular function evaluations. The algorithm maintains a working set G and a threshold w_t geometrically decreasing by a factor of $1 + \delta$, and sets the threshold to 0 when it is sufficiently small. At each threshold, it selects elements z from the ground set \mathcal{Z} which have marginal gain

$$f(G \cup \{z\}) - f(G)$$

above the threshold and do not violate the constraints. See Algorithm 1 for details.

Note that the traditional lazy evaluation heuristic also keeps a threshold but only uses the threshold to speed up selecting the element with maximum marginal gain. Our algorithm can add multiple elements z from the ground set at each threshold, and thus reduce the number of rounds from the size of the solution to the number of thresholds $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta})$. This allows us to tradeoff between the runtime and the approximation ratio (See Theorem 3).

In our influence maximization problem, evaluating the objective $f(\cdot)$ is expensive, which involves evaluating the influence of the assigned items. We will use the randomized algorithm by [6] to compute an estimation $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ of the quantity $f(\cdot)$.

6 Theoretical Guarantees

In our algorithm, we only use the estimation $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ of the influence $f(\cdot)$, which introduces additional error to the function value. More precisely, we have $|\hat{f}(S) - f(S)| \leq \epsilon$ for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. The question is whether the adaptive threshold greedy algorithm is robust to such perturbations. [1] has analyzed a decreasing-threshold algorithm for submodular maximization, but their analysis applies only for the case when the submodular function evaluation is exact. We will provide approximation guarantees for our algorithm even when the submodular function evaluation is *inexact*. We will first state a theorem for the general problem of submodular maximization over P matroids, and then specialize to our influence maximization problem. The guarantee depends on the curvature of f , which is defined as

$$c_f := \max_{j \in \mathcal{Z}, f(j) > 0} \frac{f(j) - f(j|\mathcal{Z} \setminus \{j\})}{f(j)}.$$

Theorem 3. *Suppose Algorithm 1 uses \hat{f} to estimate the function f which satisfies $|\hat{f}(S) - f(S)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. Let O denote the optimal solution. Then Algorithm 1 uses $\mathcal{O}(\min\{|G|N, \frac{N}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta}\})$ evaluations of \hat{f} , and returns a greedy solution G with*

$$f(G) \geq \frac{1}{(1 + 2\delta)(P + c_f)} f(O) - \frac{4P|G|}{P + c_f} \epsilon.$$

Roughly speaking, the approximation ratio is $\frac{1}{P + c_f}$, which decreases with the number of matroids. The parameter δ introduces a tradeoff between the approximation guarantee and the runtime: larger δ decreases the approximation ratio but needs fewer influence evaluations. The inexact influence evaluations introduce an additive error $\mathcal{O}(|G|\epsilon)$, *i.e.*, the estimation errors accumulate in the greedy selection.




Figure 3: Notation for analyzing the adaptive threshold greedy algorithm. The elements in the greedy solution G are arranged according to the order of being selected in Step 3 in Algorithm 1. A_t are all those elements in O that are available for selection when the current solution is $G^{t-1} = \{g_1, \dots, g_{t-1}\}$. That is, A_t are all those elements $j \in O$ that satisfy: (1) $j \notin G^{t-1}$; (2) $j \cup G^{t-1}$ does not violate the matroid constraints. B_t (colored in grey) are those elements in $A_t \setminus A_{t+1}$.

We provide the complete proof in the appendix, and describe a proof sketch here. Note that the properties of matroids are crucial for the proof, which justifies our formulation using matroids.

Proof Sketch: To prove the approximation guarantee, it suffices to bound the marginal gains of the elements in $O \setminus G$ w.r.t. G . If that is small, then by $f(O) \leq f(O \cup G) \leq f(G) + \sum_{j \in O \setminus G} f(j|G)$, we know that $f(O)$ is not much larger than $f(G)$, i.e. the algorithm outputs a good approximation.

To bound these marginal gains, we first partition O into a family of subsets where each subset corresponds to an element $g_t \in G$, and then bound the marginal gains of the elements in these subsets and the sizes of these subsets. More precisely,

1. Suppose $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_{|G|}\}$ in the order of selection, and let $G^t = \{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$. Let A_t denote all those elements in O that are available when selecting the t -th item. That is, A_t are all those elements $j \in O$ that satisfy: (1) $j \notin G^{t-1}$; (2) $j \cup G^{t-1}$ does not violate the matroid constraints. B_t are those elements in $A_t \setminus A_{t+1}$. (see Figure 3 for an illustration).
2. Any $j \in B_t$ has marginal gain approximately bounded by that of g_t by the greedy criterion, since j is not selected before g_t .
3. The sizes of B_t can be bounded by the properties of matroids. This is because each element in $\bigcup_{i=1}^t B_t$ either falls in G or fails the independence test at Step 4, so it belongs to the span of the current greedy solution in one of the P matroids. On the other hand, $\bigcup_{i=1}^t B_t \subseteq O$ is an independent set. It cannot contain more than t elements in the span of the current greedy solution in any matroid, since otherwise it will be dependent. So the size of $\bigcup_{i=1}^t B_t$ is bounded by Pt .

The bounds on the sizes of B_t and the marginal gains of the elements then lead to the theorem. \square

For our influence maximization problem (3), the number of matroids is $P = 2$ for modeling the item and user constraints. Noting that $|G| \leq f(G) \leq f(O)$, we have




Figure 4: For the randomly selected 512 nodes over the 64 item-specific diffusion networks, each of which has a total 1,048,576 nodes, (a) the estimated influence for increasing the number of items by fixing the item constraint $b = 8$ and users’ limited attention $u = 2$; (b) the estimated influence for increasing item constraint by fixing 64 items and $u = 2$; (c) the estimated influence for increasing users’ limited attention by fixing 64 items and $b = 8$. For all experiments, the time window is $T = 5$.

Corollary 4. *Suppose in Problem (3), item $i \in \mathcal{L}$ spreads according to diffusion network $\mathcal{G}_i = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_i)$. Let $i^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{E}_i|$. Then Algorithm 1 can output a solution G such that $f(G) \geq \frac{1-2\delta}{2+c_f} f(O)$ in expected time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{E}_{i^*}|+|\mathcal{V}|}{\delta^2} \log^3 \frac{|\mathcal{V}|}{\delta} + \frac{|\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{V}|}{\delta^3} \log^3 \frac{|\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{V}|}{\delta}\right)$.*

Proof. The approximation guarantee follows from $P = 2$ and from setting $\epsilon \leq \delta/16$ when using CONTINEST [6] to estimate the influence. The runtime is bounded as follows. In Algorithm 1, we need to estimate the marginal gain of adding one more item to the current solution. In CONTINEST [6], building the initial data structure takes time $\mathcal{O}\left((|\mathcal{E}_{i^*}| \log |\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{V}| \log^2 |\mathcal{V}|) \frac{1}{\delta^2} \log \frac{|\mathcal{V}|}{\delta}\right)$, and afterwards each function evaluation takes time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\delta^2} \log \frac{|\mathcal{V}|}{\delta} \log \log |\mathcal{V}|\right)$. As there are $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{N}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta}\right)$ evaluations where $N = |\mathcal{L}||\mathcal{V}|$, the runtime of our algorithm follows. \square

Since $0 \leq c_f \leq 1$ by definition, the algorithm achieves an approximation ratio roughly $\frac{1}{3}$. Again, the parameter δ leads to a tradeoff: larger δ decreases the approximation ratio but needs fewer and coarser influence estimations.

7 Experiments

We systematically evaluate the performance and scalability of our algorithm, denoted by BUDGETMAX, on the following datasets :

- synthetic networks which mimic the structural properties of real-world networks;
- real datasets crawled from massive media websites.

We compare BUDGETMAX to random baseline and degree-based heuristics and show that BUDGETMAX achieved significant performance gains in both cases.

7.1 Synthetic Diffusion Network Generation

We assume that different items have different diffusion paths and structures. In particular, we allow each item to spread over one of the following three different types of Kronecker networks[23]: (i) core-periphery networks (parameter matrix: $\begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}$) mimicking the diffusion traces of information in real world networks [12], (ii) the classic random networks ($\begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$) used in physics and graph theory [9] as well as (iii) hierarchical networks ($\begin{bmatrix} 0.9 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.9 \end{bmatrix}$) [11].

Once the network structure is generated, we assign a Weibull distribution [22]. The density function is $f(t; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \left(\frac{t}{\alpha}\right)^{\beta-1} e^{-(t/\alpha)^\beta}$, $t \geq 0$, with the scale parameter $\alpha > 0$ and the shape parameter $\beta > 0$, to each pair of nodes as the pairwise transmission function. For each edge, both α and β are chosen from 0 to 10 uniformly at random in order to have heterogeneous temporal dynamics.

In our experiments we used 64 items, each of which diffuses over one of the above three different types of networks with 1,048,576 nodes. In our experiments, we randomly select a subset $\mathcal{V}_S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ of 512 nodes as our candidate target set of users who will receive the given 64 items. The potential influence of an allocation will be evaluated over the underlying one-million-node networks.

7.2 Competitors

We compare BUDGETMAX with nodes' degree-based heuristics of the diffusion network which are usually applied in social network analysis, where the degree is treated as a natural measure of influence. Large-degree nodes, such as users with millions of followers in Twitter, are often the targeted users who will receive a considerable payment if he (she) agrees to post the adoption of some products (or ads) from merchants. As a consequence, we first sort the list of all pairs of item i and node $j \in \mathcal{V}_S$ in the descending order of node- j 's degree in the diffusion network of item i . Then, starting from the beginning of the list, we add each pair one by one. When the addition of the current pair to the existing solution violates the predefined matroid constraints, we simply throw it and continue to search the next pair until we reach the end of the list. Therefore, we greedily assign items to the nodes with large degree, and we refer to this heuristic as GreedyDegree. Finally, we consider the baseline method that assigns the items to the target nodes randomly.

7.3 Influence Maximization

On each of the 64 item-specific diffusion networks, we generate a set of 2,048 samples to estimate the influence of each node according to [6]. We repeat our experiments for 10 times and report the average performance in Figure 4 in which the adaptive threshold δ is set to 0.01.

First, Figure 4(a) compares the achieved influence by increasing the number of available items, each of which has constraint $b = 8$. As the number of items increases, on the one hand, more and more nodes become assigned, so the total influence will increase. Yet, on the other hand, the competitions for a few existing valuable nodes from which information diffuses faster also increases. For GreedyDegree, because high degree nodes may have many overlapping children and highly clustered, the marginal gain by targeting only these nodes could be small. In contrast, by taking both the network structure and the diffusion dynamics of the edges into consideration, BUDGETMAX is able to find allocations that could reach as many nodes as possible as time unfolds, which brings the best performance.

In Figure 4(b), we fix the set of 64 items while increasing the number of budget per item.




Figure 5: Runtime for (a) allocating increasing number of items to 512 users on the diffusion networks consisting of 1,048,576 nodes; and for (b) allocating 64 items to 512 users on on networks of varying size. For all experiments, we have item budget $b = 8$, user budget $u = 2$ and $T = 5$ time window. Panel (c) and (d) are the relative accuracy and the run-time for different threshold parameter δ .

Again, as the competitions increase, the performance of GreedyDegree tends to converge, while the advantage of BUDGETMAX becomes more dramatic.

Finally, we investigate the effect of increasing users' limited attention while fixing all the other parameters. As Figure 4(c) shows, the influence increases slowly for that fixed budget prevents additional new nodes to be assigned. This meets our intuition for that only making a fixed number of people watching more ads per day can hardly boost the popularity of the product. Moreover, even though the same node can be assigned to more items, because of the different diffusion structures, it cannot be the perfect source from which all items can efficiently spread.

7.4 Scalability

We further investigate the performance of BUDGETMAX in terms of runtime when using CONTINEST [6] as subroutine to estimate the influence. We can precompute the data structure and store the samples needed to estimate the influence function in advance. Therefore, we focus only on the runtime for the constrained influence maximization algorithm.

BUDGETMAX runs on 64 cores of 2.4Ghz by using OpenMP to accelerate the first round of the optimization. We report the allocation time for increasing number of items in Figure 5(a), which clearly shows a linear time complexity with respect to the size of the ground set. Figure 5(b) evaluates the runtime of allocation by varying the size of the network from 16,384 to 1,048,576 nodes. Moreover, we investigate the effect of the threshold parameter δ on the performance of the algorithm compared to that can be achieved by lazy evaluation on the network of 1,048,576 nodes with 64 items, 512 randomly selected users, $u = 4$ and $b = 8$. We can see that BUDGETMAX can scale up to millions of nodes.

7.5 Effects of Adaptive Thresholding

In Figure 5(c), we compared our adaptive thresholding algorithm to the lazy evaluation method. We plotted the achieved influence value by different threshold δ relative to the one achieved by the lazy evaluation method. Since the lazy evaluation method does not depend on the parameter, it is always one shown by the blue line. We can see that as δ increases, the accuracy will decrease. However, the performance is robust to δ in the sense that we can still keep 90-percent relative accuracy even if we use large δ . Finally, in Figure 5(d), we show that as δ increases, the runtime can be significantly reduced. Subsequently, Figure 5(c) and (d) verify the intuition that δ is able to trade off the solution quality of the allocation with the runtime. The larger δ becomes, the shorter the runtime will be, at the cost of reduced allocation quality.

7.6 Real-world Data

Finally, we investigate the allocation quality on real-world datasets. The MemeTracker dataset we have used contains 300 million blog posts and articles collected for the top 5,000 most active media sites from four million websites between March 2011 and February 2012 [15]. The flow of information was traced using quotes which are short textual phrases spreading through the websites. Because all published documents containing a particular quote are time-stamped, a cascade induced by the same quote is a collection of times when the media site first mentioned it.

The dataset is divided into groups, each of which consists of cascades built from quotes that were mentioned in posts containing a particular keyword. We have selected 64 groups with at least 100,000 cascades as our items, which include many well-known events such as ‘apple and jobs’, ‘tsunami earthquake’, ‘william kate marriage’, ‘occupy wall-street’, etc. We evenly split the data into two, using one half to learn the diffusion network by NETRATE with exponential transmission functions [11], and the other half for testing. Finally, we randomly select 128 nodes having nonzero out-degrees as our target users, and repeat our experiments for five times.

We first find an assignment using the learned networks from the training cascades from BUDGETMAX and GreedyDegree. We then evaluate its performance on the held-out testing cascades as follows : given an item-node pair (i, j) , let $\mathcal{C}(j)$ denote the set of cascades induced by item i that contains node j . The average number of nodes coming after j for all the cascades in $\mathcal{C}(j)$ is treated as the average influence by assigning item i to node j . Therefore, the influence of an allocation is just the sum of the average influence of each item-node pair in the solution. Figure 6 presents the evaluated results by varying the number of items (a), item budgets (b), limited attention (c) and the observation window T . Again, BUDGETMAX statistically achieves the best performance on the testing data with an average 16-percent improvement overall.




Figure 6: For the randomly selected 128 nodes over the 64 item-specific diffusion networks, the influence (a) against the increased number of items by fixing the item budget $b = 8$ and user budget $u = 4$; (b) against the increased item budget by fixing $u = 4$; (c) against the increased user’s attention by fixing $b = 8$; and (d) against the varying observation window T .

8 Discussion

We note that our formulation, algorithm, and theoretical results apply to significantly more general scenarios than the practical problem we addressed in the paper. We will investigate the following aspects of our method in future.

Our model can capture additional general budget constraints. For example, we want to assign a set of advertisements to members in a social network. For each advertisement i , we can cluster the members in the network into different groups $\mathcal{Z}_{i1}, \mathcal{Z}_{i2}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{it_i}$ based on a marketing strategy, and have a different budget b_{it} for each group \mathcal{Z}_{it} . This can be formalized as a partition matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I})$ where $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} : |S \cap \mathcal{Z}_{it}| \leq b_{it}, \forall i, t\}$. Similarly, the members in the network may have different interests in different types of products, so for each node j , we can cluster the advertisements into different groups $\mathcal{Z}_{1j}, \mathcal{Z}_{2j}, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_{s_jj}$ and assign to j at most u_{sj} items from \mathcal{Z}_{sj} . This can be formalized as a partition matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I})$ where $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} : |S \cap \mathcal{Z}_{sj}| \leq u_{sj}, \forall i, t\}$.

Our model can even capture constraints from an interweave of the marketing strategies of the items and the preferences of the nodes in the network. In the same example described above, suppose on a group of members \mathcal{V}_1 , the advertisement i has budget b_i and another advertisement i' has budget $b_{i'}$. Furthermore, to avoid too much competition between the two, at most $b < b_i + b_{i'}$ copies of i or i' can be assigned to this group of members. These can be formalized as a laminar matroid [10] as follows. Let $X_1 = \{i\} \times \mathcal{V}_1$ and $b(X_1) = b_i$, $X_2 = \{i'\} \times \mathcal{V}_1$ and $b(X_2) = b_{i'}$, and $X_3 = X_i \cup X_{i'}$ and $b(X_3) = b$. Define a laminar matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{I})$ where $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq \mathcal{Z} : |S \cap X_i| \leq b(X_i), \forall i\}$. Then any assignment in \mathcal{M} satisfies the requirement described.

9 Conclusion

We study the problem of maximizing the influence of multiple types of information (or items) in realistic continuous-time diffusion networks, subject to both user and item budget constraints: each user can only be recommended to a small number of items and each item can be displayed a limited number of times. We provide a novel formulation as a submodular maximization under an intersection of matroid constraints and then design an efficient adaptive threshold greedy algorithm with provable theoretical approximation guarantees. Experiment results show that the proposed algorithm performs significantly better than other scalable alternatives in both synthetic and real

world datasets. Furthermore, our formulation, algorithms and theoretical guarantees extends to more general practical scenarios.

References

- [1] A. Badanidiyuru and J. Vondrák. Fast algorithms for maximizing submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2014.
- [2] C. Borgs, M. Brautbar, J. Chayes, and B. Lucier. Influence maximization in social networks: Towards an optimal algorithmic solution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0884*, 2012.
- [3] W. Chen, C. Wang, and Y. Wang. Scalable influence maximization for prevalent viral marketing in large-scale social networks. In *KDD '10*, 2010.
- [4] W. Chen, Y. Wang, and S. Yang. Efficient influence maximization in social networks. In *KDD*, pages 199–208, 2009.
- [5] P. Domingos and M. Richardson. Mining the network value of customers. In *Proceedings of the seventh ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2001.
- [6] N. Du, L. Song, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and H. Zha. Scalable influence estimation in continuous-time diffusion networks. In *NIPS*, 2013.
- [7] N. Du, L. Song, A. J. Smola, and M. Yuan. Learning networks of heterogeneous influence. In *NIPS*, 2012.
- [8] N. Du, L. Song, H. Woo, and H. Zha. Uncover topic-sensitive information diffusion networks. In *AISTATS*, 2013.
- [9] D. Easley and J. Kleinberg. *Networks, Crowds, and Markets: Reasoning About a Highly Connected World*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [10] S. Fujishige. *Submodular Functions and Optimization: Second Edition*, volume 58 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. 2005.
- [11] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf. Uncovering the temporal dynamics of diffusion networks. In *ICML*, 2011.
- [12] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and A. Krause. Inferring networks of diffusion and influence. In *KDD*, pages 1019–1028, 2010.
- [13] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and B. Schölkopf. Modeling information propagation with survival theory. In *ICML*, 2013.
- [14] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and B. Schölkopf. Structure and Dynamics of Information Pathways in On-line Media. In *WSDM*, 2013.
- [15] M. Gomez Rodriguez, J. Leskovec, and B. Schölkopf. Structure and dynamics of information pathways in online media. In *Proceedings of the sixth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining, WSDM '13*, 2013.

- [16] M. Gomez-Rodriguez and B. Schölkopf. Influence maximization in continuous time diffusion networks. In *ICML '12*, 2012.
- [17] D. Ienco, F. Bonchi, and C. Castillo. The meme ranking problem: Maximizing microblogging virality. In *ICDM Workshops*, 2010.
- [18] K. Jung, W. Heo, and W. Chen. Irie: Scalable and robust influence maximization in social networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, 2012.
- [19] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos. Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automata, Languages and Programming*. 2005.
- [20] D. Kempe, J. M. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *KDD*, 2003.
- [21] A. Krause and D. Golovin. Submodular function maximization. *Tractability: Practical Approaches to Hard Problems*, 2012.
- [22] J. F. Lawless. *Statistical Models and Methods for Lifetime Data*. Wiley-Interscience, 2002.
- [23] J. Leskovec, D. Chakrabarti, J. M. Kleinberg, C. Faloutsos, and Z. Ghahramani. Kronecker graphs: An approach to modeling networks. *JMLR*, 11:985–1042, 2010.
- [24] G. Nemhauser, L. Wolsey, and M. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 14(1), 1978.
- [25] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*, volume 24 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. 2003.
- [26] T. Sun, W. Chen, Z. Liu, Y. Wang, X. Sun, M. Zhang, and C.-Y. Lin. Participation maximization based on social influence in online discussion forums. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 2011.
- [27] K. Zhou, L. Song, and H. Zha. Learning social infectivity in sparse low-rank networks using multi-dimensional hawkes processes. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2013.
- [28] K. Zhou, H. Zha, and L. Song. Learning triggering kernels for multi-dimensional hawkes processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning(ICML)*, 2013.

A Proof for Adaptive Threshold Greedy Algorithm

Theorem 3 Suppose Algorithm 1 uses \hat{f} to estimate the function f which satisfies $|\hat{f}(S) - f(S)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. Let O denote the optimal solution. Then Algorithm 1 uses $\mathcal{O}(\min\{|G|N, \frac{N}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta}\})$ evaluations of \hat{f} , and returns a greedy solution G with

$$f(G) \geq \frac{1}{(1+2\delta)(P+c_f)} f(O) - \frac{4P|G|}{P+c_f} \epsilon.$$

Proof. The number of evaluations is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\frac{N}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta})$ since there are $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\delta} \log \frac{N}{\delta})$ thresholds, and there are $\mathcal{O}(N)$ evaluations at each threshold. It is also bounded by $\mathcal{O}(|G|N)$, since we only need to update the marginal gains after the greedy solution is updated, which happens $|G|$ times.

To prove the approximation guarantee, consider the elements of the greedy solution G in the order they are added by the algorithm: for $t = 1, \dots, K = |G|$, let $G^t = \{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$. We define A_t to be the elements in $O \setminus G^{t-1}$ that will not violate the constraint if added to G^{t-1} :

$$A_t = \{j \in O \setminus G^{t-1} : G^{t-1} \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{F}\}, \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, K+1.$$

Note that $A_1 = O$, and by the down-monotonicity of \mathcal{F} , $A_1 \supseteq A_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq A_{K+1}$. Let $B_t = A_t \setminus A_{t+1}$. See Figure 7 for illustration.




Figure 7: Notation for analyzing the adaptive threshold greedy algorithm. The elements in the greedy solution G are arranged according to the order of being selected in Step 3 in Algorithm 1. A_t are all those elements in O that are available for selection when the current solution is $G^{t-1} = \{g_1, \dots, g_{t-1}\}$. That is, A_t are all those elements $j \in O$ that satisfy: (1) $j \notin G^{t-1}$; (2) $j \cup G^{t-1}$ does not violate the matroid constraints. B_t (colored in grey) are those elements in $A_t \setminus A_{t+1}$.

In the following, we will prove two claims and then use them to prove the theorem. For simplicity, for any $i \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, denote the marginal gain of i with respect to S by $f(i|S) = f(S \cup \{i\}) - f(S)$, and denote its approximation by $\hat{f}(i|S) = \hat{f}(S \cup \{i\}) - \hat{f}(S)$. We have $|f(i|S) - \hat{f}(i|S)| \leq 2\epsilon$ for any $i \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$.

Claim 1.

$$\sum_{t=1}^K \sum_{j \in B_t} f(j|G^t) \leq (1+\delta) \sum_{t=1}^K |B_t| f(g_t|G^{t-1}) + \delta\tau_1 + (4+2\delta)\epsilon|A_1|.$$

Proof. For $1 \leq t \leq K$, let τ_t be the value of the threshold when g_t was included in G . Let G^{K_0} denote the elements in greedy solution that added at non-zero thresholds, *i.e.*, suppose $G = G^{K_0} = \{g_1, \dots, g_{K_0}\}$ right before the threshold $w_{L+1} = 0$.

First, consider $t \leq K_0$. For any $t \leq K_0$, we clearly have $\widehat{f}(g_t|G^{t-1}) \geq \tau_t$ and thus $f(g_t|G^{t-1}) \geq \tau_t - 2\epsilon$. For each $j \in A_t$, if j were considered at a stage earlier, than it would have been added to G since adding it to G^{t-1} will not violate the constraint. However, $j \notin G^{t-1}$, so $\widehat{f}(j|G^{t-1}) \leq (1 + \delta)\tau_t$. Then $f(j|G^{t-1}) \leq (1 + \delta)\tau_t + 2\epsilon \leq (1 + \delta)f(g_t|G^{t-1}) + (4 + 2\delta)\epsilon$.

Next consider $t > K_0$. For each $j \in B_t$, we have $\widehat{f}(j|G) < \frac{\delta}{N}d$. In fact, the first element g_1 is of value $d = \tau_1$, so $f(j|G) < \frac{\delta}{N}\tau_1 + 2\epsilon$.

Combining the bounds on the marginal gains of elements in $A_1 \setminus A_{K_0+1}$ and A_{K_0+1} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^K \sum_{j \in B_t} f(j|G) &\leq (1 + \delta) \sum_{t=1}^{K_0} |B_t| f(g_t|G^{t-1}) + (4 + 2\delta)\epsilon \sum_{t=1}^{K_0} |B_t| + |A_{K_0+1}| \left(\frac{\delta}{N} \tau_1 + 2\epsilon \right) \\ &\leq (1 + \delta) \sum_{t=1}^K |B_t| f(g_t|G^{t-1}) + \delta\tau_1 + (4 + 2\delta)\epsilon |A_1| \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from $|A_{K_0+1}| \leq N$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{K_0} |B_t| + |A_{K_0+1}| = |A_1|$. \square

Claim 2. $\sum_{i=1}^t |B_i| \leq Pt$, for $t = 1, \dots, K$.

Proof. To bound this, we need to introduce some notations about matroids. Define $r_p(S)$, called the rank of S in matroid \mathcal{M}_p , to be the cardinality of a largest independent set contained in S in matroid \mathcal{M}_p . Define $\text{sp}^p(S)$, called the span of S in matroid \mathcal{M}_p , to be

$$\text{sp}^p(S) = \{j \in \mathcal{Z} : r_p(S \cup \{j\}) = r_p(S)\}.$$

When $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, for each $j \in A_1 \setminus A_{t+1}$, either $j \in G$ or j must have failed the independence test at Step 4. In both cases, there exist p and $s \leq t$ such that $j \in \text{sp}^p(G^s) \subseteq \text{sp}^p(G^t)$. This leads to $A_1 \setminus A_{t+1} \subseteq \bigcup_{p=1}^P \text{sp}^p(G^t)$. Since $A_1 \setminus A_{t+1} \subseteq O$ is independent and $\text{sp}^p(G^t)$ has rank t , we have $\sum_{i=1}^t |B_i| = |A_1 \setminus A_{t+1}| \leq \sum_{p=1}^P |(A_1 \setminus A_{t+1}) \cap \text{sp}^p(G^t)| \leq Pt$. \square

By the two claims, we can bound the difference between the optimal solution and the greedy solution as follows. First, suppose $G \setminus O = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m\}$. By definition of the curvature,

$$f(O \cup G) = f(O) + \sum_{i=1}^m f(j_i|O \cup \{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}\}) \geq f(O) + (1 - c_f) \sum_{j \in G \setminus O} f(\{j\}).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$f(O \cup G) \leq f(G) + \sum_{j \in O \setminus G} f(j|G).$$

Combining the two inequalities leads to

$$f(O) + (1 - c_f) \sum_{j \in G \setminus O} f(\{j\}) \leq f(G) + \sum_{j \in O \setminus G} f(j|G).$$

Adding $\sum_{g_t \in G \cap O} f(g_t | G^{t-1})$ on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(O) + (1 - c_f) \sum_{g_t \in G} f(g_t | G^{t-1}) &\leq f(G) + \sum_{j \in O \setminus G} f(j | G) + \sum_{g_t \in G \cap O} f(g_t | G^{t-1}) \\ &\leq f(G) + \sum_{t=1}^K \sum_{j \in B_t} f(j | G^{t-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the theorem follows from the two claims and Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 5. *If $\sum_{i=1}^t \sigma_{i-1} \leq t$ for $t = 1, \dots, K$ and $\rho_{i-1} \geq \rho_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ with $\rho_i, \sigma_i \geq 0$, then $\sum_{i=1}^K \rho_i \sigma_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \rho_{i-1}$.*

Proof. Consider the linear program

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \max_{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^K \rho_i \sigma_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &\sum_{i=1}^t \sigma_{i-1} \leq t, \quad t = 1, \dots, K, \\ &\sigma_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1 \end{aligned}$$

with dual

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \min_u \sum_{i=1}^K t u_{t-1} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &\sum_{t=i}^{K-1} u_t \geq \rho_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, K-1, \\ &u_t \geq 0, \quad t = 0, \dots, K-1. \end{aligned}$$

As $\rho_i \geq \rho_{i+1}$, the solution $u_i = \rho_i - \rho_{i+1}, i = 0, \dots, K-1$ (where $\rho_K = 0$) is dual feasible with value $\sum_{t=1}^K t(\rho_{t-1} - \rho_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K \rho_{i-1}$. By weak linear programming duality, $\sum_{i=1}^K \rho_i \sigma_i \leq V \leq W \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \rho_{i-1}$. \square

When δ is sufficiently small so that there is at most one marginal gain value in each interval $[w_i, w_{i+1}] (0 \leq i \leq L)$, essentially Algorithm 1 repeatedly selects the $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with maximum marginal gain $f(z|G)$, *i.e.*, it is equivalent to the original greedy algorithm without decreasing thresholds [24]. Formally,

Corollary 6. *Suppose δ is sufficiently small such that*

$$(1 + \delta) < \min \left\{ \frac{\widehat{f}(z_1 | S_1)}{\widehat{f}(z_2 | S_2)} : \widehat{f}(z_1 | S_1) > \widehat{f}(z_2 | S_2) \right\}$$

and $\frac{\delta d}{N} < \min\{\widehat{f}(z|S) \neq 0\}$. Then Algorithm 1 can be implemented to run in time $\mathcal{O}(|G|N)$, and

$$f(G) \geq \frac{1}{P + c_f} f(O) - \frac{4P|G|}{P + c_f} \epsilon.$$

Proof. The value of δ is so small that there is only one item that has marginal gain between w_i and w_{i+1} for any $i = 0, \dots, L$ during the execution of the algorithm. Then the algorithm is equivalent to the standard greedy algorithm. \square