# Introduction

<!-- X Brief description of the dataset used; -->

<!-- X from where was the dataset obtained; -->

<!-- X what form was the dataset in (edge list or triangular matrix); -->

In this report I will present a dataset obtained from the [http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php](http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php) website; it is a retweet network of the US president Barack Obama. The network was downloaded in a form of an edge list.

<!-- X what interested the student about the dataset; -->

I wanted to see if by performing a set of tests on the network, it would be possible to identify Barack Obama's vertex. I believe I succeeded to identify the aforementioned vertex with a considerable degree of confidence. Inter alia, I will: present the reasoning and the methods which led to me to such a conclusion; describe the dataset; find the shortest path between the top two nodes with the highest degrees as well as the nodes with the highest and the lowest degree; identify 138 communities within the network and their range; calculate and analyse the network's closeness, betweenness and eigenvector centrality; conduct the visual analysis.

<!-- X what questions would they like to answer about the dataset; -->

<!-- This is why the network could be even thought of as a network of tweets connected by retweets because each user has his tweets connected to his account; it does not matter if we talk about the tweets being retweeted or the users. Each user has their tweets, but the tweets are not visible in the network, so the term user or tweet can be used almost interchangeably. The only difference is that in the network of users (on the contrary to the network of tweets) each user (vertex) can have multiple tweets attached to them and can be connected to other users (vertices) only by a single edge (retweet) because the network would still show just a single edge between the users, even if a user retweeted Barack Obama a thousand of times. -->

# Methods

The network was analysed using R and Python programming languages, and Gephi software package. The data statistics were calculated using Python; the data preparation and manipulation was done using R; the data visualisation was done using R and Gephi.

## Dataset description

The only way the two users can get connected in the network is by a retweet, i.e. when one of them retweets a tweet of the other one; in other words, one of them must have retweeted the other, because there is an edge (retweet) between the vertices (users). The number of times a user retweets another user is not relevant in this case – once someone retweets someone, there is going to be a single edge (retweet) between them. The edge can be thought of as an event, instead of a quantifying feature.

<!-- If we were designing a class in Python for the vertex/user and the edge/retweet their class diagrams could look like this: -->

<!-- | Tweet | -->

<!-- | - | -->

<!-- | -tweet\_id : int -->

<!-- - tweet\_content : string | -->

<!-- | +retweeted() : User -->

<!-- | -->

<!-- | Retweet (Edge) | -->

<!-- | - | -->

<!-- | +connect(user\_id\_1 : User, user\_id\_2 : User) : bool | -->

<!-- | User (Vertex) | -->

<!-- | - | -->

<!-- | -Tweet : List -->

<!-- | -->

<!-- | + -->

<!-- | -->

It could be visualised even better, if we thought of the user (vertex) and the retweet (edge) as classes in Python (or any other OOP language). The user has his own id, a list of his own tweets as well as a list of connected users (by retweets). The network is a retweet network, so the tweets do not really matter; the only thing that will matter are the users' ids and a list of connected users by retweets - which is in fact our network.

<!-- In the network, the vertices are the twitter users, the edges are the retweets, ergo the twitter users are connected by the retweets. -->

<!-- This is why the network could be even thought of as a network of tweets connected by retweets because each user has his tweets connected to his account; it does not matter if we talk about the tweets being retweeted or the users. Each user has their tweets, but the tweets are not the part of the network, so the term user or tweet can be used almost interchangeably. The only difference is that in the network of users (on the contrary to a network of tweets) each user (vertex) can have multiple tweets attached to them and can be connected to other users (vertices) only by a single edge (retweet) because the network would still show just a single edge between the users, even if a user retweeted a thousand of Barack Obama's tweets. We can suspect that when the data was being collected, the only thing that was taken into account was if the user retweeted at least one of the Barack Obama's tweets; if they did, then there would be an edge (retweet) between them. This would also make the data collection way more efficient because analysing all the tweets of all the users, against Barack Obama's tweets, would have a complexity of O(n^2) and it could take dozens of hours to create such a network. In other words, for the network creation, we do not need to know how many of Barack Obama's tweets someone has retweeted; it only matters if they retweeted it and from who. -->

<!-- X What data preparation did they have to carry out; -->

## Data Preparation

The data was prepared using R programming language and RStudio software; the data was downloaded, unzipped and saved into an R table (within the code). \*Timestamp\* column was dropped (it would be useful if the dataset was being updated; then it could be used to update the set only from a certain timestamp but in this case the set was a complete one).

By default, R names the columns like this:

$$ x = \big\{V1, V2, ... , Vn \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \big\} $$

To make the data manipulation easier the columns were renamed, such that:

| Previous column name | Changed column name |

| - | - |

| V1 | from |

| V2 | to |

Later, the data was saved in a `.csv` format so it could be easily loaded into memory using Python programming language.

<!-- X definitions of the network metrics used; any code should be provided in the Appendix of the report or as separate files; -->

<!-- Comment -->

<!-- methods section is not well presented - an explicit description of the nodes and edges is not given until near the end of this section. Some assumptions are stated as fact (Obama is the highest degree node for example). -->

<!-- X which metrics did they use to analyse the data; -->

## Metadata

The following metadata (which can be found on the [http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php](http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php) website) was used in the network analysis:

```{r, out.width="1.00\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/png/Metadata.png")

```

<!-- | | Metadata | | -->

<!-- | - | - | - | -->

<!-- | Category | Sparse Network | -->

<!-- | Collection | Retweet Network | -->

<!-- | Vertex type | User | -->

<!-- | Edge type | Retweet | -->

<!-- | Edge weights | Unweighted | -->

<!-- | Description | Nodes are twitter users and edges are retweets. These were collected from various social and political hashtags | -->

The dataset creators stated that the data was collected from "various social and political hashtags". It is not clear what methods were used but I suspect that once a user (which later will become a vertex in the network) retweeted Barack Obama's tweet, a retweet link (the edge in the network) was created. Later, in the dataset visualisation, it is clearly visible that some people retweeted the retweets of someone who retweeted Barack Obama's tweets. This would create a path in the network to Barack Obama. The creators did not state if the network was simple or not but the fact that the network is sparse, tells us that the creators took the steps to improve the network's efficiency in loading into memory and its computation time. The sparsity statistic was not given so it is not certain to what degree the network's connection weights were reduced to 0 or very close to 0. The creators did not also specifically state if the network is simple or not but their efforts to make it as efficient as possible lead me to an assumption that the network is a simple one, meaning it contains no loops or multiple edges; the visual analysis, as well as the size metrics, confirm this assumption, on which I elaborate in the next section.

## Network size metrics

The analysis conducted with Python relied on the correct data preparation in R; it was crucial for further analysis, for the statistics from the ‘Network Repository’ website, like \*number of nodes\*, \*number of edges\*, \*average degree\* etc. (Rossi and Ahmed, 2015) to match the ones I calculated. The statistics matched and the comparison of the results is presented in the table below:

| | Calculated Statistics | Website Statistics |

| - | -------------------| --------------------- |

| Number of nodes | 9631 | 9.6K |

| Number of edges | 9775 | 9.8K |

| Average degree | 2.0299 | 2 |

## Network Structure Metrics

The graph in undirected so it does not contain in- or out-degrees. Instead, the highest degree node was found - it had an id of 2506 and degree of 7655.

## Network Density

The network’s density is equal to 0.000210789557302036, which is close to zero, meaning - our graph is close to being ‘fully disconnected’.

## Shortest Path Between Two Nodes

The shortest path between the top two nodes with the highest degree and between the nodes with the highest and the lowest degree:

### Top Two

The top two nodes with the highest degree had ids: 2506 (assumed to be Barack Obama) and 9302 (assumed to be Barack Obama’s biggest retweet community). Shortest path between these two nodes is: ['2506', '8474', '9302']; the length of this path is 2, which means they are not connected directly.

### Highest and Lowest Degree

As already mentioned, the id of the node with the highest degree is: 2506 and the id of the node with the lowest degree is: 2709; the shortest path between these two nodes is: ['2506', '2709'] and its length is 1, meaning the nodes are connected directly; if my assumptions are correct, it is likely a person who retweeted Barack Obama's tweet but is not a part of any community and their retweet, of Barack Obama’s tweet, was not retweeted by anyone.

## Identifying Network Communities

138 community groups were identified:

`Counter({1: 7414, 6: 611, 7: 158, 12: 114, 4: 106, 2: 102, 50: 84, 5: 69, 88: 66, 61: 61, 127: 53, 35: 49, 19: 39, 25: 38, 17: 27, 111: 27, 77: 26, 23: 25, 112: 25, 0: 22, 49: 22, 26: 20, 54: 15, 37: 14, 102: 14, 22: 13, 41: 12, 48: 12, 55: 12, 9: 11, 15: 10, 32: 10, 75: 10, 97: 10, 34: 9, 38: 9, 82: 9, 85: 9, 13: 8, 3: 7, 29: 7, 84: 7, 105: 7, 108: 7, 68: 6, 78: 6, 83: 6, 117: 6, 86: 5, 110: 5, 8: 4, 27: 4, 31: 4, 62: 4, 67: 4, 79: 4, 93: 4, 100: 4, 129: 4, 10: 3, 20: 3, 36: 3, 40: 3, 47: 3, 66: 3, 70: 3, 80: 3, 81: 3, 87: 3, 90: 3, 95: 3, 104: 3, 107: 3, 114: 3, 125: 3, 133: 3, 134: 3, 139: 3, 11: 2, 14: 2, 16: 2, 18: 2, 21: 2, 24: 2, 28: 2, 30: 2, 33: 2, 39: 2, 42: 2, 43: 2, 44: 2, 45: 2, 46: 2, 51: 2, 52: 2, 53: 2, 56: 2, 57: 2, 58: 2, 59: 2, 60: 2, 63: 2, 64: 2, 65: 2, 69: 2, 71: 2, 72: 2, 73: 2, 74: 2, 76: 2, 89: 2, 91: 2, 92: 2, 94: 2, 96: 2, 98: 2, 99: 2, 101: 2, 103: 2, 106: 2, 109: 2, 113: 2, 115: 2, 116: 2, 118: 2, 119: 2, 120: 2, 121: 2, 122: 2, 123: 2, 124: 2, 126: 2, 128: 2, 130: 2, 131: 2, 132: 2, 135: 2, 136: 2, 137: 2, 138: 2})`

It was calculated that the sizes of the communities ranged from 2 to 7414. It could be assumed that the biggest community is likely to be centred around Barack Obama; these would be the people who retweeted his tweets directly from him.

## Network Structure Connectivity

Investigation reveals that the Barack Obama network is fully connected, and it has no sub-components; this is not surprising because the edges are retweets, nodes are twitter users and the network consists only of users who retweeted Barack Obama's posts.

## Network Hubs/Brokers

Betweenness and closeness centrality was successfully calculated (although, it took almost 40 minutes to compute) and sorted from the highest to the lowest score for top 20 results; but the `(PowerIterationFailedConvergence(...), 'power iteration failed to converge within 100 iterations')`

error kept occurring when calculating the eigenvector centrality; replacing `nx.eigenvector\_centrality` with `nx.eigenvector\_centrality\_numpy` solved the issue (Stack Overflow, 2019) and after the fix, the computation was almost instantaneous.

Barack Obama’s assumed node (id = 2506) had the highest score in closeness, betweenness and eigenvector centrality, which means:

- The highest closeness centrality score – it is the farthest away from all other nodes in the network or – it takes the most time to spread information sequentially from it to other nodes (Sciencedirect.com, 2019).

- The highest betweenness centrality score – it has the highest number of distinct paths that strictly contain it in-between (Sci.unich.it, 2019).

- The highest eigenvector centrality score – it is the most influential node in the network.

# Results

<!-- X Have they been able to answer the queries they wished to pose as described in the introduction; X visualisation(s) of the network structure; X results from the analyses described in methods; -->

The network is a retweet network of Barack Obama's tweets; it is not obvious that Barack Obama (as a user) features in the network; the highest degree vertex could be someone who's retweeted Barack Obama thousands of times. At the time, it could had been his official \@POTUS twitter account which used to retweet every tweet from his private [\@BarackObama](https://twitter.com/barackobama) twitter account. This would mean that every single person in the network had retweeted the POTUS account instead of Barack Obama's private account (\@POTUS account gets thousands of retweets, so it is possible). Although, the fact that it is "Barack Obama's retweet network" suggests that his vertex is in the network and most plausibly, the highest degree vertex is Barack Obama's private twitter account.

It could also be thought that the vertex with the highest degree could be [\@POTUS44](https://twitter.com/POTUS44) (the archival twitter account of Barack Obama’s tweets when he was the incumbent from 2009 to 2017). Albeit, this is unlikely, given that the data reference request is dated to 2015. This would mean that the dataset was created when Barack Obama was the incumbent president.

```{r, out.width="1.00\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.aligh="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/png/reference.png")

```

Which leaves us with a hypothesis that the data was collected from either \@POTUS (which in 2015 was Barack Obama) or \@BarackObama. The title of the network, and no apparent reason why it would be taken from any other twitter account retweeting the original tweets by Barack Obama, leads me to a conclusion that the data was gathered from Barack Obama's official twitter account.

<!-- Comments -->

<!-- Results section is mainly comprised of different visualisations of the network (metric calculations are in Methods section but are taken into account here). -->

## Data Visualisation

Because the data represents a network of users and was likely collected from Barack Obama's official twitter account, it was assumed that the biggest community of 7414 would be Barack Obama’s first-degree neighbours. This cannot be really well seen on the graph without any colouring or sizing:

```{r, out.width="1.0\\linewidth", keepaspectratio, include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/Network/vanilla.pdf")

```

\pagebreak

Barack Obama’s node can be immediately seen (The big red one, obstructed by a bunch of smaller, blue nodes) when the node’s degree is distinguished using sizing and colouring:

```{r, out.width="0.95\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/Network/size\ colour\ node\ degree.pdf")

```

\pagebreak

The graph becomes even more readable when colouring is used to represent the node’s score of closeness and the node’s sizing - to represent its measure of betweenness:

```{r, out.width="0.95\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/Network/colour\ closeness\ -\ size\ betweenness\ with\ NO\ lgl.pdf")

```

\pagebreak

The same graph was plotted using `Large Graph Layout` function which slightly improved the readability of the graph:

```{r, out.width="0.95\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/Network/colour\ closeness\ -\ size\ betweenness\ with\ lgl.pdf")

```

\pagebreak

Interesting results were achieved using `Gephi` (Gephi.org, 2019), were it is clearly visible that there is one central node in the network (assumed to be Barack Obama’s private twitter account); some of the 138 community groups (clusters) can be visible in the graph - there is one bigger cluster which was marked with an orange frame and many smaller ones which were marked with a green frame; the framed clusters are some of the 138 identified community groups, characterised by the size ranging from 2 to 611 (the smallest community having the size of 2 and the second largest – 611).

```{r, out.width="0.85\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/pdf/graph\ marked.pdf")

```

\pagebreak

The second largest community of size 611 up close:

```{r, out.width="1.00\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/png/cluster.png")

```

\pagebreak

The aforementioned community is centred around the node with an id of 9302. These are the users who are centred around the user, who retweeted Barack Obama’s tweets the most; this could be the Democratic Party’s or his wife’s twitter account.

```{r, out.width="1.00\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/png/cluster\_label.png")

```

<!-- About the cluster 9302 -->

All the network’s 138 communities are likely to be: organisations associated with the Democratic Party (or not, e.g. there could be a community gathered around an account taunting Barack Obama), people supporting Barack Obama, or his close family members and friends, who were actively retweeting his tweets.

\pagebreak

Below is the zoom of the node with the highest degree and the biggest community (it is the zoomed in graph generated with Gephi but with the node-labels on), where it is clearly visible that the most central node, has an id of 2506:

```{r, out.width="1.00\\linewidth", include=TRUE, fig.align="center", echo=FALSE}

knitr::include\_graphics("/Users/mateuszzaremba/dev/R/Networks/png/Screenshot\ 2019-12-17\ at\ 19.01.19.png")

```

# Conclusion

<!-- Comment-->

<!-- Student does state that they have "very likely" identified Barack Obama's node (although I disagree - if edges are retweets then is he likely to have retweeted so much of his own posts? This is out of character for him in my opinion. This node is more likely a close family member, publicist or close friend). Conclusions are a bit scarce - further analysis on any communities within this network should have been suggested (or better carried out here). -->

<!-- What can be inferred from their analysis of the network; If they could answer their initial questions, what were the answers; was the dataset detailed enough - if not what other information could have been useful in the analysis; what problems did they encounter; how could they have overcame them; -->

To my best knowledge, the report presents compelling evidence for the conclusion that the node with an id of 2506 is Barack Obama's private twitter account.

The MIT 'Electome project' analysis (Enter the Electome, 2020), provided exclusively to Vice News (Thompson, 2020), shows Trump vs Clinton campaign (which also ties into Barack Obama's end of presidency in 2017) that the Democrats and the Republicans live in their own social bubbles on twitter. This might bring us to an assumption that people who have interacted with Barack Obama's tweets (by retweeting them) are most likely living in one of these bubbles or are his devotees (all of them are likely to be a part of an even bigger network of the Democrats on twitter). It is also possible that people who are not Barack Obama's supporters would retweet him to comment on his tweets; they might be even creating one of the communities within the spoken network.

Some of the challenges were rendered by the size of the network which made it quite difficult to work with; calculation of the node betweenness and closeness centrality took approx. 40 minutes. Plotting of the network in R took only a few moments but it was only due to the fact that the nodes' labels were not being displayed, otherwise, it was taking approx. 5-10 minutes to plot. Nonetheless, an attempt was made to speed up the process using `with\_lgl(…)` (Rdrr.io, 2019) function for `Large Graph Layout` (See Appendix B) but no improvement in rendering speed was noticed apart from a slightly better visual representation of the communities.

One of the things that could be done in the future, to improve calculation and render times, when analysing as big or even bigger networks, could be a usage of a GPU for network analysis. (Mathworks.com, 2019); e.g. GeForce GTS 250 has 450 cores working in parallel versus 4 on the CPU (Kajan and Slačka, 2019).

Overall, the original data found on the [http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php](http://networkrepository.com/rt-barackobama.php) website was well described and of good quality; the metadata and statistics provided good insight, and the size of the data was appropriate for a comprehensive analysis.

\pagebreak