

Cost-efficient Strategies for Restraining Rumor Spreading in Mobile Social Networks

Zaobo He, *Student Member, IEEE*, Zhipeng Cai, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Jiguo Yu, Xiaoming Wang, Yunchuan Sun, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Yingshu Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—With the popularity of mobile devices, Mobile Social Networks (MSNs) have become an important platform for information dissemination. However, the spread of rumors in MSNs present a massive social threat. Currently, there are two kinds of methods to address this: blocking rumors at influential users and spreading truth to clarify rumors. However, most existing works either overlook the cost of various methods or only consider different methods individually. This paper proposes a heterogeneous network based epidemic model that incorporates the two kinds of methods to describe rumor spreading in MSNs. Moreover, two cost-efficient strategies are designed to restrain rumors. The first one is the Real-Time Optimization (RTO) strategy that minimizes the rumor-restraining cost by optimally combining various rumor-restraining methods such that a rumor can be extinct within an expected time period. The second one is the Pulse Spreading truth and Continuous Blocking rumor (PSCB) strategy that restrains rumor spreading through spreading truth periodically. The two strategies can restrain rumors in a continuous or periodical manner and guarantee cost-efficiency. The experiments towards the Digg2009 dataset demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed model and the efficiency of the two strategies.

Index Terms—Blocking rumors, Spreading truth, Pontryagin's Maximum Principle, Pulse immunization, Maximum immunization period.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the advance of mobile communication technology, Mobile Social Networks (MSNs) are providing diverse services through interconnecting mobile devices and social networks. Unfortunately, MSNs also pave the way for the spread of rumors, unverified claims and other kinds of disinformation. It has been shown that rumors spread much faster in MSNs than in other networks, and cause more severe consequences [1]. For example, on April 23, 2013, the rumor “*Two bombs had exploded at the White House and Barack Obama is injured*” spread in Twitter and caused the US stock market to crash in a few minutes [2].

Currently, there are two kinds of methods for restraining rumor spreading in MSNs: *blocking rumors* at influential users [3] [4] [5] [6] and *spreading truth* to clarify rumors [7] [8].

Z. He, Z. Cai and Y. Li are with Department of Computer Science, Georgia State University, 25 Park Place, Atlanta, GA, 30302, USA. Email: zhe4@student.gsu.edu, zcai@gsu.edu, yili@gsu.edu

J. Yu is with School of Information Science and Engineering, Qufu Normal University, Rizhao, Shandong, 276826, China. Email: jiguoyu@sina.com. To whom correspondence should be addressed.

X. Wang is with School of Computer Science, Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, 710119, China. Email: wangxm@snnu.edu.cn

Y. Sun is with Business School, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China. Email: yunch@bnu.edu.cn

Manuscript received April, 01, 2015; revised April, 22, 2015.

Unfortunately, the costs to carry out these two methods are usually overlooked [9] [5]. The first kind of method may violate human rights and persuading someone to abandon her current opinion is a tedious work. Hence, the first kind of methods generally needs various resources such as incentives, supported documents and so forth. Similarly, *spreading truth* needs the cooperation with social medias and requires several network resources such as channels. For simplicity, we denote *blocking rumors* at influential users and *spreading truth* to clarify rumors as *immunization* and *cure* in the rest of the paper without confusion, respectively. Moreover, immunization and cure are individually considered in most exiting works [3] [4] [5] [6]. Hence, prior works overestimate the efficiency of the designed countermeasures and are costly. In this paper, we present two strategies to restrain rumor spreading, both of which consider immunization and cure with limited costs. We first propose a Real-Time Optimization (RTO) strategy that minimizes the rumor-restraining cost by optimally combining immunization and cure, so that a rumor can be extinct within an expected time period. With the optimization objective, RTO provides the optimized rates for immunization and cure in a realtime manner. Obviously, RTO requires immunization and cure to be conducted continuously in a period. Namely, at any time t , $t \in [0, t_f]$ where t_f is an expected time period, both immunization and cure should be carried out with certain rates. Obviously, RTO needs to occupy rumor-restraining resources continuously since it continuously spreads truth to immunize susceptible users (*i.e.*, immunization). However, it is challenging, sometimes impossible, to continuously consume the limited resources in a period among multi-parties. Therefore, this challenge motivates us to propose the PSCB strategy that carries out immunization in a periodical manner. Therefore, we propose a Pulse Spreading truth and Continuous Blocking rumor strategy (PSCB) that restrains rumor spreading by spreading truth periodically. PSCB intends to find a maximum period so that the cost of spreading truth can be reduced. We denote such a period as the *maximum immunization period*. RTO is applicable when rumor-restraining resources are enough and rumors are intended to be restrained within a certain time period. Comparatively, PSCB is applicable when resources are not enough and there is no specific time limitation to restrain rumor. The main contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first cost-efficient work that jointly considers various methods for restraining rumor spreading in MSNs.

- We propose a continuous strategy that continuously carries out countermeasures with the smallest cost to restrain rumor spreading within an expected time period.
- We propose a pulse strategy that periodically spreads truth to restrain rumor spreading. This strategy identifies the maximum immunization period.
- We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed model and the efficiency of the two strategies towards the real Digg2009 dataset.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the network model and the problem definition. Section III presents the rumor spreading model under continuous countermeasures and derives the threshold that determines whether a rumor continuously spreads or becomes extinct. The RTO strategy and PSCB strategy are illustrated in Section IV and Section V, respectively. The validation of the proposed model and strategies are presented in Section VI. The related works are addressed in Section VII. Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Network model

We use four states to indicate the different status of users while a rumor spreads in a network. *Susceptible* (S) means a user has not been infected by a rumor yet but is susceptible to it; *Infected* (I) means a user has been infected by a rumor and performs as a rumor spreader; *Recovered* (R) means a user would never be infected by a rumor; *Dead* (D) means a user has no interests in spreading truth or rumors. Since different users have different abilities to spread and absorb information, we further divide users into different groups based on their degrees in a social network. Hence, the network presents degree based heterogeneity. Although degree based heterogeneity is not optimal, some recent works have shown that it can effectively characterize information spreading in social networks [4] [6] [10]. The users in a network are then divided into n groups and the users in one group have the same degree. Let k_i denote the degree of the users in group i ($i = 0, 1, \dots, n$). Let $S_{k_i}(t)$, $I_{k_i}(t)$, $R_{k_i}(t)$ and $D_{k_i}(t)$ denote the density of the susceptible, infected, recovered and dead users in group i at time t , respectively. Hence, at any time t , the active nodes in a network satisfy $S_{k_i}(t) + I_{k_i}(t) + R_{k_i}(t) = 1$. With countermeasures carried out to restrain rumors, a user's state transforms among S , I and R . For an arbitrary user, the state transition is shown in Fig.1 with the following rules:

- 1) A user changes state S to state I if it believes in the rumor. The rumor acceptance rate of a user in S_{k_i} is $\lambda(k_i)$ ($0 < \lambda(k_i) < 1$), i.e., an S user is infected with probability $\lambda(k_i)$ if it is connected to an I user. An S user is connected to one or more I users with probability $\Theta(t)$ at time t . Thus, the infected probability for an S user at time t is $\lambda(k_i)\Theta(t)$.
- 2) In the RTO strategy, at any time t , an S user is immunized and transforms to R with probability $\varepsilon_1(t)$. In the PSCB strategy, an S user is immunized and transforms to R with probability p every other period T . An I user

is cured and transforms to R with probability $\varepsilon_2(t)$ at time t .

- 3) New users concern about the rumor with rate α . Assume new users are susceptible users, namely, have not been infected or immunized. As time passes, some users lose interests in spreading either truth or rumors with interest decaying rate μ to become dead users.




Fig. 1. State transition of a user.

Initially, just a few infected users and most users are S users. As the rumor spreads, S users become I users gradually. Thus, the initial condition of the model is $I_{k_i}(t_0) > 0$, $S_{k_i}(t_0) = 1 - I_{k_i}(t_0)$ and $R_{k_i}(t_0) = D_{k_i}(t_0) = 0$, where $t_0 = 0$.

B. Problem definition

Based on the aforementioned network model, three questions need to be addressed: 1) What is the threshold that determines whether a rumor continuously spread or become extinct as time passes? 2) If countermeasures can be carried out continuously, what is the real-time strategy to restrain rumor spreading with efficient cost in an expected time period? and 3) If countermeasures have to be carried out periodically, what is the cost-efficient pulse strategy? Specifically, the problem studied in this paper is defined as follows.

Case 1. Continuous strategy:

Input:

1) A mobile social network with its initial state: $I_{k_i}(t_0)$, $S_{k_i}(t_0)$, $R_{k_i}(t_0)$ and $D_{k_i}(t_0)$, where $t_0 = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and they describe the density of the susceptible, infected, recovered and dead users in group i at time t_0 , respectively.

2) The expected time period to restrain a rumor: $[0, t_f]$.

Output:

1) Threshold of countermeasures, which determines whether a rumor continuously spreads or becomes extinct as time passes.

2) Real-time strategy: $\varepsilon_1^*(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2^*(t)$, $t \in (0, t_f]$, namely, an S user is immunized and transforms to R with probability $\varepsilon_1^*(t)$, and an I user is cured and transforms to R with probability $\varepsilon_2^*(t)$, at time t .

Case 2. Pulse strategy:

Input:

1) 1) A mobile social network with its initial state: $I_{k_i}(t_0)$, $S_{k_i}(t_0)$, $R_{k_i}(t_0)$ and $D_{k_i}(t_0)$, where $t_0 = 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$,

and they describe the density of the susceptible, infected, recovered and dead users in group i at time t_0 , respectively.

Output:

1) Threshold of countermeasures, which determines whether a rumor continuously spreads or becomes extinct as time passes.

2) Pulse strategy: maximum immunization period T_{max} .

III. CONTINUOUS COUNTERMEASURE BASED EPIDEMIC MODEL

In this section, we first present the rumor spreading model under continuous countermeasures. Then, we analyze the existence and stability of the equilibrium solutions to derive the threshold that determines whether a rumor continuously spreads or becomes extinct.

Ever since the standard model for rumor spreading was introduced by Daley and Kendall in 1965 (*i.e.*, DK model [11]), many variants have been proposed. We also describe the rumor spreading under continuous countermeasures, taking the epidemic model as the basis. Based on the network model introduced in Section II-A, the continuous countermeasure based epidemic model can be described as the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dR_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}(t) + \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu R_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dD_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \mu S_{k_i}(t) + \mu I_{k_i}(t) + \mu R_{k_i}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, n, t > 0$

For convenience, Table I summarizes the major parameters in System (1). The four equations describe the changing rate of $S_{k_i}(t)$, $I_{k_i}(t)$, $R_{k_i}(t)$ and $D_{k_i}(t)$, respectively. As shown by the first equation in System (1), the changing rate of $S_{k_i}(t)$ is determined by four parts. First, new susceptible users join the network with rate α at any time t . Second, $\lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t)$ susceptible users are infected to transform to infected ones. Third, $\varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}(t)$ susceptible users are immunized by truth to transform to recovered ones. Last, $\mu S_{k_i}(t)$ susceptible users become dead nodes. The remaining two equations obey the similar rules.

$\Theta(t)$ computes the average degree of all the I users:

$$\Theta(t) = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega(k_i) P(k_i) I_{k_i}(t)$$

where $P(k_i)$ is the probability of a user with degree k_i so that $\sum_{i=1}^n P(k_i) = 1$, and $\langle k \rangle$ is the average degree of the users in a network, thus $\langle k \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n k_i P(k_i)$. $\omega(k_i)$ measures the infectivity of a user with degree k_i . Several cases of $\omega(k_i)$ have been considered such as $\omega(k_i) = C$ where C is a constant [12], $\omega(k_i) = k_i$ [13] or $\omega(k_i)$ is a nonlinear function $k_i^\beta / (1 + k_i^\gamma)$ [14]. Intuitively, a user with a larger degree would have larger infectivity. However, the infectivity will saturate when a user's degree reaches some extent. Hence, in this work, we adopt the nonlinear function $k_i^\beta / (1 + k_i^\gamma)$ to compute $\omega(k_i)$.

TABLE I
MAJOR PARAMETERS IN THE DYNAMIC MODEL

Parameter	Definition
k_i	Social connectivity of the users in group i (<i>i.e.</i> , degree)
α	Rate of new users entering an MSN
μ	User interest decaying rate
$\lambda(k_i)$	Rumor acceptance rate of the susceptible users in group i
$\varepsilon_1(t)$	Proportion of the susceptible users being immunized at time t
$\varepsilon_2(t)$	Proportion of the infected users being blocked at time t
$P(k_i)$	Probability of a node with degree k_i
$\langle k \rangle$	Average degree of an MSN
$\omega(k_i)$	Infectivity of an infected user with degree k_i

A. The definition of the equilibrium solution

If the countermeasures are strong, a rumor does not spread any more. Otherwise, a rumor would continuously spread. These two cases correspond to the zero-equilibrium solution and the positive-equilibrium solution of System (1), respectively. For clarity, the definitions of the equilibrium solutions are presented as follows. More details can be found in [15].

Definition 3.1: Equilibrium solution. Mathematically, the solution $x^* \in \mathbb{R}$ is an equilibrium solution for the differential equation

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x)$$

if $f(t, x^*) = 0$ for all t .

Definition 3.2: Zero-equilibrium solution. E_0 is called a zero-equilibrium solution of System (1) if the solution of System (1) $E = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ converges to $E_0 = (e_1^0, e_2^0, \dots, e_n^0)$ where $e_i = (S_{k_i}(t), I_{k_i}(t), R_{k_i}(t), D_{k_i}(t))$, $e_i^0 = (S_{k_i}^0, I_{k_i}^0, R_{k_i}^0, D_{k_i}^0)$ and $S_{k_i}^0 > 0$, $R_{k_i}^0 > 0$, $I_{k_i}^0 = 0$, $D_{k_i}^0 > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

Definition 3.3: Positive-equilibrium solution. E_+ is called a positive-equilibrium solution of System (1) if the solution of System (1) $E = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ converges to $E_+ = (e_1^+, e_2^+, \dots, e_n^+)$, where $e_i = (S_{k_i}(t), I_{k_i}(t), R_{k_i}(t), D_{k_i}(t))$, $e_i^+ = (S_{k_i}^+, I_{k_i}^+, R_{k_i}^+, D_{k_i}^+)$ and $S_{k_i}^+ > 0$, $R_{k_i}^+ > 0$, $I_{k_i}^+ > 0$, $D_{k_i}^0 > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

From the above definitions, we find that to compute the threshold that determines whether the rumors continuously spread or not, we should first discuss the existence of the equilibrium solutions of System (1).

B. The existence of the equilibrium solution

We simplify $\Theta(t)$ by letting $\varphi(k_i) = \omega(k_i)P(k_i)$. Moreover, since users with state D do not transform to other states any more, for simplicity, we just analyze the active states (*i.e.*, S, I, R) in the following parts. The following theorem shows the existence of the equilibrium solution of System (1).

Theorem 1: For parameter

$$r_0 = \frac{\alpha}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda(k_i) \varphi(k_i)}{(\varepsilon_1 + \mu)(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)},$$

Case 1: If $r_0 \leq 1$, System (1) only has a zero-equilibrium solution denoted by $E_0 = \{(S_{k_1}^0, I_{k_1}^0, R_{k_1}^0), \dots, (S_{k_n}^0, I_{k_n}^0, R_{k_n}^0)\}$, where $S_{k_i}^0 = \alpha / (\varepsilon_1 + \mu)$, $I_{k_i}^0 = 0$ and $R_{k_i}^0 = 1 - \alpha / (\varepsilon_1 + \mu)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

Case 2: If $r_0 > 1$, System (1) has both zero-equilibrium solution and positive-equilibrium solution denoted by $E_+ = \{(S_{k_1}^+, I_{k_1}^+, R_{k_1}^+), \dots, (S_{k_n}^+, I_{k_n}^+, R_{k_n}^+)\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}^+ &= \frac{(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)I_{k_i}^+}{\lambda(k_i)\Theta^+}, \\ I_{k_i}^+ &= \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i)\Theta^+}{(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)(\lambda(k_i)\Theta^+ + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)}, \\ R_{k_i}^+ &= 1 - S_{k_i}^+ - I_{k_i}^+, \end{aligned}$$

$$\Theta^+ = \langle k \rangle^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) I_{k_i}^+ (i = 1, 2, \dots, n).$$

Proof. Since the first two equations of System (1) do not contain R_{k_i} , we first analyze them, then obtain $R_{k_i}(t)$ based on $S_{k_i}(t) + I_{k_i}(t) + R_{k_i}(t) = 1$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$). System (2) is the simplified system after extracting the first two equations from System (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

When System (2) gets equilibrium solutions $E_* = \{(S_{k_1}^*, I_{k_1}^*, R_{k_1}^*), \dots, (S_{k_n}^*, I_{k_n}^*, R_{k_n}^*)\}$, it indicates that $S_{k_i}(t)$, $I_{k_i}(t)$ and $R_{k_i}(t)$ converges to $S_{k_i}^*$, $I_{k_i}^*$ and $R_{k_i}^*$, respectively. In this case, $dS_{k_i}(t)/dt = 0$, $dI_{k_i}(t)/dt = 0$, and $dR_{k_i}(t)/dt = 0$. Thus, when System (1) gets E_* , System (2) should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^* \Theta^* - \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}^* - \mu S_{k_i}^* &= 0 \\ \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^* \Theta^* - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}^* - \mu I_{k_i}^* &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\Theta^* = \langle k \rangle^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) I_{k_i}^*$. From System (3), we have

$$I_{k_i}^* = \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i)\Theta^*}{(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)(\lambda(k_i)\Theta^* + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)}. \quad (4)$$

Obviously, $I_{k_i}^* = 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) is always the solution of Equation (4). Substituting $I_{k_i}^* = 0$ in System (3), the corresponding $S_{k_i}^*$ and $R_{k_i}^*$ can be derived as shown in Case 1 of Theorem 1. Substituting Equation (4) in Θ^* and moving the right item to left, we have

$$\Theta^* \left(1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)}{(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)(\lambda(k_i)\Theta^* + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)} \right) = 0. \quad (5)$$

For Equation (5), let

$$F(\Theta^*) = 1 - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)}{(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)(\lambda(k_i)\Theta^* + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)}.$$

Since $F'(\Theta^*) > 0$ for all Θ^* and $\lim_{\Theta^* \rightarrow \infty} F(\Theta^*) = 1$, there is a non-trivial solution for equation $F(\Theta^*) = 0$ if and only if $\lim_{\Theta^* \rightarrow 0^+} F(\Theta^*) < 0$ which is true when $r_0 > 1$. That is, System (1) has a positive-equilibrium solution when $r_0 > 1$. Substituting Equation (4) in System (3), we can obtain the positive-equilibrium solution of System (3) as shown in Case 2 of Theorem 1. \square

Theorem 1 shows the restrictive correlation between the existence of equilibrium solution and level of countermeasures. However, as pointed out in [16], a differential system only converges to a stable equilibrium solution, so Theorem 1 is

not enough to determine the spreading dynamics of rumors. The stability of the two equilibrium solutions will be analyzed in the next section, respectively.

C. The stability of the equilibrium solution

Two types of stabilities exist, local asymptotic stability and global asymptotic stability. The stability theory [16] shows that the equilibrium solution is locally asymptotically stable if and only if the system variables (*i.e.*, S_{k_i} , I_{k_i} and R_{k_i} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) converge to it when the initial values of system variables slightly deviate from the equilibrium solution. Correspondingly, the equilibrium solution is globally asymptotically stable if and only if the system variables converge to it under any value of the initial values. For simplicity, we denote *locally asymptotically stable*, *globally asymptotically stable*, *local asymptotic stability* and *global asymptotic stability* as *L-stable*, *G-stable*, *L-stability* and *G-stability*, respectively. Lyapunov's second stability method is generally utilized to determine the G-stability of the equilibrium solution of differential equation system. For clarity, it is introduced as follows and more details can be found in [16].

Definition 3.4: Lyapunov's second method for stability. Mathematically, the equilibrium solution $x^* = 0$ is G-stable for the differential equation

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = f(t, x)$$

if there is a scalar function $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which has continuous first partial derivative and satisfies

- 1) $V(x) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = 0$.
- 2) $dV(x)/dt \leq 0$ with equality not constrained to only $x = 0$.

We now investigate the L-stability and G-stability of E_0 and E_* , respectively.

1) *Stability of E_0 :* For the stability of System (1) at E_0 , we have the following theorems.

Theorem 2: If $r_0 < 1$, E_0 is L-stable. If $r_0 > 1$, E_0 is unstable.

Proof. According to the stability theory [16], if and only if all the eigenvalues of the characteristic equation of $J(E_*)$ are less than zero, the system is L-stable at E_* , where $J(E_*)$ is the Jacobian matrix of dynamic system at E_* . Thus, to analyze the stability of System (1) at E_0 , we need to linearize System (1) firstly to obtain the eigenvalues of the characteristic equation of $J(E_0)$. The result of linearizing System (2) at E_0 is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= J_{k_i}^{1,1}(S - S_{k_i}^0) + J_{k_i}^{1,2}(I - I_{k_i}^0) \\ \frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= J_{k_i}^{2,1}(S - S_{k_i}^0) + J_{k_i}^{2,2}(I - I_{k_i}^0) \end{aligned}$$

where $J_{k_i}^{p,q}$ ($p, q \in \{1, 2\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are the elements of the Jacobian matrix of System (2) at E_0 for group i . Then, the Jacobian matrix of System (2) at E_0 can be written as

$$J(E_0) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \cdots & A_{1n} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \cdots & A_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & A_{n2} & \cdots & A_{nn} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For each $A_{i,j}$ where $i = j$, i.e., the diagonal elements of $J(E_0)$, we have

$$A_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varepsilon_1 - \mu & -\frac{\lambda(k_i)\alpha}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu} \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \varphi(k_i) \\ 0 & \frac{\lambda(k_i)\alpha}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu} \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \varphi(k_i) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $A_{i,j}$ where $i \neq j$, we have

$$A_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{\lambda(k_i)\alpha}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu} \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \varphi(k_i) \\ 0 & \frac{\lambda(k_i)\alpha}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu} \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \varphi(k_i) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The characteristic equation of $J(E_0)$ is

$$(\chi + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)^3(\chi + \varepsilon_2 + \mu)^2(\chi - (\Gamma - \varepsilon_2 - \mu)) = 0$$

where

$$\Gamma = \frac{\alpha}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu}.$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of the characteristic equation of $J(E_0)$ are $\chi_1 = -\varepsilon_1 - \mu$, $\chi_2 = -\varepsilon_2 - \mu$ and $\chi_3 = \Gamma - \varepsilon_2 - \mu$. Since $-\varepsilon_1 - \mu < 0$ and $-\varepsilon_2 - \mu < 0$, the local stability of E_0 is completely determined by the sign of $\Gamma - \varepsilon_2 - \mu$. If $r_0 < 1$, we have $\Gamma - \varepsilon_2 - \mu < 0$ so that System (1) is L-stable at E_0 . If $r_0 > 1$, we have $\Gamma - \varepsilon_2 - \mu > 0$, thus System (1) is unstable at E_0 . \square

To verify the global asymptotic stability of E_0 , we first present Lemma 1.

Lemma 1: As System (1) asymptotically converges to E_+ (i.e., $r_0 > 1$), ε_2 should satisfy

$$\lim_{E^* \rightarrow E^+} \varepsilon_2 = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)S_{k_i}^+ - \mu. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Based on the definition of $\Theta(t)$ and combining the second equation of System (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta'(t) &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i)I'_{k_i}(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i)(\lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t)) \\ &= \Theta(t) \left(\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \right) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

When System (1) converges to E_+ , $\Theta'(t) = 0$. Since $\Theta(t) > 0$, from Equation (7) we can derive Equation (6). \square

Based on Lemma 1, the stability of E_0 is stated by Theorem 3:

Theorem 3: If $r_0 < 1$, E_0 is G-stable.

Proof. To investigate the G-stability of System (1) at E^* where E^* is the equilibrium point, we need to construct a Lyapunov function $V(t)$. According to Definition 3.4, we construct the Lyapunov function for E_0 as

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \Theta(t).$$

Then, based on Lemma 1 and combining the equilibrium solution $S_{k_i}^0 = \alpha/(\varepsilon_1 + \mu)$, the time derivative of $V(t)$ computed in the solution space of System (1) for $t > 0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dV(t)}{dt} &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \Theta'(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \Theta(t) \left(\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \Theta(t) \left(\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)S_{k_i}^0) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \Theta(t) \left(\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)}{\varepsilon_1 + \mu} - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \right) \\ &= \Theta(t) \left(\frac{\alpha}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda(k_i)\varphi(k_i)}{(\varepsilon_1 + \mu)(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)} - 1 \right) \\ &= \Theta(t)(r_0 - 1) \end{aligned}$$

When $r_0 < 1$, we have $dV(t)/dt < 0$. Thus, as time approaches to infinity, E_0 is G-stable. \square

2) **Stability of E_+ :** For the stability of System (1) at E_+ , we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4: If $r_0 > 1$, E_+ is G-stable.

Proof. We construct the Lyapunov function $V(t)$ as

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} (\varphi(k_i)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)^2) + \left(\Theta(t) - \Theta^+ - \Theta^+ \ln\left(\frac{\Theta(t)}{\Theta^+}\right) \right).$$

Then the time derivative of $V(t)$ computed in the solution space of System (1) is

$$\begin{aligned} V'(t) &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)S'_{k_i}(t) \right) + \\ &\quad \frac{\Theta(t) - \Theta^+}{\Theta(t)} \Theta'(t). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For clarity, we split Equation (8) into two parts. When System (2) converges to E_+ , from the first equation of System (3), we have $\alpha = \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^+ \Theta^+ + \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}^+$. Thus, for the first part of Equation (8),

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)S'_{k_i}(t) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)(\alpha - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - \varepsilon_1 S_{k_i}(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)(\lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^+ \Theta^+ + (\varepsilon_1 + \mu)S_{k_i}^+ - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}(t)\Theta(t) - (\varepsilon_1 + \mu)S_{k_i}(t)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i)(\lambda(k_i)\Theta(t) + \varepsilon_1 + \mu)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)^2 - \varphi(k_i)\lambda(k_i)(\Theta(t) - \Theta^+)(S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and for the second part of Equation (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\Theta(t) - \Theta^+}{\Theta(t)} \Theta'(t) \\
 &= \frac{\Theta(t) - \Theta^+}{\Theta(t)} \left[\Theta(t) \left(\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu \right) \right] \\
 &= (\Theta(t) - \Theta^+) \left[\frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}^+ \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) (\Theta(t) - \Theta^+) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Combining Equation (9) and Equation (10), we can derive the result of Equation (8) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 V'(t) &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+) S_{k_i}'(t) \right\} \\
 &+ \frac{\Theta(t) - \Theta^+}{\Theta(t)} \Theta'(t) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i) (\lambda(k_i) \Theta(t) + \varepsilon_1 + \mu) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)^2 \right. \\
 & \quad \left. - \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) (\Theta(t) - \Theta^+) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+) \right) \\
 &+ \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) (\Theta(t) - \Theta^+) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-\frac{1}{S_{k_i}^+} \varphi(k_i) (\lambda(k_i) \Theta(t) + \varepsilon_1 + \mu) (S_{k_i}(t) - S_{k_i}^+)^2 \right) \\
 &\leq 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, E_+ is G-stable. \square

Based on the discussion of the existence and stability of equilibrium solutions under continuous countermeasures, we have the following conclusion regarding the threshold:

Theorem 5: If strong continuous-countermeasures are carried out making $r_0 < 1$, the rumor would become extinct. Otherwise, if the continuous-countermeasures are so weak that $r_0 \geq 1$, the rumor would continuously spread and the user states would converge to the positive-equilibrium solution.

Theorem 5 indicates that to restrain rumor spread, countermeasures should be carried out to let $r_0 < 1$.

IV. REAL-TIME OPTIMIZATION STRATEGY

In this section, we introduce the RTO strategy to restrain rumor spreading at the end of an expected time period with the lowest cost. To specify the cost, we employ c_1 and c_2 to represent the average cost of immunizing an S user and curing an I user, respectively. The expected time period is $(0, t_f]$. Then the RTO strategy motivates the following objective

function:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t)) &= \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n I_{k_i}(t_f) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_0^{t_f} \sum_{i=1}^n (c_1 F(\varepsilon_1(t), S_{k_i}(t)) + c_2 G(\varepsilon_2(t), I_{k_i}(t))) dt \right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ are control variables. The feasible region of $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ is $U = \{(\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t)) \mid 0 \leq \varepsilon_1(t) \leq \varepsilon_1^{max}, 0 \leq \varepsilon_2(t) \leq \varepsilon_2^{max}, t \in (0, t_f]\}$ where ε_1^{max} and ε_2^{max} are the upper bound of ε_1 and ε_2 , respectively.

The objective function (11) incorporates two optimization objectives. First, $\sum_{i=1}^n I_{k_i}(t_f)$ is the number of the I users at t_f so that minimizing it can guarantee that the rumor can be restrained at t_f . Second, $\int_0^{t_f} \sum_{i=1}^n (c_1 F(\varepsilon_1(t), S_{k_i}(t)) + c_2 G(\varepsilon_2(t), I_{k_i}(t))) dt$ is the total cost of the two methods in $(0, t_f]$ within which immunization and cure are carried out. Functions F and G represent the value of immunized S users and I users at each time t , respectively. F and G are quadratic functions which is popular. Thus, the objective function can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t)) &= \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n I_{k_i}(t_f) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \int_0^{t_f} \sum_{i=1}^n (c_1 \varepsilon_1^2(t) S_{k_i}^2(t) + c_2 \varepsilon_2^2(t) I_{k_i}^2(t)) dt \right\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The main challenge of computing the optimized $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ is that System (1) can be solved on the condition that $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ are unknown. Moreover, an exhaustive search in U is impossible since an infinite number of such $\varepsilon_1(t)$'s and $\varepsilon_2(t)$'s are in U . Fortunately, the Pontryagin's Maximum Principle offers an efficient way based on which the optimized $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ can be derived easily. Based on the Pontryagin's Maximum Principle [17], our optimized control problem is shown as follows.

Input:

- (1) Dynamic control system: rumor spreading model, *i.e.*, System (1).
- (2) Initial conditions: $I_{k_i}(t_0) > 0$, $S_{k_i}(t_0) = 1 - I_{k_i}(t_0)$ and $R_{k_i}(t_0) = 0$, where $t_0 = 0$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- (3) Transversality conditions: $\psi_i(t_f) = 0$ and $\phi_i(t_f) = 1$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$), where ψ_i and ϕ_i are co-state functions of group i .
- (4) Admissible controls: $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$, where $t \in (0, t_f]$, $0 \leq \varepsilon_1(t) \leq \varepsilon_1^{max}$, $0 \leq \varepsilon_2(t) \leq \varepsilon_2^{max}$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Output: The optimized controls $(\varepsilon_1^*(t), \varepsilon_2^*(t))$ that satisfy the objective function (12).

According to the Pontryagin's Maximum Principle, if there exist continuous and differentiable adjoint functions $\psi_i(t)$ and $\phi_i(t)$ at each $t \in (0, t_f]$, $\varepsilon_1^*(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2^*(t)$ satisfy

$$(\varepsilon_1^*(t), \varepsilon_2^*(t)) \in \arg \max H \{(\psi_i(t), \phi_i(t)), (S_{k_i}(t), I_{k_i}(t)), U\}$$

where the Hamiltonian function H is defined as

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^n (c_1 \varepsilon_1^2(t) S_{k_i}^2(t) + c_2 \varepsilon_2^2(t) I_{k_i}^2(t)) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(t) (\alpha - \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \varepsilon_1(t) S_{k_i}(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t)) \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(t) (\lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2(t) I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t)) \right)$$

in which, adjoint functions $\psi_1(t)$ and $\psi_2(t)$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\psi_i(t)}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial S_{k_i}(t)} \\ &= -2c_1 \varepsilon_1^2(t) S_{k_i}(t) - \psi_i(t) (-\lambda(k_i) \Theta(t) - \varepsilon_1(t) - \mu) \\ &\quad - \phi_i(t) \lambda(k_i) \Theta(t) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\phi_i(t)}{dt} &= -\frac{\partial H}{\partial I_{k_i}(t)} \\ &= -2c_2 \varepsilon_2^2(t) I_{k_i}(t) + \psi_i(t) \langle k \rangle^{-1} \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \\ &\quad - \phi_i(t) \left(\langle k \rangle^{-1} \varphi(k_i) \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) - \varepsilon_2(t) - \mu \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since the density of I users are minimized at t_f , the transversality conditions are

$$\psi_i(t_f) = 0, \phi_i(t_f) = 1.$$

Since H is a quadratic convex function of $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$, the maximum value of H is obtained at the stationary point (i.e., $\frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon_1(t)} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon_2(t)} = 0$) or at the start point and end point. We first compute the stationary point of H as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon_1(t)} &= 2c_1 \varepsilon_1(t) \sum_{i=1}^n S_{k_i}^2(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(t) S_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \varepsilon_2(t)} &= 2c_2 \varepsilon_2(t) \sum_{i=1}^n I_{k_i}^2(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(t) I_{k_i}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Let $\partial H / \partial \varepsilon_1(t) = 0$ and $\partial H / \partial \varepsilon_2(t) = 0$. From (13), we have

$$\varepsilon_1(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(t) S_{k_i}(t)}{2c_1 \sum_{i=1}^n S_{k_i}^2(t)}, \varepsilon_2(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(t) I_{k_i}(t)}{2c_2 \sum_{i=1}^n I_{k_i}^2(t)}.$$

Finally, the optimized $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ under the objective function (12) in $(0, t_f]$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1^*(t) &= \min \{ \max(0, \varepsilon_1(t)), \varepsilon_1^{max} \} \\ \varepsilon_2^*(t) &= \min \{ \max(0, \varepsilon_2(t)), \varepsilon_2^{max} \} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Thus, Equations (14) provide the optimized $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ to restrain rumor spreading at the end of the expected time period $(0, t_f]$ with the lowest cost.

V. PULSE SPREADING TRUTH AND CONTINUOUS BLOCKING RUMOR STRATEGY

In this section, we introduce the PSCB strategy to restrain rumor spreading with efficient cost. PSCB spreads truth in every other period T . Specifically, at any time $t = mT$ ($m = 1, 2, \dots$), an S user is immunized to transform to R with a

certain probability. With the state transition rule stated in II-A, the heterogeneous network based epidemic model with pulse immunization is shown as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} t \neq mT : \\ \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dR_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu R_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dD_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \mu S_{k_i}(t) + \mu I_{k_i}(t) + \mu R_{k_i}(t) \\ i &= 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad t > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$t = mT :$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}(mT^+) &= (1 - p) S_{k_i}(mT) \\ I_{k_i}(mT^+) &= I_{k_i}(mT) \\ R_{k_i}(mT^+) &= R_{k_i}(mT) + p S_{k_i}(mT) \\ D_{k_i}(mT^+) &= D_{k_i}(mT) \end{aligned}$$

In System (15), pulse immunization is applied to $p S_{k_i}(mT)$ S users so that they can transform to R users at time mT ($m = 1, 2, \dots$). Worth to note that the I users do not have any changes at time mT ($m = 1, 2, \dots$) since we carry out continuous cure. When $t = mT$, the state transition rule is similar to System (1).

A. Existence of the zero-equilibrium solution

Similarly, since users of state D do not transform to other states any more, for simplicity, we just analyze the active states (i.e., S, I, R) in the following parts. For the existence of the zero-equilibrium solution, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 6: If the immunization period is T , the T -period zero-equilibrium of System (15) is $(S_{k_i}^T(t), 0, 1 - S_{k_i}^T(t))$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}^T(t) &= \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (S_{k_i}^* - \frac{\alpha}{\mu}) e^{-\mu(t-mT)} \\ \text{where } S_{k_i}^* &= \frac{\alpha(1-p)(1-e^{-\mu T})}{\mu(1-(1-p)e^{-\mu T})} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From System (15), we observe that the first and second equations do not include R_{k_i} and D_{k_i} when $t \neq T$. Hence, we first analyze them, and then drive $R_{k_i}(t)$ from $S_{k_i}(t) + I_{k_i}(t) + R_{k_i}(t) = 1$. Then we just analyze the following subsystem (16):

$$\begin{aligned} t \neq mT : \\ \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t) \\ \frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \lambda(k_i) S_{k_i}(t) \Theta(t) - \varepsilon_2 I_{k_i}(t) - \mu I_{k_i}(t) \\ i &= 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad t > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$t = mT :$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}(mT^+) &= (1 - p) S_{k_i}(mT) \\ I_{k_i}(mT^+) &= I_{k_i}(mT) \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of the zero-equilibrium solution described in Section III-A, we have $I_{k_i}(t) = 0$ ($i =$

$1, 2, \dots, n$) when System (15) gets the zero-equilibrium solution. Substituting $I_{k_i}(t) = 0$ into System (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \mu S_{k_i}(t), \quad t \neq mT \\ S_{k_i}(mT^+) &= (1-p)S_{k_i}(mT), \quad t = mT \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

In time interval $(mT, (m+1)T]$, the solution of System (17) is $S_{k_i}(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (S_{k_i}(mT^+) - \frac{\alpha}{\mu})e^{-\mu(t-mT)}$. Represent $S_{k_i}(mT^+)$ by $S_{k_i}^m$. Meanwhile, in the case of $t = mT$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}((m+1)T^+) &= (1-p)S_{k_i}((m+1)T) \\ &= (1-p) \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (S_{k_i}(mT^+) - \frac{\alpha}{\mu})e^{-\mu T} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can construct a map $S_{k_i}^{m+1} = f(S_{k_i}^m)$, in which

$$f(S_{k_i}) = (1-p) \left(\frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (S_{k_i} - \frac{\alpha}{\mu})e^{-\mu T} \right) \quad (18)$$

Thus, solving the map function (18), we can obtain the only equilibrium:

$$S_{k_i}^* = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \frac{(1-p)(1-e^{-\mu T})}{1-(1-p)e^{-\mu T}}.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{df}{dS_{k_i}} = (1-p)e^{-\mu T} < 1.$$

Hence, $S_{k_i}^*$ is the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution of $S_{k_i}(t)$ at a series of time $t = mT$. As such, the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution of System (17) is

$$S_{k_i}^T(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (S_{k_i}^* - \frac{\alpha}{\mu})e^{-\mu(t-mT)}.$$

Thus, $(S_{k_i}^T(t), 0, 1 - S_{k_i}^T(t))$ is the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution of System (15).

□

B. Stability of the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution

For the local asymptotical stability of the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution, we can get the following theorem.

Theorem 7: If $R_0^{k_i} < 1$, the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution of System (15) is L-stable, where

$$R_0^{k_i} = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \frac{\lambda(k_i)}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \left(1 - \frac{p(1-e^{-\mu T})}{T\mu(1-(1-p)e^{-\mu T})} \right).$$

Proof. To verify the L-stability of $(S^T(t), 0)$, we first let

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}(t) &= S_{k_i}^T(t) + s_{k_i}(t) \\ I_{k_i}(t) &= i_{k_i}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $s_{k_i}(t)$ and $i_{k_i}(t)$ are small perturbations on $(S_{k_i}^T(t), 0)$. Substituting Equations (19) into System (16) and expanding by the Taylor Series while neglecting the high-order terms, we can obtain a linear pulse differential system of System (16) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= -\mu s_{k_i}(t) - \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(t)\theta(t) \\ \frac{di_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(t)\theta(t) - (\varepsilon_2 + \mu)i_{k_i}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\theta(t) = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega(k_i)P(k_i)i_{k_i}(t)$. Then, from System (20), we can obtain the fundamental solution matrix of linear System (20):

$$B_{k_i}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\mu t} & \gamma_{12}(t) \\ 0 & \gamma_{22}^{k_i}(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\gamma_{22}^{k_i}(t) = e^{\int_0^T \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(\tau) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu} d\tau$. When $t = nT$, from System (16), we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} s_{k_i}(mT^+) \\ i_{k_i}(mT^+) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s_{k_i}(mT) \\ i_{k_i}(mT) \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to the Floquet theorem [18], we have.

$$\begin{aligned} M_{k_i} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} B_{k_i}(t) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\mu T} & \gamma_{12}(t) \\ 0 & e^{\int_0^T \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(\tau) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu} d\tau \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (1-p)e^{-\mu T} & (1-p)\gamma_{12}(t) \\ 0 & e^{\int_0^T \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(\tau) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu} d\tau \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Thus, the eigenvalues of Equation (21) are

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1^{k_i} &= (1-p)e^{-\mu T} \\ \beta_2^{k_i} &= e^{\int_0^T \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(\tau) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu} d\tau \end{aligned}$$

According to the Floquet theorem, we know that the equilibrium state of System (16) is L-stable if $|\beta_j^{k_i}| < 1$, where $j = 1, 2$. Obviously, $0 < |\beta_1^{k_i}| < 1$. Thus, the stability of the T -period zero-equilibrium solution of System (16) just requires $|\beta_2^{k_i}| < 1$, namely, $e^{\int_0^T \lambda(k_i)S_{k_i}^T(t) - \varepsilon_2 - \mu} dt < 0$. Solve it, we can obtain $R_0^{k_i} < 1$ and value of $R_0^{k_i}$ is as described in Theorem 7.

□

For the G-stability of the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 8: If $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} < 1$, the T -peroid zero-equilibrium solution of System (15) is G-stable, where

$$\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \frac{\lambda(k_i)}{\varepsilon_2 + \mu} \left(1 - \frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^{-\mu T}} \right)$$

Proof. From the first equation of System (16), we have $\frac{dS_{k_i}(t)}{dt} \leq \alpha - \mu S_{k_i}(t)$. Then, we can construct the comparison system as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x'_{k_i} &= \alpha - \mu x_{k_i}(t), \quad t \neq mT : \\ x_{k_i}(mT^+) &= (1-p)x_{k_i}(mT), \quad t = mT \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

With the similar procedure, we can get the T -period zero-equilibrium solution of System (22) as

$$x_{k_i}^T(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} + (x_{k_i}^* - \frac{\alpha}{\mu})e^{-\mu(t-mT)} \quad (23)$$

where $x_{k_i}^* = \frac{\alpha}{\mu} \frac{(1-p)(1-e^{-\mu T})}{1-(1-p)e^{-\mu T}}$.

According to the differential equation comparison theorem [19], $\forall \kappa > 0, \exists M_1 \in \mathbb{N}_+$, when $m \geq M_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{k_i}(t) &\leq x_{k_i}^T(t) + \kappa \leq x_{k_i}^* + \kappa, \\ t &\in (mT, (m+1)T], m > M_1. \end{aligned}$$

From the second equation of System (15), we have

$$\frac{dI_{k_i}(t)}{dt} \leq \lambda(k_i)\Theta(t)(x^* + \kappa) - (\varepsilon_2 + \mu)I_{k_i}(t). \quad (24)$$

Then, we can construct the comparison equation of Equation (24):

$$\frac{dy_{k_i}(t)}{dt} \leq \lambda(k_i)\Theta_y(t)(x^* + \kappa) - (\varepsilon_2 + \mu)y_{k_i}(t)$$

where $\Theta_y(t) = \frac{1}{\langle k \rangle} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega(k_i)P(k_i)y_{k_i}(t)$.

Since $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} < 1$, there exists a sufficiently small κ_{k_i} letting $\lambda(k_i)(x_{k_i}^* + \kappa_{k_i}) < (\varepsilon_2 + \mu)$, hence, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} y_{k_i}(t) = 0$. According to the differential equation comparison theorem, we also have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} I_{k_i}(t) = 0$. Namely, for $\forall \kappa > 0, \exists M_2 > M_1$, when $m \geq M_2$, we have $I_{k_i}(t) < \kappa$. Moreover, from the first equation of System (16), we have

$$\frac{S_{k_i}(t)}{dt} \geq \alpha - \lambda(k_i)\kappa S_{k_i}(t) - \mu S_{k_i}(t)$$

Then, we can construct the comparison equation of System (16):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{z_{k_i}(t)}{dt} &= \alpha - \lambda(k_i)\kappa z_{k_i}(t) - \mu z_{k_i}(t), \quad t \neq mT \\ z_{k_i}(mT^+) &= (1-p)z_{k_i}(mT), \quad t = mT \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Similar to the T -period zero-equilibrium solution of System (22) (i.e., Equation (23)), we have the T -period zero-equilibrium solution of System (25) in $(nT, (n+1)T]$:

$$z_{k_i}^T(t) = \frac{\alpha}{\mu + \lambda(k_i)\kappa} + \left(1 - \frac{pe^{-(\mu + \lambda(k_i)\kappa)(t-mT)}}{1 - (1-p)e^{-(\mu + \lambda(k_i)\kappa)T}}\right)$$

According to the comparison theorem [19], for $\forall \kappa > 0, \exists M_3 > M_2$, when $m \geq M_3$, we have $z_{k_i}^T(t) - \kappa \leq S_{k_i}(t) \leq x_{k_i}^T(t) + \kappa$. Meanwhile, we found that $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} x_{k_i}^T(t) = S_{k_i}^T(t)$ and $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow 0} z_{k_i}^T(t) = S_{k_i}^T(t)$. Hence, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S_{k_i}(t) = S_{k_i}^T(t)$. Hence, the T -period zero-equilibrium solution $(S_{k_i}^T(t), 0)$ is G-stable for System (16). Namely, $(S_{k_i}^T(t), 0, 1 - S_{k_i}^T(t))$ is G-stable for System (15). \square

Based on the above discussion of the existence and stability of the T -period zero-equilibrium under pulse countermeasures, we have the following conclusion:

Theorem 9: If strong pulse-countermeasures are carried out making $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} < 1$, the rumor would become extinct. Otherwise, if the pulse-countermeasures are so weak that $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} \geq 1$, the rumor would continuously spread.

C. The maximum immunization period

Immunizing the S users with the maximum immunization period can minimize the frequency of occupying network resources. In this section, we derive the maximum immunization period $T_{max}(k_i)$ as the threshold that determines whether the T -period zero-equilibrium solution in group i is G-stable, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Hence, any immunization period $T_{k_i}(T_{k_i} < T_{max}(k_i))$ would guarantee the rumors become extinct in group i . On the contrary, any immunization period

$T_{k_i}(T_{k_i} > T_{max}(k_i))$ would guarantee the rumors continuously spread in group i . Based on Theorem 8, we just need to let $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i} = 1$ to obtain:

$$T_{max1}(k_i) = \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \ln \left((1-p) \cdot \frac{\alpha\lambda(k_i) - \mu(\varepsilon_2 + \mu)}{\alpha\lambda(k_i) - \mu(\varepsilon_2 + \mu) - p\alpha\lambda(k_i)} \right)$$

VI. MODEL VALIDATION

In this section, we validate the proposed rumor spreading model and the RTO and PSCB strategies towards the Digg2009 dataset [20]. The Digg2009 dataset contains 1731658 friendship links of 71367 users. According to different social connectivity degrees, these 71367 users are divided into 848 groups. The maximum degree of this data set is 995 and the minimum degree is 1. The average degree of this data set is around 24, i.e., $\langle k \rangle = 24$.

A. Effectiveness of the thresholds of the RTO strategy

Theorem 5 shows that the threshold is r_0 , which gives the specific relationship between rumor spreading dynamics and the countermeasure levels ε_1 and ε_2 . We assume the rumor acceptance rate grows linearly with users' degree, namely, $\lambda(k_i) = k_i$. Meanwhile, we take the non-linear infectivity as illustrated in Section III: $\omega(k_i) = k_i^\beta / (1 + k_i^\gamma)$ with $\beta = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.5$. Other parameters in System (1) are set as $\alpha = 0.01$, $\varepsilon_1 = 0.2$, and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.05$. We can compute that $r_0 = 0.7220 < 1$ so that E_0 is G-stable (as indicated by Theorem 3). According to Theorem 5, in this case, the rumor will be extinct and the state of System (1) would converge to E_0 .

Assuming $E(t)$ is an arbitrary solution of System (1), we employ $Dist_0(t)$ to denote the Euclidean Distance between $E(t)$ and E_0 :

$$Dist_0(t) = \|E(t) - E_0\|_\infty.$$

Under 10 different initial values (i.e., different $S_{k_i}(0)$ and $I_{k_i}(0)$, $R_{k_i}(0) = 0$), the evolution of $Dist_0(t)$ is shown in Fig.2(a). We observe that $Dist_0(t)$ converges to zero under different initial conditions, which means that E_0 is G-stable. Next, Fig.2(b), Fig.2(c) and Fig.2(d) show the evolutions of S_{k_i} , I_{k_i} , and R_{k_i} , $i = 1, 50, 100, \dots, 800$ under an arbitrary initial condition, respectively. We observe that the infection is no longer epidemic and the rumor will be extinct with such countermeasures.

Keeping the other parameters unchanged, we set $\alpha = 0.002$, $\varepsilon_1 = 0.002$, and $\varepsilon_2 = 0.0001$ and compute that $r_0 = 2.1661 > 1$. In this case, E_+ is G-stable (as indicated by Theorem 4). According to Theorem 5, the rumor will continuously spread and system variables converge to E_+ . Similarly, to verify it, the Euclidean Distance between $E(t)$ and E_+ is measured by

$$Dist_+(t) = \|E(t) - E_+\|_\infty.$$

The evolution of $Dist_+(t)$ under 10 initial conditions is shown in Fig.3(a). We observe that $Dist_+(t)$ converges to zero under different initial conditions, which means that E_+ is G-stable.




Fig. 2. (a): The evolution of $Dist_0(t)$ under 10 different initial conditions. The evolution of (b): $S_{k_i}(t)$; (c): $I_{k_i}(t)$; (d): $R_{k_i}(t)$, where $i = 1, 50, \dots, 800$ and $r_0 = 0.7220 < 1$.




Fig. 3. (a): The evolution of $Dist_+(t)$ under 10 different initial conditions. The evolution of (b): $S_{k_i}(t)$; (c): $I_{k_i}(t)$; (d): $R_{k_i}(t)$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, 20$ and $r_0 = 2.1661 > 1$.

Then, setting an arbitrary initial condition, the evolution of S_{k_i} , I_{k_i} , and R_{k_i} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, 20$ are shown in Fig.3(b), Fig.3(c) and Fig.3(d), respectively. We observe that with such level of countermeasures, a rumor will continuously spread and the system variables converge to E_+ .

B. Efficiency of the RTO strategy

Suppose the expected time period is $(0, 100]$ and the cost of immunization is larger than that of cure, specifically, $c_1 = 5$ and $c_2 = 10$. Keeping the other parameters unchanged, the optimized $\varepsilon_1(t)$ and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ ($t \in (0, 100]$) are shown in Fig.4(a). As shown in Fig.4(a), spreading truth should play a dominant role (*i.e.*, $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2$) in the initial rumor restraining phase. Then, when approaching to the end of the expected time period,

blocking rumors should be carried out intensively, (*i.e.*, $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$).




Fig. 4. The evolution of (a): ε_1 and ε_2 ; (b): cost comparison of the heuristic and RTO strategies where the horizontal axis is t_f .

To verify the efficiency of the RTO strategy, we compare the cost of the heuristic and RTO strategy when controlling the number of the I users to a same level within a same expected time period. The heuristic strategy restrains rumor spreading just based on the current infection state, *i.e.*, there is no global control. We set a set of t_f such as $t_f = 10, 20, \dots, 100$ and let the density of the I users at t_f to be less than 0.0001. The cost comparison of these 10 different time periods is shown in Fig.4(b). Compared with the heuristic strategy, the RTO strategy has lower cost while achieving the same effects.

C. Effectiveness of the PSCB strategy

For simplicity, we represent the T -period zero-equilibrium solution of System (15) as E_0^p . According to Theorem 8, the thresholds in group i are determined by threshold $\tilde{R}_0^{k_i}$. As indicated in Section V-C: if $T_{k_i} < T_{max}(k_i)$, we expect the infection in group i is no longer epidemic and the rumor will be extinct; otherwise, the rumor will continuously spread if $T_{k_i} > T_{max}(k_i)$. The reason is that $T_{k_i} < T_{max}(k_i)$ or $T_{k_i} > T_{max}(k_i)$ guarantees E_0^p is G-stable (or not). For clarity, we only show the evolutions of S_{k_1} , I_{k_1} and R_{k_1} under an arbitrary initial condition, respectively. Assuming immunization rate $p = 0.2$ and keeping the other parameters unchanged, we can compute $T_{max}(k_1) = 12.3770$. Given $T_{k_1} = 5(T_{k_1} < T_{max}(k_1))$, we expect the rumors in group i to become extinct. Given an arbitrary initial condition, the evolutions of S_{k_1} , I_{k_1} , and R_{k_1} are shown in Fig.5(a). We observe that with frequent immunization, a rumor will become extinct and the system variables converge to E_0 . Keeping the other parameters unchanged, we set $T_{k_1} = 20$, *i.e.*, $T_{k_1} > T_{max}(k_1)$. In this case, we expect the rumors to continuously spread. Then, setting an arbitrary initial condition, the evolutions of S_{k_1} , I_{k_1} , and R_{k_1} are shown in Fig.5(b). We observe that with such countermeasures, the rumor continuously spreads.

To verify the cost-efficiency of the PSCB strategy, we compare the costs of the heuristic strategy and the PSCB strategy when the densities of the I users reach to a same level within a same expected time period. Similarly, we set a set of t_f such as $t_f = 200, 250, \dots, 1000$ and let the density of the I users at t_f to be less than 0.0001. The cost of countermeasures of PSCB with these 10 different time periods is shown in Fig.6(b). Compared with the heuristic strategy as shown in




Fig. 5. (a): The evolutions of $S_{k_1}(t), I_{k_1}(t), R_{k_1}(t)$ when $T_{k_1} < T_{max}(k_1)$. (b): The evolutions of $S_{k_1}(t), I_{k_1}(t), R_{k_1}(t)$ when $T_{k_1} > T_{max}(k_1)$.




Fig. 6. The cost comparison between (a): heuristic strategy and (b): PSCB strategy, when both of them have the same level of I users.

Fig.6(a), the PSCB strategy has lower cost while achieving the same effect.

VII. RELATED WORKS

Rumor threats in MSNs have been extensively documented and a large body of research efforts have been made. For restraining rumor spreading, the popular approach of the existing works is to select several seed users based on their social connectivity (such as degree, core, betweenness) as truth spreaders, or to block rumors at these selected seed users such as blocking the links [3] and removing influential nodes [5] [6]. The work in [12] shows which method has better performance: *blocking rumors at influential users* or *spreading truth to clarify rumors*. Taking users' preference into consideration, an analytical model has been developed in [21] to investigate the temporal dynamics of positive and negative information spreading in MSNs. Moreover, the work in [22] proposes an efficient immunization strategy to restrain rumor spreading in MSNs based on the weighted trust networks.

On the other hand, various variants of epidemic models are proposed to investigate rumor spreading [23] [24] [25]. To name some, an Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model that incorporates immunization method is proposed [23]. An SIR model is proposed in [24] to investigate the final infected scale of the rumor spreading under different levels of countermeasures. Similarly, The work in [26] utilized SIR model to describe the rumor spreading in microblog considering different rumor-blocking strategies such as recovered opinion leader. The work in [27] extends the SIR model into a partial differential equations model to describe the temporal-spatial dynamics of malware spreading in sensor networks.

Unfortunately, few existing works consider the implementation cost of rumor restraining method. The work in [5] has

shown how to minimize the cost of *spreading truth to clarify rumors* method is an NP-Hard problem. In our prior work [28], a cost-efficient countermeasure is proposed. However, [28] ignore the limitation of rumor-restraining resources. In this paper, we improves the aforementioned works by combining different methods and investigates the effective and cost-efficient countermeasures.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we analyze the rumor spreading dynamics in MSNs and propose two cost-efficient strategies to restrain rumor spreading. On the basis of our rumor spreading model, the analysis results indicate that whether the rumor continuously spreads or becomes extinct is determined by a threshold, which formulates a restrictive relationship between network properties and countermeasures. In addition, we propose two cost-efficient strategies to restrain rumor spreading with a continuous (RTO) and pulse (PSCB) manner, respectively. For the RTO strategy, we obtain the optimized countermeasures that can efficiently restrain rumors within an expected time period. For the PSCB strategy, we can restrain rumors efficiently by immunizing susceptible users with the maximum immunization period. The experiment results show that both RTO and PSCB outperform the heuristic strategy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is partly supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grant NO.CNS-1252292, NSF of China under contract 61373083, 61370084, 61502116, 61371185 and 61373027, NSF of Shandong Province under contract ZR2012FM023 and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation NO.2015M571231.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Doerr, M. Fouz, and T. Friedrich, "Why rumors spread so quickly in social networks," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 70–75, Jun. 2012.
- [2] <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/markets/10013768/Bogus-AP-tweet-about-explosion-at-the-White-House-wipes-billions-off-US-markets.html>.
- [3] M. Kimura, K. Saito, and H. Motoda, "Blocking links to minimize contamination spread in a social network," *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 9:1–9:23, Apr. 2009.
- [4] R. Cohen, S. Havlin, and D. ben Avraham, "Efficient immunization strategies for computer networks and populations," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 91, p. 247901, 2003.
- [5] J. Aspnes, K. Chang, and A. Yampolskiy, "Inoculation strategies for victims of viruses and the sum-of-squares partition problem," *JCSS*, vol. 72, no. 6, pp. 1077–1093, Sep. 2006.
- [6] H. Habiba, Y. Yu, T. Y. Berger-Wolf, and J. Saia, "Finding spread blockers in dynamic networks," ser. SNAKDD'08, 2010, pp. 55–76.
- [7] N. P. Nguyen, G. Yan, M. T. Thai, and S. Eidenbenz, "Containment of misinformation spread in online social networks," ser. WebSci '12, ACM, 2012, pp. 213–222.
- [8] R. M. Tripathy, A. Bagchi, and S. Mehta, "A study of rumor control strategies on social networks," ser. CIKM '10. ACM, 2010.
- [9] S. Wen, J. Jiang, Y. Xiang, S. Yu, W. Zhou, and W. Jia, "To shut them up or to clarify: Restraining the spread of rumors in online social networks," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 99, no. PrePrints, p. 1, 2014.
- [10] R. Albert, H. Jeong, and A. Barabasi, "Error and attack tolerance of complex networks," *Nature*, vol. 406, no. 6794, pp. 378–382, 2000.
- [11] D. J. DALEY and D. G. KENDALL, *Stochastic Rumours*. Ima Journal of Applied Mathematics, 1965.

- [12] R. Yang, B.-H. Wang, J. Ren, W.-J. Bai, Z.-W. Shi, W.-X. Wang, and T. Zhou, "Epidemic spreading on heterogeneous networks with identical infectivity," *Physics Letters A*, vol. 364, pp. 189 – 193, 2007.
- [13] Y. Moreno, R. Pastor-Satorras, and A. Vespignani, "Epidemic outbreaks in complex heterogeneous networks," *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 521–529, 2002.
- [14] G. Zhu, X. Fu, and G. Chen, "Global attractivity of a network-based epidemic {SIS} model with nonlinear infectivity," *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 2588 – 2594, 2012.
- [15] V. F. *Nonlinear Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [16] J. P. LaSalle, "Stability theory for ordinary differential equations," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 4, pp. 57–65, Jan. 1968.
- [17] D. Grass, A. Vienna, J. Caulkins, and P. Rand, *Optimal Control of Nonlinear Processes*. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [18] G. Iooss and D. Joseph, *Elementary Stability and Bifurcation Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [19] P. Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations: Second Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2002.
- [20] <http://www.isi.edu/lerman/downloads/digg2009.html>.
- [21] W. Zhou, W. Jia, M. Haghighi, Y. Xiang, and C. Chen, "A sword with two edges: Propagation studies on both positive and negative information in online social networks," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 99, no. PrePrints, p. 1, 2014.
- [22] Y. Bao, Y. Niu, C. Yi, and Y. Xue, "Effective immunization strategy for rumor propagation based on maximum spanning tree," 2014, pp. 11–15.
- [23] A. Singh and Y. N. Singh, "Rumor dynamics with inoculations for correlated scale free networks," in *Communications (NCC), 2013 National Conference on*, Feb 2013, pp. 1–5.
- [24] Z. Qian, S. Tang, X. Zhang, and Z. Zheng, "The independent spreaders involved {SIR} rumor model in complex networks," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 429, pp. 95 – 102, 2015.
- [25] X. Wang, Y. Lin, Y. Zhao, L. Zhang, J. Liang, and Z. Cai, "A novel approach for inhibiting misinformation propagation in human mobile opportunistic networks," *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications*, pp. 1–18, 2016.
- [26] J. Huang and Q. Su, "A rumor spreading model based on user browsing behavior analysis in microblog," in *ICSSSM*, pp. 170–173.
- [27] X. Wang, Z. He, X. Zhao, C. Lin, Y. Pan, and Z. Cai, "Reaction-diffusion modeling of malware propagation in mobile wireless sensor networks," *SCIENCE CHINA Information Sciences*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 1–18, 2013.
- [28] Z. He, Z. Cai, S. Cheng, and X. Wang, "Approximate aggregation for tracking quantiles and range countings in wireless sensor networks," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 607, pp. 381–390, 2015.



in networks. He is a senior member of the CCF (China Computer Federation).



Xiaoming Wang is a Professor in the School of Computer Science at Shaanxi Normal University, China. He received his PhD degree in computer software and theory from Northwest University, China, in 2005. He was a visiting scholar in the Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University, USA, from 2007 to 2008. His main research interests include delay tolerant networks, network security, wireless sensor networks, and information diffusion modeling.



Yunchuan Sun Yunchuan Sun is currently an associate professor in Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China. He is an IEEE senior member and acts as the Secretary of the IEEE Communications Society Technical Subcommittee for the Internet of Things. He is an CCF (China Computer Federation) member. He also acts as associate editor of the Springer journal Personal and Ubiquitous Computing since Jan. 2012. He received his PhD from the Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing China in 2009. His research interests include Internet of Things, Big Data Modeling and Analysis, Event-linked Network, Semantic Technologies, Knowledge Engineering, and Information Security.



Yingshu Li received her Ph.D. and M.S. degrees from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. She received her B.S. degree from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at Beijing Institute of Technology, China. Dr. Li is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University. Her research interests include Wireless Networking, Sensor Networks, Sensory Data Management, Social Networks, and Optimization. Dr. Li is the recipient of an NSF CAREER Award. She is a senior member of the IEEE.



Zaobo He is a PhD Student in the Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University. He received his M.S. degree in computer science from Shannxi Normal University, China, in 2013. His research interests include Privacy Preservation, Social Networking, and Big Data. He is now a Student Member of the IEEE.



Zhipeng Cai received his PhD and M.S. degrees in the Department of Computing Science at University of Alberta, and B.S. degree from Beijing Institute of Technology. Dr. Cai is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science at Georgia State University. Dr. Cai's research areas focus on Networking, Privacy and Big data. Dr. Cai is the recipient of an NSF CAREER Award. He is an editor/guest editor for *Algorithmica*, *Theoretical Computer Science*, *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, and *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*. He is a senior member of the IEEE.