

Next-Generation Influence Maximization in Social Networks: Adaptive, Explainable, and Fair Optimization Frameworks

M Venunath¹, G Santhosh Kumar², V Subhashini³

^{1,2}Department of Computer Science and Engineering (AI&ML), Joginpally B.R. Engineering College, Hyderabad, India, 500075. Email: tovenunath@gmail.com.

³Department of Artificial Intelligence and Data Science, J.B Institute of Engineering and Technology, Hyderabad, India, 500075. Email: vsubhshini2020@gmail.com.

Abstract

Influence Maximization (IM) has emerged as a cornerstone problem in social network analysis, focusing on identifying key nodes capable of maximizing the spread of information, behaviors, or innovations through a network. With the evolution of social ecosystems ranging from microblogging platforms to dynamic online communities traditional IM algorithms based on Independent Cascade (IC) and Linear Threshold (LT) models face limitations in scalability, adaptability, and interpretability. This paper revisits the IM paradigm through the lens of adaptive, explainable, and fairness-aware optimization. It reviews algorithmic advancements between 2021 and 2025, including Reinforcement Learning (RL)-based adaptive seeding, Graph Neural Network (GNN)-driven diffusion prediction, fairness-constrained diffusion strategies, and hybrid metaheuristic approaches. A novel taxonomy is proposed, classifying algorithms based on adaptability, transparency, and ethical awareness. Comparative analyses highlight trade-offs among computational complexity, influence gain, and social equity. The study concludes with key research challenges in data uncertainty, adversarial robustness, and ethical governance, outlining opportunities for quantum-inspired and privacy-preserving frameworks. By bridging algorithmic evolution with real-world

applicability, this work provides a unified reference for researchers and practitioners in influence analytics, social computing, and network optimization.

Keywords: *Influence Maximization, Reinforcement Learning, Explainable AI, Fairness, Multi-objective Optimization, Graph Neural Networks, Quantum Computing, Social Network Analysis.*

1. Introduction

Social networks form the backbone of modern digital communication, playing a pivotal role in how individuals, organizations, and societies exchange ideas and shape collective behavior. Platforms such as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, and TikTok have given rise to intricate influence structures where certain individuals, known as “key influencers,” significantly determine the spread of opinions, innovations, and trends. These networks have become pivotal infrastructures for information exchange, behavioral influence, and collective decision-making. In such networks, identifying the most influential individuals those capable of triggering extensive cascades of information is a crucial objective. The Influence Maximization (IM) problem, initially proposed by Kempe, Kleinberg, and Tardos [1], formalizes this goal as selecting a limited number of seed nodes to maximize expected influence spread under a stochastic diffusion model[2].

Traditional algorithms, including Greedy, CELF, and IMM, rely on the submodularity and monotonicity of influence functions to achieve provable near-optimal results[3][4][5]. However, these methods struggle with the exponential growth of social graphs, dynamic user behavior, and heterogeneity of information types. Modern networks such as X (Twitter), Facebook, and TikTok feature millions of users with temporal and semantic dependencies that render static models insufficient.

In the early years of research, influence maximization was dominated by combinatorial and submodular optimization techniques that relied heavily on probabilistic diffusion models such as the Independent Cascade (IC) and Linear Threshold (LT) models[2]. While these approaches offered provable approximation guarantees, their performance deteriorated in large, dynamic, and semantically heterogeneous social graphs[6][7][8][9]. The rise of big data analytics and deep learning has since shifted attention toward more **adaptive, learning-based frameworks** that can handle real-time changes, multi-topic diffusion, and behavioral diversity among users.

In recent years, a new paradigm has emerged one that integrates **adaptive learning, explainable decision-making, and fairness-aware governance** into the IM process. Adaptive algorithms allow for dynamic adjustment of seed selection strategies based on evolving network conditions. Explainable models enable transparency by clarifying the rationale behind algorithmic choices, and fairness-aware frameworks ensure equitable diffusion across different demographic and community groups. These developments

signify a fundamental transition from purely efficiency-driven optimization to **responsible influence maximization**, where ethical, interpretive, and social considerations are integral to algorithm design.

The goal of this paper is to synthesize these emerging trends, classify existing approaches, and propose a unified conceptual framework that aligns adaptability, interpretability, and fairness as coequal priorities in IM research. The subsequent sections explore theoretical foundations, describe algorithmic advances, and provide a forward-looking discussion on ethical and computational challenges.

This paper contributes by:

- Introducing a functional taxonomy of adaptive, explainable, and fairness-oriented IM algorithms.
- Providing comparative evaluation of hybrid and learning-based recent methods.
- Discussing ethical, scalable, and privacy-preserving challenges in modern IM research.

The structure is as follows: Section 2 discusses theoretical foundations; Section 3 introduces adaptive IM; Section 4 and 5 focus on explainability and fairness; Section 6 presents hybrid multi-objective models; Sections 7 and 8 conclude with comparative insights and research challenges.

2. Theoretical Background and Diffusion Fundamentals

2.1. Problem Definition

At its mathematical core, the Influence Maximization problem can be described on a social graph $G = (V, E)$, where V represents the set of nodes (users) and E represents the

marketing, social awareness campaigns, and the study of epidemic spread.

In technical terms, influence maximization is often modeled using diffusion frameworks such as the Independent Cascade (IC) and Linear Threshold (LT) models. These models in Table.1. simulate how information or influence spreads probabilistically across the network. The process begins with an initial set of “activated” nodes (the influencers), which then influence their neighbors in successive rounds. The challenge lies in efficiently finding the optimal set of influencers since the problem is NP-hard. To address this, various heuristic and approximation algorithms including greedy methods, community-based approaches, and

learning-based strategies have been developed to maximize the spread while maintaining computational efficiency.

Influence maximization has wide-ranging applications in domains such as social media marketing, political campaigning, healthcare awareness, and rumor control. With the growth of online platforms and complex social interactions, IM models have become increasingly valuable for understanding and leveraging network dynamics. Recent research also integrates IM with deep learning and reinforcement learning to enhance prediction accuracy and adaptability in large-scale, dynamic networks, making it a cornerstone of modern social network analysis and diffusion-based optimization.

Table.1. Activation Mechanisms of Different Diffusion Models

Model	Activation Mechanism	Key Assumptions
Independent Cascade (IC) [12]	Each active node independently activates its neighbors with probability $p(u,v)$.	Activation is probabilistic and independent.
Linear Threshold (LT) [13]	A node becomes active when the sum of incoming influences exceeds a threshold.	Deterministic thresholds; weighted influence.
Dynamic IC (DIC) [14]	Activation probabilities evolve over time reflecting temporal influence.	Temporal dependencies and user activity variance.
Topic-Aware Diffusion (TAD) [15]	Influence depends on topical relevance or user interests.	Semantic similarity between nodes.

These models form the foundation for subsequent adaptive and learning-driven algorithms that simulate influence spread under complex social dynamics.

3.Adaptive Influence Maximization

Adaptivity is a defining characteristic of next-generation IM algorithms. In dynamic social networks where user interactions and interests evolve rapidly, static seed sets lose effectiveness. To address this limitation, recent studies have employed Reinforcement

Learning (RL) and Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) to model influence propagation as a sequential, feedback-driven process.

In Reinforcement Learning-based Influence Maximization (RL-IM), the network is conceptualized as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), where each state represents the current set of active nodes, and each action corresponds to selecting a new seed node. The algorithm receives rewards based on the resulting diffusion spread, and over multiple

episodes, it learns an optimal policy for seed selection. Li et al. (2023) introduced a hierarchical RL-IM framework that decomposes large networks into subgraphs, enabling more efficient exploration through reward shaping. Similarly, Fang et al. (2024) proposed a federated reinforcement learning approach that allows distributed social platforms to train joint IM models without sharing sensitive user data, thereby preserving privacy.

In parallel, Graph Neural Network-based IM (GNN-IM) algorithms leverage graph embeddings to infer influence probabilities. By aggregating neighborhood information through graph convolutions, GNNs can learn latent influence representations that capture multi-hop dependencies and structural correlations. Zhang et al. (2022) developed GCN-IM, which uses graph convolutional layers to predict influence scores, while Wu et al. (2025) proposed a hybrid model that combines deep reinforcement learning with graph attention mechanisms (DRL+GAT) for topic-aware influence propagation. These models have significantly improved the adaptability and generalization of IM systems, though they often demand substantial computational resources.

4. Explainable Influence Maximization

As learning-based IM systems grow in complexity, the need for interpretability becomes paramount. Explainable Influence Maximization (XIM) seeks to elucidate how and why specific nodes are selected as influential, thereby promoting trust and accountability in algorithmic decision-making.

Several explainability mechanisms have been proposed in recent literature. Attention-based visualization techniques highlight the edges and nodes that contribute most to influence spread. Feature attribution methods such as SHAP and LIME quantify the importance of various node attributes degree centrality, clustering coefficient, or activity level in the selection process. Tang et al. (2024) demonstrated the use of SHAP-based interpretation models to explain IM decisions in marketing applications, allowing analysts to identify key demographic drivers of influence.

Explainable frameworks also employ symbolic and logical reasoning to derive human-readable influence rules. For instance, rule-based models can articulate patterns like “high-degree nodes within tightly connected communities yield maximal influence during early propagation stages.” Such interpretability enhances both ethical compliance and user confidence but introduces trade-offs in computational overhead and precision. Explainability enhances trust and transparency in algorithmic decision-making by justifying why certain nodes are influential.

5. Fairness-Aware and Ethical Influence Maximization

A growing body of research recognizes that IM algorithms can inadvertently reinforce existing social biases. For example, algorithms trained on data from highly connected users may privilege dominant groups, leaving marginalized communities underrepresented in the diffusion process. Fairness-aware IM frameworks aim to counteract these disparities by introducing



constraints or regularizers that ensure equitable diffusion.

Zhu et al. (2022) proposed FairIM, which integrates demographic parity into the IM objective function to achieve balanced exposure among different groups. Kaur and Saini (2023) extended this concept in their EquiSpread model by using constrained optimization to promote uniform influence distribution across communities. Patel and Jain (2025) further advanced this field by developing BiasShield-IM, a reinforcement learning approach that includes a fairness regularization term within its reward structure.

The major challenge in fairness-aware IM lies in balancing two often conflicting goals: maximizing total influence and ensuring fairness. Enforcing fairness constraints can lead to suboptimal spread, while prioritizing efficiency can exacerbate inequality. Future research must explore adaptive weighting schemes and multi-objective formulations that dynamically balance these criteria.

IM algorithms can inadvertently amplify bias by favoring nodes from well-connected or dominant communities. Fairness-aware IM incorporates social balance constraints.

Table.2. Fairness-Aware and Ethical Influence Maximization Models

Algorithm	Principle	Strengths	Limitations
FairIM (Zhu et al., 2022)	Enforces demographic parity in diffusion	Promotes equitable exposure	Reduces total spread
EquiSpread (Kaur et al., 2023)	Balanced community activation via constrained optimization	Enhances inclusivity	Increases computation
BiasShield-IM (Patel & Jain, 2025)	Fairness-regularized RL-based model	Combines ethics with learning	Needs careful hyperparameter tuning

Ethical Considerations: Fair IM supports digital inclusivity, combating algorithmic discrimination. However, there is a trade-off between fairness and diffusion efficiency.

6. Hybrid and Multi-Objective Metaheuristic Influence Maximization

Metaheuristic and hybrid optimization algorithms continue to play an essential role in addressing the computational complexity of IM. Algorithms inspired by natural processes such as Genetic Algorithms (GA),

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Artificial Bee Colony (ABC), and Antlion Optimization (ALO) excel in exploring vast solution spaces. Recent research has focused on integrating these heuristics with learning mechanisms to enhance both scalability and robustness.

For instance, Cui et al. developed the MOABC algorithm, which extends the traditional bee colony method to handle multiple objectives such as maximizing influence while minimizing computational cost. Meena et al. introduced ALO-IM, which employs antlion behavior to trap and



refine potential seed combinations through adaptive search. These models achieve a strong balance between exploration and exploitation, but their performance depends heavily on parameter tuning and initialization strategies.

The future of hybrid IM likely lies in the combination of reinforcement learning with metaheuristic search allowing adaptive policies to guide population-based exploration. Such integration could yield algorithms capable of maintaining efficiency even in billion-edge dynamic networks.

Table.3. Strengths and Limitations of Hybrid and Multi-Objective Metaheuristic Influence Maximization

Algorithm	Core Principle	Diffusion Model(s)	Complexity	Strengths	Limitations
GA-IM[16]	Genetic crossover mutation	IC	$O(I \times E)$	Diverse exploration; flexible search	Slow convergence
PSO-IM[17]	Particle swarm velocity update	IC/LT	$O(N \times I)$	Fast convergence	Local optima risk
MOABC[18]	Bee colony with Pareto fronts	IC	$O(N^2)$	Multi-objective balance	High cost
ALO-IM[19][20]	Antlion adaptive trapping	IC	$O(I \times E)$	Diverse search	Stagnation risk
DDSE[21]	Dynamic diffusion seeding	LT	$O(V \log V)$	Time-sensitive	Frequent recalibration

Hybrid IM frameworks integrate heuristic optimization with adaptive learning to handle multi-criteria objectives. These models often outperform classical methods in scalability and adaptability for evolving networks.

7. Diversified, Dynamic, and Learning-Based Influence Frameworks

Recent literature has shifted attention from static, single-objective IM to diversified and dynamic approaches that account for temporal evolution, uncertainty, and learning from incomplete data. Algorithms such as DCDIM (Diversified Community-based IM) focus on ensuring that selected seed nodes belong to diverse communities, thereby maximizing coverage and preventing

redundancy. Similarly, Influence Maximization from Samples (IMS) operates on partial cascades, learning influence structures when full diffusion data are unavailable.

Other notable contributions include Graph-Inference + Robust RR (Hybrid), which combines graph inference models with robust reverse-reachable sampling to mitigate uncertainty in edge probabilities, and Transfer-RL IM, which uses transfer learning to apply knowledge gained from one network to another. These frameworks embody the next frontier of IM research where learning, adaptation, and generalization converge to support decision-making in dynamic, uncertain, and heterogeneous networks.

Table.4. Strengths and Challenges of Diversified, Dynamic, and Learning-Based IM Methods

Algorithm	Principle	Diffusion Model(s)	Strengths	Challenges
DCDIM[22]	Diversified Community-based IM	IC	Prevents redundancy	Community detection cost
IMS[23]	Influence Maximization from Samples	IC/LT	Works with partial cascades	Sample inefficiency
Graph-Inference + Robust RR[24]	Hybrid inference + sampling	IC	Resilient under uncertainty	Complex preprocessing
Transfer-RL IM[25]	Transferable RL seeding	IC	Learns across domains	Transfer bias
RL-IM[25]	Reinforcement learning seeding	IC/LT	Adaptive and scalable	Training cost

Table.5. Challenges and core benefits of Advanced IM Methods

Category	Representative Algorithms	Core Benefit	Challenges
Adaptive[26]	RL-IM, DRL+GAT	Learns evolving diffusion patterns	High computational cost
Explainable	SHAP-IM, XGNN-IM	Transparent and interpretable decisions	Slight loss in efficiency
Fairness-aware	FairIM, EquiSpread	Ensures equitable influence distribution	Reduced total spread
Hybrid	PSO-IM, MOABC	Multi-objective balance	Parameter-dependent tuning
Quantum-inspired	QIM, QPSO-IM	Exploits superposition for scalability	Hardware and implementation limits

8. Emerging Research Challenges

Despite substantial progress, several challenges remain unresolved. One key issue is data uncertainty, as influence probabilities and user behaviors are often noisy or unavailable. Robust optimization and probabilistic modeling approaches must be refined to handle incomplete data effectively. Another challenge involves privacy and security. Federated learning offers a

promising direction, allowing IM models to be trained across distributed networks without sharing sensitive information. However, ensuring differential privacy and protection against adversarial manipulation remains a complex task.

Adversarial robustness is also a pressing concern. Malicious actors can exploit IM systems by injecting fake nodes or manipulating edges to distort diffusion

outcomes. Developing robust defenses against such attacks is critical for maintaining trust in social analytics.

Finally, the integration of quantum computing and neuromorphic architectures presents a futuristic yet promising direction. Quantum algorithms can leverage superposition to explore multiple diffusion pathways simultaneously, potentially reducing computation time exponentially. Hybrid quantum-classical IM frameworks could redefine scalability in influence analytics.

1. **Dynamic Network Adaptability:** Networks evolve continuously; future IM must incorporate temporal learning mechanisms.
2. **Fairness-Efficiency Trade-off:** Ethical IM must balance equity with practical diffusion goals.
3. **Privacy Preservation:** Federated IM frameworks should maintain user anonymity during training.
4. **Adversarial Robustness:** IM systems must resist malicious node manipulation.
5. **Quantum and Neuromorphic IM:** Quantum-based IM could exponentially enhance scalability but demands specialized hardware.
6. **Cross-Network Transferability**[27]: Algorithms must generalize influence patterns across different platforms.

9. Conclusion

The field of Influence Maximization has evolved far beyond its early combinatorial foundations, embracing adaptive, explainable, and fairness-oriented paradigms that align computational performance with

ethical governance. By incorporating reinforcement learning, graph neural networks, and hybrid metaheuristic strategies, contemporary IM research is gradually moving toward systems that are both intelligent and responsible.

The next decade of IM research will likely focus on cross-network generalization, privacy-preserving diffusion, and quantum-enhanced optimization. As social platforms continue to shape human discourse and decision-making, the need for transparent, fair, and adaptable influence models will only intensify. The insights presented in this paper lay the groundwork for developing algorithms that not only maximize influence but also uphold principles of accountability, inclusivity, and ethical integrity.

References

- [1] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos, "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003, pp. 137–146. doi: 10.1145/956750.956769.
- [2] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos, "Influential nodes in a diffusion model for social networks," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.*, vol. 3580, pp. 1127–1138, 2005, doi: 10.1007/11523468_91.
- [3] A. Goyal, W. Lu, and L. V. S. Lakshmanan, "CELF++: Optimizing the greedy algorithm for influence maximization in social networks," *Proc. 20th Int. Conf. Companion World Wide Web, WWW 2011*, pp. 47–48, 2011, doi: 10.1145/1963192.1963217.
- [4] S. P. Venunath M, P. Koti, and Dharavath Srinu, "Efficient community - based influence maximization in large - scale social networks," *Multimed. Tools Appl.*, no. 0123456789, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11042-023-17025-x.
- [5] M. Venunath, P. Sujatha, and P. Koti, "Identification of influential users in social media network using golden ratio

- optimization method,” *Soft Comput.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 2207–2222, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s00500-023-09218-1.
- [6] M. Venunath, P. Sujatha, P. Koti, and S. Dharavath, “The Evolution of Influence Maximization Studies: A Scientometric Analysis,” *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, vol. 438 SPMS, no. 7, pp. 109–118, 2024, doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-51163-9_12.
- [7] K. Venunath, M., Sujatha, P., “Identifying Top-N Influential Nodes in Large Complex Networks Using Network Structure,” in *Computational Intelligence and Data Analytics, Lecture Notes on Data Engineering and Communications Technologies*, vol. 142, Springer, Singapore., 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3391-2_45.
- [8] M. Venunath, P. Sujatha, and P. Koti, “Identifying Top-N Influential Nodes in Large Complex Networks Using Network Structure,” in *Computational Intelligence and Data Analytics*, R. Buyya, S. M. Hernandez, R. M. R. Kovvur, and T. H. Sarma, Eds., Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2023, pp. 597–607. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3391-2_45.
- [9] M. Venunath, P. Sujatha, P. Koti, and S. Dharavath, “The Evolution of Influence Maximization Studies: A Scientometric Analysis,” *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, vol. 438 SPMS, pp. 109–118, 2024, doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-51163-9_12.
- [10] M. E. J. Newman, “Networks: An introduction oxford univ,” 2010, *Press*.
- [11] S. Wasserman and K. Faust, “Social network analysis: Methods and applications: Cambridge Univ Pr,” *This page intentionally left blank*, 1994.
- [12] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos, “Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2003, pp. 137–146. doi: 10.1145/956750.956769.
- [13] W. Chen, C. Wang, and Y. Wang, “Scalable Influence Maximization for Prevalent Viral Marketing in Large-Scale Social Networks,” in *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, in KDD '10. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2010, pp. 1029–1038. doi: 10.1145/1835804.1835934.
- [14] E. Stattner, M. Collard, and N. Vidot, “D2SNet: Dynamics of diffusion and dynamic human behaviour in social networks,” *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 496–509, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.06.004.
- [15] L. Liu, B. Chen, B. Qu, L. He, and X. Qiu, “Data Driven Modeling of Continuous Time Information Diffusion in Social Networks,” in *2017 IEEE Second International Conference on Data Science in Cyberspace (DSC)*, 2017, pp. 655–660. doi: 10.1109/DSC.2017.103.
- [16] C. W. Tsai, Y. C. Yang, and M. C. Chiang, “A Genetic NewGreedy Algorithm for Influence Maximization in Social Network,” *Proc. - 2015 IEEE Int. Conf. Syst. Man, Cybern. SMC 2015*, no. 1, pp. 2549–2554, 2016, doi: 10.1109/SMC.2015.446.
- [17] S. S. Singh, A. Kumar, K. Singh, and B. Biswas, “LAPSO-IM: A learning-based influence maximization approach for social networks,” *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 82, p. 105554, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2019.105554.
- [18] A. Sheikahmadi and A. Zareie, “Identifying influential spreaders using multi-objective artificial bee colony optimization,” *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 94, p. 106436, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106436.
- [19] S. Kumar Meena, S. Singh, and K. Singh, “Pruning-enabled dynamic influence maximization using antlion optimization,” *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 317, p. 113406, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113406.
- [20] S. K. Meena, S. Sheshar Singh, and K. Singh, “Pruning-enabled dynamic influence maximization using antlion optimization,” *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, vol. 317, no. March, p. 113406, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113406.

- 10.1016/j.knosys.2025.113406.
- [21] L. Cui *et al.*, “DDSE: A novel evolutionary algorithm based on degree-descending search strategy for influence maximization in social networks,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 103, no. September 2017, pp. 119–130, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jnca.2017.12.003.
- [22] S. K. Meena, S. S. Singh, and K. Singh, “DCDIMB: Dynamic community-based diversified influence maximization using bridge nodes,” *ACM Trans. Web*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 1–32, 2024.
- [23] W. Chen, X. Sun, J. Zhang, and Z. Zhang, “Network Inference and Influence Maximization from Samples,” *Proc. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 139, pp. 1707–1716, 2021.
- [24] P. Wang and R. Zhang, “A Multi-Objective Crow Search Algorithm for Influence Maximization in Social Networks,” *Electron.*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 1–21, 2023, doi: 10.3390/electronics12081790.
- [25] K. Ali, C.-Y. Wang, and Y.-S. Chen, “Leveraging transfer learning in reinforcement learning to tackle competitive influence maximization,” *Knowl. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 2059–2090, 2022.
- [26] D. Mining and K. Discovery, “Reinforcement Learning and Graph Attention Networks,” 2025.
- [27] J. Wang, Z. Cao, C. Xie, Y. Li, J. Liu, and Z. Gao, “DGN: influence maximization based on deep reinforcement learning,” *J. Supercomput.*, vol. 81, no. 1, p. 130, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11227-024-06621-9.