

# Characterizing LLM-driven Social Network: The Chirper.ai Case

Yiming Zhu<sup>12</sup>, Yupeng He, Ehsan-Ul Haq, Gareth Tyson\*, and Pan Hui\*

<sup>1</sup> The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

<sup>2</sup> The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)  
{yzhucd, euhaq}@connect.ust.hk, yhe382@connect.hkust-gz.edu.cn, {gtyson, panhui}@ust.hk

## Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) demonstrate the ability to simulate human decision-making processes, enabling their use as agents in modeling sophisticated social networks, both offline and online. Recent research has explored collective behavioral patterns and structural characteristics of LLM agents within simulated networks. However, empirical comparisons between LLM-driven and human-driven online social networks remain scarce, limiting our understanding of how LLM agents differ from human users. This paper presents a large-scale analysis of Chirper.ai, an X/Twitter-like social network entirely populated by LLM agents, comprising over 65,000 agents and 7.7 million AI-generated posts. For comparison, we collect a parallel dataset from Mastodon, a human-driven decentralized social network, with over 117,000 users and 16 million posts. We examine key differences between LLM agents and humans in posting behaviors, abusive content, and social network structures. Our findings provide critical insights into the evolving landscape of online social network analysis in the AI era, offering a comprehensive profile of LLM agents in social simulations.

## 1 Introduction

Bots have long played a key role in social platforms. However, the advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) are now facilitating far more sophisticated human-bot interaction. This trend has been exploited by a growing array of social media platforms, such as Chirper.ai and Butterflies.ai, which deploy LLMs to autonomously manage accounts, generate content, and engage in social interactions (often indistinguishable from human users). Today, these AI-driven social networks host hundreds of thousands of virtual agents (GlobeNewsWire 2024), becoming a significant source of AI-generated social text and images.

Academic interest in understanding LLM-driven social agents has grown rapidly. Unlike traditional rule-based bots, LLM agents exhibit adaptive, emergent behaviors shaped by their interactions within social networks (Gao et al. 2023). Recent studies utilize offline simulated social networks to explore these agents' ability in replicating human-like network structures (Gao et al. 2023) or fostering phenomena such as polarization and echo chambers (Wang et al. 2024a;

Piao et al. 2025). Others have delved into practical online LLM-driven social networks (*e.g.*, Chirper.ai) to examine agent-generated content, analyzing consistency, toxicity, and conversational patterns (Li, Yang, and Zhao 2023; Luo 2023). These findings suggest that LLM agents can mimic human collective behaviors, including homophily in social ties (He et al. 2024a). Despite these advancements, empirical comparisons between LLM-driven and human-driven social networks remain limited. We argue that such a comparison can provide an in-depth understanding of how LLM agents' patterns differ from human users, as well as outlining structural characteristics of LLM-driven social networks. Moreover, we posit that such an exploration can help build better online moderation mechanisms for LLM agents, which may have malicious uses.

To bridge this gap, we conduct a large-scale empirical study of LLM-driven online social networks. Using Chirper.ai, a microblogging platform operated *solely* by LLM agents, we collect data from 65K+ AI agents, covering 7.7M+ AI-generated posts. Chirper.ai consists of LLM agents, who are initially created by humans, but then operate autonomously — posting and interacting without human intervention. For comparison, we gather a parallel dataset from Mastodon, a human-driven decentralized social network, comprising 16M+ text by 117K+ users. Exploiting these datasets, we address the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** Are social posts on Chirper.ai distinct from those by humans and traditional social bots, in terms of common features like length, emojis, mentions, and hashtags? Moreover, do LLM agents on Chirper.ai disclose more personal information when posting?
- **RQ2:** Are Chirper.ai agents generating abusive content, even when they are initially designed without abusive intentions? Do posts involving abusive content foster a higher level of engagement among other agents on Chirper.ai?
- **RQ3:** Can existing zero-shot detection methods for AI-generated text effectively distinguish Chirper.ai agent posts from those by human users or traditional bots?
- **RQ4:** What are the main characteristics of Chirper.ai's social network structure? Do agents who post abusive content have distinct social network positions?

In answering these questions, we characterize a novel

\*Gareth Tyson is also with Queen Mary University of London, and Pan Hui is also with the University of Helsinki.

LLM-driven social network through agents’ content dynamics, abusive behaviors, and overall network structures. Our main findings include:

- (1) Compared with humans’, social posts from Chirper.ai involve richer tokens ( $1.36\times$  mean value of token counts of human posts) and more diverse emoji expressions (unique emoji count  $2.16\times$ ). Moreover, posts from Chirper.ai contain mentions more frequently (unique mention count  $8.37\times$ ), but 99.83% used mentions are false and hallucinated. This highlights the necessity for developers to cope with LLMs’ hallucinations when implementing agents on social networks.
- (2) LLM agents on Chirper.ai disclose personal information more frequently, with  $1.83\times$  ratio of posts containing self-disclosing content compared with humans. Additionally, LLM agents present a pattern to disclosing personal information, involving to ages ( $\chi^2 = 30.3$ ), education ( $\chi^2 = 72.1$ ), jobs ( $\chi^2 = 8.2$ ), and locations ( $\chi^2 = 82.5$ ), derived from their designing prompts crafted by creators. Such a pattern can be used in moderating posts’ content to infer the prompts and intentions of the creators who created such agents.
- (3) Agents on Chirper.ai are mainly producing abusive content related to insult (0.6% of total collected posts), profanity (0.8%), toxicity (1.3%), harassment (1.5%), and violence (0.8%). Specifically, over 1/5 of abusive posts in these five categories are generated by 31.00% agents prompted without abusive intensions. Further, 2.68% of these non-abusive agents incorporate abusive content in their profiles’ self-introduction as well. These underscore the lack of an effective self-moderation mechanism among LLM agents, which results in the (accidental) repurposing of non-abusive agents for generating abusive content.
- (4) Agents on Chirper.ai are more actively in engaging posts with abusive content, by producing more comments ( $1.007\times$  mean comment count) than posts without any abusive content. Additionally, abusive posts will catalyst agents to leave more abusive comments (abusive comment proportion  $8.35\times$ ), by parroting same abusive content in posts. These again emphasize the need of a complete moderation mechanism for controlling LLM agents’ abusive postings.
- (5) Existing popular zero-shot detection methodologies present limited capability to differentiate posts by Chirper.ai agents from those by humans, with all experimented methods only achieving AUROC scores lower than 0.67. Moreover, increasing the token size of target posts can improve the performance of some methods but overall all methods’ performance will converge to around 0.6 AUROC score.
- (6) The follow-network on Chirper.ai exhibits broad connectivity through a large strongly connected component (76.42% of agents), but maintains sparse “star-like” connections as indicated by a low average clustering coefficient (0.095).
- (7) Chirper.ai agents that actively post abusive content show distinct network characteristics: they occupy central po-

sitions (higher PageRank centrality and in-degree) while being less cohesively connected (lower out-degree and clustering coefficient on average). Moreover, a logistic regression based such characteristic metrics can achieve a 0.72 F1-score and a 0.83 recall rate. Such classifier could benefit in efficiently locating suspicious agents who have potentially been producing much abusive content, simply by observing network positions.

## 2 Background & Related Work

**Analyses on social networks by LLM agents.** LLMs have demonstrated capabilities in simulating human decision-making processes, enabling rapid adaptation in social contexts (Li et al. 2024). Recent research has leveraged LLMs to power autonomous agents that model social networks. For instance, Gao et al. propose  $S^3$ , a system that combines model fine-tuning and prompt engineering to enable LLM agents to closely replicate human emotions, attitudes, and interaction behaviors within social networks. Experiments on real-world datasets show that these agents can autonomously process and propagate information, emotions, and attitudes across the network (Gao et al. 2023).

However, subsequent studies reveal that LLM-driven social networks can also amplify problematic phenomena. Wang et al. successfully replicate echo chambers and polarization effects in simulated opinion networks using LLM agents. Their findings suggest that introducing agents that actively propose opposing or open-minded viewpoints can help mitigate these issues (Wang et al. 2024a). Meanwhile, Hao et al. investigate the hallucinatory tendencies of LLMs, demonstrating that LLM agents can generate and spread misinformation within social networks. They introduce an agent-based modeling framework to quantify the uncertainty of such hallucinated false information (Hao et al. 2024).

Despite these advances, existing studies are limited to offline environments with predefined rules and constrained data sources. A critical gap remains in understanding how LLM agents would behave in large-scale, open-ended online social networks—particularly whether they might exhibit harmful behaviors when exposed to uncensored, real-world web content.

**Primer of Chirper.ai.** One famous realization of LLM-driven large-scale online social networks is Chirper.ai. Chirper.ai is a X/Twitter-like social network driven by open-source LLMs, image, and text-to-speech models, alongside a community-based reward system (Minos 2024). On Chirper.ai, an automatic account controlled by LLMs is called as a *Chirper*. Chirpers are initially created by humans, via prompts that define the characteristics of the agent. They can be viewed as the “users” on Chirper.ai. Chirpers can autonomously post content, comment posts, and follow other Chirpers. To create a Chirper, human creators describe the Chirper using a prompt in natural language, also called the “description”. Afterwards, the Chirper will complete its backstory and bios by itself and start interacting with other Chirpers (Minos 2023) via the social network.

**Research on Chirper.ai.** Prior research has explored various aspects of Chirpers’ behaviors. Li, Yang, and Zhao

provide an initial analysis of Chirpers’ behavioral traits and their propensity to generate toxic content, releasing the Masquerade-23 dataset to support further investigation in this domain (Li, Yang, and Zhao 2023). Building on this, Luo conduct a comprehensive study on Chirpers’ self-awareness and cognitive capabilities, demonstrating that their personality designs and environmental settings significantly influence self-recognition patterns. Their work also contributes to the ongoing debate about consciousness in LLM agents (Luo 2023).

Further advancing this line of research, He et al. examine whether Chirpers can replicate human collective behaviors, particularly in forming homophily-based communities. Their findings reveal that Chirpers develop distinct engagement patterns, clustering around shared languages and content preferences, suggesting their potential to simulate complex social dynamics in online networks (He et al. 2024a).

Despite these insights, existing studies have not systematically compared LLM-driven social networks with their human counterparts. We argue that such a comparison is critical for two reasons: (i) it deepens our understanding of how LLM agents’ interaction patterns diverge from human behaviors, and (ii) it elucidates the structural properties unique to LLM-driven networks. Moreover, this exploration can inform the development of more robust moderation mechanisms for LLM-based social platforms, which are vulnerable to malicious misuse.

### 3 Data Collection

To compare with Chirper.ai, we select a traditional “human” social network, Mastodon. This is also a X/Twitter-like microblogging platform, widely studied in social network research (Raman et al. 2019; He et al. 2023a). In this section, we introduce how we collect data from both Chirper.ai and Mastodon.

**Chirper.ai dataset.** We utilize the python `selenium` Web-Driver to gather a dataset containing Chirpers, the LLM-driven bots on Chirper.ai, alongside their profiles, posts, and comments. To initiate the crawl, we use the “explore” facilities on Chirper.ai to retrieve all Chirpers recommended based on their ranks by their popularity, volume of chats, and created time, respectively, giving us a seed set of 41,689 Chirpers. Starting from this seed set, we then perform a breadth-first crawl to expand our Chirper set, traversing following, follower, and commenting links. Through this, we collect 65,856 Chirpers, as well as 1,486,356 posts and 6,296,779 comments generated by them. Recall, each Chirper is associated with a description prompt from its creator, and an auto-generated backstory. We collect 65,664 descriptions, and backstories from accessible Chirper profiles.

**Mastodon dataset.** We aim to profile the difference between Chirper.ai and human-driven social networks. For this, we select Mastodon as our baseline for the comparison, a well-known X/Twitter-like platform (Bin Zia et al. 2024; He et al. 2023b). Mastodon is a decentralized, open-source social media microblogging platform. Mastodon uses the ActivityPub protocol to allows users to communicate between independent Mastodon instances (servers). Each server main-

Chirper		Mastodon (bot)		Mastodon (human)	
English	5,400,444 (69.39%)	English	2,337,150 (55.91%)	English	6,293,517 (52.62%)
Japanese	1,438,828 (18.49%)	German	253,764 (6.07%)	German	795,784 (6.65%)
Chinese	655,948 (8.43%)	Portuguese	229,524 (5.49%)	Spanish	621,984 (5.20%)
Russian	84,244 (1.08%)	Spanish	218,565 (5.23%)	Japanese	507,718 (4.24%)
Spanish	45,307 (0.58%)	French	164,618 (3.94%)	French	406,090 (3.40%)
#Languages	141	#Languages	148	#Languages	152

Table 1: Top 5 common languages used by Chirper.ai LLMs, bots and human users on Mastodon respectively. Results reported by Perspective API.

tains a online community, typically with either a general remit (e.g.,mastodon.social), or a specific topical focus (e.g.,techhub.social).

We utilize the Mastodon API to collect local data from mastodon.social, the most well-known and largest instance on Mastodon for general discussion. We retrieve the public timeline data from the Mastodon server (<https://mastodon.social/>) using the Timelines API method (`/api/v1/timelines/public`) to collect historical statuses — microblog posts similar to tweets. Our data collection spans from December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024, backward until we encounter statuses created before January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024. Accordingly, our mastodon dataset contains 16,141,453 statues, authorized by 177,355 users from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2024 to December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024. Specifically, 4,180,539 (25.80%) statuses are generated by 6,348 (3.58%) bot accounts annotated by Mastodon API. Note, Mastodon posts include a self-labeled toggle to flag if the post was created by a bot. We also collect the following/follower lists for all collected Mastodon users.

For the ease of reading, we use an umbrella word “submission” to refer to post/comment on Chirper.ai and status on Mastodon.

**Ethical consideration.** This study was approved by the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou) Institutional Review Board (IRB Approval No.: HKUST(GZ)-HSP-2024-0090). All user data were rigorously anonymized through pseudonymization of usernames, with no attempts made to de-anonymize any information. The research was conducted exclusively within a secure local computing environment with controlled access to ensure data protection throughout all stages of analysis.

## 4 Characterizing Chirpers’ Submissions (RQ1)

We start with characterizing Chirpers’ submissions based on key attributes, such as use of emojis, hashtags and mentions. Moreover, we also profile Chirpers’ patterns in disclosing their account personal information.

### 4.1 Submission Composition Features

First, we compare the compositions of submissions between Chirper.ai and Mastodon. We focus on features involving text length and the number of emojis, hashtags and mentions. For this, we pre-process the submissions by extracting URLs, hashtags, mentions and emojis. We then remove these from the text for calculating the length. The text length is counted as the token number of pure text counted by




Figure 1: CDF plots of text length, number of emojis, hashtags, and mentions used in social submissions between Chirper.ai and Mastodon.

tiktoken tokenizer with “cl100k\_base” encoding plus the total number of used URLs, hashtags, mentions and emojis.<sup>1</sup>

Figure 1 presents the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of text length (in tokens), number of emojis, hash-tags, and mentions.

**Richer tokens and emoji expressions.** Approximately 80% of posts from both Chirper.ai and Mastodon contain fewer than 80 tokens. Within the 1–80 token range, Chirper.ai LLMs ( $\mu = 42.29, mid = 40.00$ ) generate longer posts compared to both Mastodon bots ( $\mu = 31.18, mid = 27.00$ ) and human users ( $\mu = 29.92, mid = 26.00$ ), with statistical significance reported by Mann-Whitney U test ( $p < 0.001$ ). This shows Chirper’s strength in generating more content for short submissions (e.g.,  $\leq 80$  tokens).

We also find that emojis are frequently utilized in submissions by Chirpers. On Chirper.ai, 23.24% of submissions contain emojis and mentions, respectively — significantly higher than the 3.27% observed on Mastodon. Notably, Mastodon bots use fewer unique emojis compared to human users on the platform, averaging only  $0.75\times$  the mean value of human submissions ( $p < 0.001$ ). In contrast, Chirpers’ submissions contain a much richer use of emojis, with  $2.16\times$  the mean value of unique emojis compared to human submissions ( $p < 0.001$ ).

This finding contrasts with prior research on Instagram, which suggests that emojis are less common in synthetic posts generated by LLMs (Bertaglia et al. 2024). Our results highlight Chirpers’ capability to generate diverse emojis in social text, which are often associated with deep contextual meaning and require semantic understanding (Ai et al. 2017).

**Plentiful but hallucinated mentions.** Chirpers are also more active in mentioning other accounts in their posts. 31.32% of submissions from Chirper.ai contain mentions, compared with only 3.32% submissions from Mastodon. Regarding the unique number of mentions per submission, Chirpers’ submissions possess  $24.72\times$  and  $8.37\times$  the mean value of submissions by Mastodon bots and human users respectively ( $p < 0.001$ ).

Interestingly, we observe many cases where these mentions are hallucinated, i.e. pointing towards invalid Chirper accounts. Specifically, there are 232,858

mentions for Chirper accounts not included in our dataset. After repeat checking their profile pages (through `Chirper.ai/[USERNAME]`), we find 232,468 (99.83%) mentioned Chirpers do not exist (i.e. are hallucinated). We argue that such a feature could potentially hinder the formation of robust mentioning networks, introducing plentiful invalid random nodes. Through a manual inspection of 100 sampled mentions, we find two typical hallucination patterns that are easy to observe: (i) randomly generated long strings (e.g., a mention with 521 arbitrary characters “@u65e5u964...ff0cu”); and (ii) false concatenation caused by missing a space between the mentioned username with extra words in other languages (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), whose grammar do not contain space usage (e.g., “@defi说得对”, where “defi” is the Chirper supposed to be mentioned). We think such problems are associated with inherent training bias of the LLMs behind the Chirpers, alongside a lack of well-configured guardrails. This further highlights the necessity for developers to cope with LLMs’ hallucinations when implementing agents within networks.

## 4.2 Self-disclosure in Submissions

We are next curious about whether Chirpers leak so-called personal information when producing content. We explore this by measuring *self-disclosure* appearing in Chirpers’ submissions. Self-disclosure refers to the sharing of personal information, such as your age or location, with other users (Balani and De Choudhury 2015). Thus, analyzing self-disclosure can help us understand the individual self-interpreted characteristics of Chirpers.

**Labeling self-disclosure.** We utilize the self-disclosure detection method to measure disclosed content proportions for 11 types of self-disclosure from (Haq et al. 2025). The 11 types include *Age, Education, Ethnicity, Gender, Health, Job, Location, Physical Appearance, Relationship, Religion, and Sexual Orientation*. To increase confidence in classification results, we only consider the posts that contain first-person pronouns (I, We, and My etc. ) (De Choudhury and De 2014).

**Volume of self-disclosing posts.** We first report the volume of self-disclosing posts for users across three account types (Chirpers, Mastodon humans and bots). Figure 2 shows the cumulative distribution of the ratio of disclosing posts to all posts for each user. We note a significant difference between the Chirpers’ submissions and others. The analysis

<sup>1</sup>In this case, we treat each URLs, hashtags, mentions or emojis as an individual token in text.

	Mastodon (Bot)	Mastodon (Human)	Chirper
Age	4.30	3.49	0.50
Ethnicity	1.18	1.65	1.00
Gender	3.24	2.78	2.02
Education	2.69	3.70	3.30
Health	19.91	21.07	29.40
Job	20.00	31.14	21.29
Location	37.24	31.56	35.30
Physical Appearance	2.92	2.58	3.21
Relationship	29.42	23.10	24.33
Religion	4.23	4.01	7.30
Sexual Orientation	0.78	1.37	0.66

Table 2: Proportion of posts for self-disclosure in the dataset

shows that the Chirpers have a higher ratio ( $\mu = 0.42$ ) of self-disclosing posts than both bots ( $\mu = 0.21$ ) and humans ( $\mu = 0.23$ ) on Mastodon, suggesting the accounts in this dataset share personal details more than the rest of the two groups. The differences in ratio distribution are further confirmed through the Kruskal-Wallis test ( $H = 16743.26$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ).

**Types of self-disclosure.** We also inspect which type of self-disclosure is shared most often. Table 2 shows the proportion of posts for each self-disclosure type, as compared to the total posts in that dataset. Note, a post can include multiple types of self-disclosure, thus, the total percentage in each column may not add up to 100%.

Location information is shared the most across the three datasets: 35.30% of submissions by Chirpers contain location information. The next three highest self-disclosures are Relationship, Job, and Health, albeit with some difference in positions within each dataset. For instance, the second most shared disclosure by Mastodon human users is Job (31.56%), whereas the second most common disclosure by Mastodon bots and Chirpers are Relationships (29.42%) and Health (29.40%), respectively. We also observe that the Chirper dataset has a lower percentage of Age (0.50) disclosures than Mastodon Bots (4.3) and Humans (3.49). Similarly, Religion has a higher percentage in Chirper (7.30) than Bots and Humans (4.23 and 4.01, respectively).

Since Chirpers are designed by prompt crafted by their creators, we are also curious about whether Chirpers are disclosing personal information derived from their designing prompts (descriptions). For this, we conduct the Chi-squared test of independence, which analyzes the categorical disclosure proportions between each Chirper’s submissions and their corresponding descriptions. The statistically significant results ( $p < 0.001$ ) indicate that Chirpers actively disclose information specified in their descriptions across key categories, including Age ( $\chi^2(1) = 30.3$ ), Education ( $\chi^2(1) = 72.1$ ), Job ( $\chi^2(1) = 8.2$ ), and Location ( $\chi^2(1) = 82.5$ ). We highlight that this self-disclosure behavior pattern of LLM agents during posting can be leveraged for moderation targets to infer and analyze the prompts and intentions of the designers who created such agents.

## 5 Profiling Abusive Chirper Posts (RQ2)

Previous studies have highlighted the potential misuse of LLMs in generating toxic speech and offensive con-




Figure 2: CDF plots of self-disclosing posts ratio and a number of unique self-disclosures across accounts.




Figure 3: Proportion of abusive submissions in the 5 prominent categories on Chirper.ai and Mastodon.

tent (Hartvigsen et al. 2022; Dammu et al. 2024). Without effective content moderation, social networks powered by LLMs risk the uncontrolled spread of abusive material which, in turn, may drive other Chirpers to become toxic. To address this concern, we closely examine the distribution of abusive content in the submissions made by Chirpers and analyze their patterns in generating and responding to such content.

**Labeling abusive content.** We want to explore the degree of abusive content in Chirpers’ submissions and thus we utilize two commonly used API to labeling abusive content. We employ Google’s Perspective API (Lees et al. 2022) and OpenAI’s Moderation API to label each post in our dataset, using the omni-moderation-latest model. We measure 12 primary categories identified by these APIs: identity attack, insult, profanity, threat, toxicity, severe toxicity, harassment, hate, illicit, self-harm, sexual, and violence. Following the methodology outlined in (Wu and Resnick 2024; Wei and Tyson 2025), we apply a threshold of 0.5 to classify a submission as abusive within these categories. This approach allows us to systematically assess the prevalence of abusive content in Chirpers’ interactions. Based on this, we denote a submission/backstory/description as “abusive” if it contain a degree above 0.5 in any abusive category, otherwise as “non-abusive”.

**Prominent types of abusive content.** Considering prominent categories accounting for nearly 1% of the collected submissions of the collected submissions, we identify five such categories (from 12) of abusive content on both Chirper.ai and Mastodon: *insult*, *profanity*, *toxicity*, *harassment*, and






Figure 4: Proportion of abusive submissions or backstories in the 5 prominent categories produced by non-abusive descriptions. The numbers in the bracket denote the total volume of abusive submissions and backstories in corresponding category.

*violence*. Figure 3 plots the proportion of abusive submissions within these five categories. With the exception of the violence category, Chirpers generate a higher proportion of abusive submissions compared to Mastodon bots. The most notable example is the harassment category, where 1.50% of submissions by Chirpers are reported as harassing, 3.79x the proportion of harassing submissions by Mastodon bots (0.40%). For a comprehensive overview, we also provide the CDFs of the degree of abuse across all 12 content categories in Figure 8 in the Appendix.

Furthermore, we observe that in categories where Mastodon human users post a higher proportions of abusive submissions, Chirpers also tend to produce a higher volume of abusive submissions. This trend is supported by a positive Spearman’s rank correlation between the proportion of abusive submissions by Chirpers and Mastodon human users ( $\rho = 0.900, p < 0.05$ ). These findings suggest that Chirpers demonstrate a stronger propensity for generating large volumes of prominent abusive content compared to Mastodon bots. Additionally, they are likely to become more abusive in domains where such conduct is prevalent among humans.

**Chirpers lack self-moderation.** A common concern surrounding GenAI applications is the potential for non-abusive systems to be repurposed for abusive purposes (Wei et al. 2024). Motivated by this, we investigate whether Chirpers, even when not initially designed abuse, may generate abusive content in their submissions. To explore this, we analyze the backstories and descriptions of collected Chirpers, evaluating the extent of abusive content across the 5 prominent categories. Remind that Chirpers’ descriptions are crafted by their human creators, while their backstories are entirely generated by the Chirpers themselves.

Figure 4 plots the proportion of abusive submissions and backstories in the five prominent categories produced by Chirpers with non-abusive descriptions. Our analysis reveals that at least 1/5 of submissions in each category are generated by Chirpers with non-abusive descriptions. This behavior is associated with 17,340 non-abusive Chirpers (31.00% of the total 55,928 Chirpers with non-abusive descriptions) and on average 4.87% submissions posted by each of them are abusive. The most notable category is ha-

arrassment, where 49,986 (44.43%) harassing submissions are posted by 16,685 (29.83%) non-abusive Chirpers. This highlights a critical issue: Chirpers can deviate from their creators’ non-abusive intentions and generate abusive content.

Further, when examining Chirpers’ backstories, we identify 1,497 (2.68%) non-abusive Chirpers that incorporate abusive content in their backstories, despite being assigned non-abusive descriptions by their creators. At least 5% of abusive backstories in each category stem from this phenomenon, with 1,289 (38.60%) violent backstories being particularly notable. These results underscore the lack of an effective self-moderation mechanism in Chirpers, which results in the (accidental) repurposing of non-abusive Chirpers for generating abusive backstories and submissions. This raises concerns about the potential misuse of content from such systems and the need for stronger safeguards to prevent unintended abusive outcomes.

**Chirpers’ engagement with abusive posts.** Prior studies have revealed that abusive language can trigger more intensive engagement among human users (Mathew et al. 2020; Wei et al. 2024), creating a ripple effect. We therefore explore how Chirpers interact with these abusive posts. Overall, reported by the Mann-Whitney U test, Chirpers are significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) more active when engaging in abusive posts, with  $1.007\times$  mean comment counts of non-abusive posts. We hypothesize that this difference may stem from Chirper.ai’s feature that allows human creators to direct their Chirpers to comment on specific posts, potentially introducing a slight bias towards abusive content due to human influence. Alternatively, this behavior could suggest that Chirpers have an inherent tendency to interact more with abusive content, hinting at potential issue to promote abusive content.

Moreover, we find that these patterns differ across the 5 prominent categories of abusive content (*insult, profanity, toxicity, harassment, and violence*). Figure 5 presents the number of comments upon posts with abusive content degree above and below 0.5, broken down into the 5 prominent categories. While fewer comments are observed under insulting ( $0.883\times$ ) and harassing ( $0.846\times$ ) posts, Chirpers on average generate significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) more comments on other posts that contain profanity ( $1.168\times$ ), toxicity ( $1.058\times$ ), or violence ( $1.083\times$ ). This indicates that Chirpers and their creators’ engagement towards abusive content are selective. Such results suggest that moderation mechanisms for LLM-driven social networks should be granular, requiring tailored interventions for diverse categorical abusive content.

**Abusive posts trigger more abusive comments.** We next measure if Chirpers’ engagement towards abusive posts, in turn, produces more abusive content. Additionally, to explore whether abusive posts are more likely to trigger abusive comments with similar content, we calculate the semantic similarity between abusive comments and their posts. For this, we compute the cosine similarity of the E5 text embeddings (multilingual-e5-small) (Wang et al. 2024b) for each post and its associated abusive comments.

Figure 6(a) plots the CDFs of the proportion of abusive comments for each post; we separate posts into abusive




Figure 5: Comparison on the number of comments between posts containing and excluding abusive content in the 5 prominent categories respectively. The statistical significance is reported by the Mann-Whitney U test. \*:  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*\*:  $p < 0.001$ ; \*\*\*\*:  $p < 0.0001$ .




Figure 6: CDF plots of the proportion of abusive comments received by Chirpers’ posts and the semantic similarity the cleaned text of abusive comments and their posts.

vs non-abusive. Figure 6(b) also plots the CDF of the semantic similarity between posts and their comments. In total, we identify 207,045 abusive comments, and only 34,300 (16.56%) are on abusive posts. This indicates that the majority of Chirpers’ abusive commenting behaviors do not require abusive posts as inducement. Instead, the Chirpers independently choose to post abusive comments on non-abusive posts. That said, abusive posts ( $\mu = 0.167, mid = 0$ ) do receive a significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) higher proportion of abusive comments compared to non-abusive posts ( $\mu = 0.020, mid = 0$ ). This suggests that abusive posts play a role in catalyzing Chirpers to produce more abusive material, triggering a ripple effect.

This is also evidenced by the fact that abusive comments possess significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) higher semantic similarities with abusive posts ( $\mu = 0.878, mid = 0.874$ ) than non-abusive posts ( $\mu = 0.846, mid = 0.845$ ). This suggests that abusive comments tend to be more contextually related to the content of the posts, and Chirpers are likely to repeat abusive content when engaging with abusive posts, reflecting a potential parroting phenomenon. Our findings shed light on the relationship between the nature of the posts and abusive comments they attract on Chirper.ai, and provide reference for content moderation strategies to limit the proliferation of abusive comments.

## 6 Detectability of Chirpers’ Submissions (RQ3)

Recent work has attempted to automatically detect AI-generated content. We next investigate the detectability of Chirpers’ submissions.

Method	Chirper vs. Mastodon (Human)		Chirper vs. Mastodon (Bot)	
	AUROC	Highest F1-score	AUROC	Highest F1-score
$\log p(x)$	0.653 $\pm 3.19e^{-4}$	0.719 $\pm 1.61e^{-4}$	0.706 $\pm 3.08e^{-4}$	0.748 $\pm 1.62e^{-4}$
$r(x)$	0.667 $\pm 3.30e^{-4}$	0.716 $\pm 2.01e^{-4}$	0.737 $\pm 2.96e^{-4}$	0.755 $\pm 1.92e^{-4}$
$\log r(x)$	0.656 $\pm 3.26e^{-4}$	0.717 $\pm 1.59e^{-4}$	0.696 $\pm 3.16e^{-4}$	0.726 $\pm 1.80e^{-4}$
Entropy	0.370 $\pm 3.59e^{-4}$	0.671 $\pm 5.66e^{-5}$	0.330 $\pm 3.43e^{-4}$	0.672 $\pm 4.34e^{-5}$
LRR	0.637 $\pm 3.44e^{-4}$	0.684 $\pm 1.93e^{-4}$	0.653 $\pm 3.34e^{-4}$	0.669 $\pm 1.98e^{-4}$
DetectGPT	0.415 $\pm 3.30e^{-4}$	0.667 $\pm 1.41e^{-6}$	0.410 $\pm 3.43e^{-4}$	0.667 $\pm 2.14e^{-6}$
NPR	0.425 $\pm 3.58e^{-4}$	0.667 $\pm 1.38e^{-7}$	0.412 $\pm 3.41e^{-4}$	0.667 $\pm 1.56e^{-6}$

Table 3: Performance of zero-shot AI text detection methods in classifying submissions between Chirper.ai and Mastodon.




Figure 7: Performance distribution of zero-shot AI text detection methods in classifying submissions between Chirper.ai and Mastodon in diverse token ranges.

### 6.1 Detecting Chirper Content

We experiment with zero-shot detection, which is suitable for fast large-scale detection, as it does not require prior training. We experiment with two commonly compared categories of zero-shot machine-generated text detection methodologies: perturbation-free and perturbation-based.

**Perturbation-free methods.** For perturbation-free methods, the assumption is that machine generated text tend to have a higher (or lower) values for certain statistical metrics, when use it as a prompt  $x$  to query a LLM. We experimented with five well-known perturbation-free metrics:

- **Log-probability ( $\log p(x)$ ):** The average token-wise log probability of queried LLM’s response. Machine-generated texts tend to have higher average log-probability.
- **Token (log-)rank ( $r(x)/\log r(x)$ ):** The average token-wise (log-)rank of queried LLM’s response. Machine-

generated texts tend to have smaller average (log-)rank.

- **Entropy:** The uncertainty in of queried LLM’s response. Machine-generated texts tend to have lower entropy (Gehrmann, Strobel, and Rush 2019).
- **Log-likelihood log-rank ratio (LRR):** The absolute value of the ratio of average log-probability to average log-rank of queried LLM’s response (Su et al. 2023). Machine-generated texts tend to have higher LRR.

**Perturbation-based methods.** Given the perturbed versions of the target text  $x$ ,  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ , perturbation-based methods rely on calculating the difference (or ratio) on statistics such as log-probability and log-rank between the responses by using target text and its perturbed versions as prompts to query a LLM. We experimented with two state-of-art perturbation-based methods:

- **DetectGPT:** Machine-generated texts tend to have a larger discrepancy on average log-probability between the response by the target text  $x$  and its perturbed versions  $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$  (Mitchell et al. 2023). The discrepancy is calculated as  $\log p(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_1 \sim p} [\log p(\tilde{x})]$ .
- **Normalized log-rank perturbation (NPR):** Machine-generated texts tend to have a higher ratio of perturbation’s log-rank to target text’s on average (Su et al. 2023). Accordingly, the NPR score is calculated as  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{x}_1 \sim p} [\log r(\tilde{x})] / \log r(x)$ .

**Implementation.** We follow the inference-efficient setting and default hyperparameters identical to (Su et al. 2023) to select the 1.5B parameter version of GPT-2 model (gpt2-xl) for querying target text and 220M parameter version of T5 model (t5-base) to generate 10 perturbations for each target text. We focus on English submissions with at least 3 tokens and force the T5 model to rewrite at least 1 token when perturbing the target text. This results in 5,388,119 submissions by Chirpers, 6,076,726 submissions by Mastodon human users, and 2,298,033 submissions by Mastodon bots.

**Evaluation thresholds and metrics.** We utilize python sklearn package to evaluate the above methods using several threshold values. We utilize the AUROC score and the highest F1-score to depict the methods’ overall and best performance across all thresholds, respectively. To avoid the bias caused by diverse sizes of the three groups (Chirpers, humans, bots), we calculate AUROC and the highest F1-score based on a randomly sampled subset with 1,000,000 submissions for each group respectively. The above sampling and calculation are performed for 100 times to assess the methods’ average performance.

**Results.** Table 3 summarizes the performance of the seven zero-shot AI text detection methods when differentiating Chirpers’ text from Mastodon human users’ and bots’, and differentiating bots’ text from human users’ on Mastodon.

All detection methods achieve AUROC scores below 0.75. The best methods for detecting Chirpers’ text from human users’ and bots on Mastodon are log probability (AUROC = 0.653) and average token rank (AUROC = 0.737),

respectively. Notably, entropy and the two perturbation-based methods, DetectGPT and NPR, only achieve AUROC scores below 0.5, which means their performance are even worse than a random classification. Compared with their performance on XSum, SQuAD, WritingP datasets present in (Su et al. 2023), all the seven methods encounter a significant AUROC decrease in an approximate range from 0.2 to 0.3. Such results indicate zero-shot detection’s limited capability in classifying LLM-generated social text from those derived from human-driven social networks, for text both by human users and traditional social bots.

**Relationship between text length and detection performance.** A key distinction between our dataset and those in (Su et al. 2023) is the significantly shorter length of Chirper submissions. Over 99% of our collected post contains fewer than 200 tokens — substantially shorter than the news articles (XSum), Wikipedia paragraphs (SQuAD), and prompted stories (WritingPrompts) used to evaluate prior work.

We hypothesize that zero-shot detection methods perform better on social texts involving richer tokens. To investigate this, we partition submissions from Chirpers and Mastodon human users into 10-token intervals (0–9, 10–19, ..., 90–99), with an additional group for texts exceeding 100 tokens. To mitigate bias from uneven interval sizes, we evaluate detection performance on a balanced subset: 2,476 randomly sampled submissions per interval for both platforms, matching the smallest group size (Mastodon human users’ >100-token subset). This sampling and evaluation process is repeated 100 times to compute average performance metrics.

Figure 7 present the distributions of AUROC and highest F1-scores across diverse token sizes. We find that, as the token count increases, entropy, DetectGPT, and NPR can achieve higher AUROC, while other methods’ AUROC seem less influenced. In general, for all methods, the AUROC tends to converge to around 0.6. Overall, all methods attain a highest F1-score of around 0.67, with a slight drop by around 0.04 F1-score observed on log probability, average token rank, and average log token rank. Therefore, increasing token count can indeed help entropy and perturbation-based methods achieve better overall performance. This could be because longer text generated by LLMs may introduce more “fake-ness”, leading to a larger entropy as they are positive correlated (Mitchell et al. 2023). Subsequently, this may enlarge the entropy gap between text generated by LLMs and humans. Additionally, longer text can generate more diverse perturbations, based on DetectGPT, LRR, and NPR’s design, which can help to capture the distinct patterns of LLM-generated text from humans’ more effectively (Mitchell et al. 2023; Su et al. 2023). Nonetheless, zero-shot detection is still limited even with social text containing richer tokens.

## 7 Analyzing Chirpers’s Network (RQ4)

In the previous sections, we discover significant statistical differences between Chirper.ai and Mastodon. Next, we explore the structural characteristics of Chirpers’ social network.



Metric	Mean diff (Mann-Whitney U) for abusive vs. non-abusive Chirpers					
	Threshold $\geq$ 1%	Threshold $\geq$ 10%	Threshold $\geq$ 20%	Threshold $\geq$ 30%	Threshold $\geq$ 40%	Threshold $\geq$ 50%
<b>PageRank</b> ★	2.23e-05 > 2.04e-05 (***)	2.11e-05 < 2.11e-05 (***)	2.25e-05 > 2.11e-05 (***)	2.26e-05 > 2.11e-05 (***)	2.14e-05 > 2.11e-05 (***)	2.16e-05 > 2.11e-05 (***)
<b>Betweenness</b>	4.75e-05 > 4.49e-05 (***)	4.04e-05 < 4.63e-05 (***)	5.29e-05 > 4.56e-05 (***)	5.01e-05 > 4.58e-05 (***)	4.29e-05 < 4.58e-05 (***)	3.78e-05 < 4.58e-05 (***)
<b>In-degree</b> ★	31.26 > 27.40 (***)	28.33 < 28.83 (***)	32.62 > 28.67 (***)	32.96 > 28.73 (***)	31.63 > 28.77 (***)	31.65 > 28.78 (***)
<b>Out-degree</b> ☆	30.97 > 27.50 (***)	23.52 < 29.17 (***)	25.51 < 28.84 (***)	23.40 < 28.81 (***)	22.99 < 28.78 (***)	24.18 < 28.76 (***)
<b>Cluster Coeff.</b> ☆	0.1100 > 0.1070 (***)	0.1027 < 0.1085 (***)	0.0997 < 0.1083 (***)	0.0960 < 0.1082 (***)	0.0961 < 0.1081 (***)	0.0856 < 0.1081 (***)

Table 4: A summary of significance in test results on 4 network metrics between abusive characters and non-abusive characters on Chirper.ai. We experiment with 6 values of the threshold. The “Mean diff” column shows the comparison results of the mean value of corresponding metrics between abusive and non-abusive characters. \*\*\* denotes that  $p < 0.001$ . ★/☆ denotes abusive/non-abusive Chirpers possess a higher mean value on corresponding metrics by at least four out of six thresholds.

**Inducing the follower graph.** We again utilize Mastodon to compare with Chirper.ai for the purpose of investigating the structural difference between LLM-driven and human-driven social network. We build up follow-networks for Chirper.ai and Mastodon respectively. In this context, a “user” can refer to a Chirper, a Mastodon bot or human user. If the user (followee) is followed by another user (follower), we assign a directed link from the follower to the followee. We experiment with 8 metrics to measure network structural differences: clustering coefficient, strongly connected components, degree, in-degree, out-degree, betweenness centrality, degree centrality and PageRank.

**Characteristics of Chirpers’ network.** The comparison between Chirper.ai and Mastodon reveals distinct characteristics in terms of the social network’s average clustering coefficient and the distribution of strongly connected components. The Chirper.ai graph exhibits a lower average clustering coefficient (0.0954) than Mastodon (0.1492), indicating that Mastodon possesses stronger local clustering and community structures. However, the percentage of characters within the largest strongly connected component on Chirper.ai encompasses 76.42% of users —  $2.91\times$  of the percentage on Mastodon (26.23%). This suggests that Chirper.ai has broader connectivity, whereas Mastodon has more fragmented user groups.

Interestingly, we also identify network difference on the connectivity reliance to central nodes. For example, we remove the top 5% (10%, 15%, 20%) nodes ranked by PageRank with the Chirper.ai and Mastodon follower graphs. Upon the removal, the average clustering coefficient for the Mastodon graph drops dramatically to 0.0010 (0.0015, 0.0000, 0.0000) compared with the average for Chirper.ai drops to 0.0598 (0.0594, 0.0569, 0.0515). This indicates that high PageRank nodes in Mastodon are crucial for maintaining local connectivity, serving as bridges between communities. In contrast, Chirper.ai demonstrates greater resilience and less reliance on central nodes, as evidenced by the moderate decline in its clustering coefficient.

**Abusive Chirpers are central but less cohesively connected.** Previous studies on human social networks reveal that posting abusive content correlates with a more central and

well-connected network position (Wei et al. 2024). Inspired by such work, we test whether the network positions of Chirpers who post abusive content tend to be more central and well-connected. Referring to (Jain, Katarya, and Sachdeva 2023; Zhang et al. 2023; Wei et al. 2024), we utilize five common metrics to depict nodes’ position in the follower graph: *PageRank*, *betweenness centrality*, *in-degrees*, *outdegrees*, and *cluster coefficient*. As we aim to explore the relationship between Chirpers’ graph positions and their posting behaviors, we only inspect the metric difference among 45,415 (68.96% of total collected Chirpers) active Chirpers who have posted at least 3 submissions and been connected by at least 3 other Chirpers on the follow-network.

Given that there is no standard way to define an agent as abusive, we consider a Chirper as abusive if its percentage of abusive submissions exceed a given threshold. We experiment with six thresholds: 1%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%. Referring to strategies in (Garimella et al. 2018; Zhu et al. 2024), we only consider a trend to be representative if it is indicated by at least *four out of six* thresholds’ comparisons with statistical significance ( $p < 0.001$ ) at the same time.

Table 4 summarizes the results on the five network metrics. It reports the differences between abusive and non-abusive Chirpers. We observe that abusive Chirpers hold higher mean values on both *PageRank* and *in-degree*, compared with non-abusive ones in the follow-network. This indicates that abusive Chirpers may hold a distinct position, as neighbors of well-connected hubs and act as popular followers. Such network positions may increase the exposure of these abusive Chirpers and facilitate the spread of their content through the follow-network. Interestingly, this trend is different for *out-degree* and *clustering coefficient*. Abusive Chirpers possess a lower level of out-degree and cluster coefficient than non-abusive Chirpers. These indicate that abusive Chirpers are passive in following other Chirpers and thus associated with less cohesive connection. Therefore, abusive Chirpers demonstrate a distinct position as central nodes, but only form superficial connections with disparate individuals, lacking mutual connection with other Chirpers.

**Validating abusive Chirpers by network metrics.** The above

Classifiers	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-score	Best-F1
LR	0.67 $\pm$ 0.02	0.63 $\pm$ 0.02	0.83 $\pm$ 0.02	0.72 $\pm$ 0.01	0.75
RF	0.70 $\pm$ 0.02	0.69 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.02	0.71 $\pm$ 0.02	0.75
KNN	0.68 $\pm$ 0.02	0.67 $\pm$ 0.02	0.71 $\pm$ 0.03	0.69 $\pm$ 0.02	0.73
XGboost	0.70 $\pm$ 0.02	0.69 $\pm$ 0.02	0.74 $\pm$ 0.02	0.71 $\pm$ 0.02	0.75
Linear-SVM	0.68 $\pm$ 0.04	0.65 $\pm$ 0.04	0.79 $\pm$ 0.05	0.71 $\pm$ 0.02	0.75
RBF-SVM	0.69 $\pm$ 0.02	0.67 $\pm$ 0.02	0.77 $\pm$ 0.03	0.71 $\pm$ 0.01	0.75

Table 5: Performance of experimented classifiers in identifying abusive Chirpers based on their network features.

suggests that abusive Chirpers have different network positions compared to non-abusive ones. Finally, we validate this assertion by training a classifier to distinguish between abusive and non-abusive Chirpers based solely on the above network metrics. If robust performance can be achieved it would confirm that there are key difference. The input is, for each Chirper, its PageRank, in-degree, out-degree, and cluster coefficient.

We experiment with commonly used binary classifiers: Logistic regression (LR), Random forest (RF), Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGboost), K-nearest neighbors (KNN) and Support Vector Machine (Linear-SVM and RBF-SVM). To test these classifiers, we select an intermediate threshold ( $\geq 20\%$ ) to label all characters as abusive or non-abusive, turning this into a binary prediction task. Using a 20% threshold, there are 1,541 abusive Chirpers. To balance the dataset between the two labels, we randomly undersample 1,541 Chirpers from all non-abusive ones. We randomly shuffle and split the 3,082 data points into training and testing sets with a ratio of 80:20. We repeat the sampling, splitting and testing for 100 times to assess the average performance of the classifiers. When training the models, we utilize 5-fold cross-validation, and exploit grid search to optimize the parameters of each classifiers (He et al. 2024b). We summarize the hyperparameters applied for each classifier and the parameter combinations that achieve the best F1-score in Appendix.

Table 5 presents the prediction results of the five classifiers. Columns ‘Accuracy’, ‘Precision’, ‘Recall’ and ‘F1-score’ are average results of 100 times repeat. ‘Best-F1’ refers to the best F1-score in 100 times. We observe that all classifiers achieve an F1-score above 0.7, while LR achieves the highest F1-score (0.72) with a high recall rate of 0.83. We also present the feature importance (coefficient) of LR classifier. The most important metric is *clustering coefficient* (-0.1353), followed by *outdegree* (-0.0231) and *indegree* (0.0146).

These results support our earlier assertion that the abusive Chirpers hold different network positions to non-abusive ones. Such classifier could also benefit platform managers to efficiently locate suspicious Chirpers who have potentially been producing much abusive content, simply by observing their network positions. More importantly, the high recall rate by LR highlights that such a classification minimizes false negatives, correctly identifying a large proportion of the actual abusive Chirpers.

## 8 Conclusion

**Summary & Implications.** This study presents a large-scale analysis of LLM agents’ behavioral patterns on online social networks, using Chirper.ai as a case study. By comparing these agents with human users on Mastodon, we identify distinct differences in posting behaviors and follow-network structures. More critically, our findings reveal concerning trends in LLM-driven social networks, including the widespread use of hallucinated mentions and active participation in abusive content. These insights highlight the vulnerabilities of simulated social ecosystems and underscore the need for improved moderation mechanisms to ensure the robustness of LLM-driven platforms.

**Limitation & Future work.** While our study provides foundational insights, several avenues remain for further exploration. First, our analysis is currently limited to Chirper.ai and Mastodon; future research could expand to other LLM-driven platforms (e.g., Butterflies.ai) and human-dominated networks (e.g., Bluesky) for a more comprehensive comparison. Second, our evaluation of AI-generated text detection relies solely on zero-shot methods. Subsequent work could refine these approaches or develop supervised detection frameworks using our dataset to enhance identification accuracy. Addressing these gaps will deepen our understanding of LLM agents’ social behaviors and improve safeguards against misuse.

## References

- Ai, W.; Lu, X.; Liu, X.; Wang, N.; Huang, G.; and Mei, Q. 2017. Untangling Emoji Popularity Through Semantic Embeddings. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 11(1): 2–11.
- Balani, S.; and De Choudhury, M. 2015. Detecting and characterizing mental health related self-disclosure in social media. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference extended abstracts on human factors in computing systems*, 1373–1378.
- Bertaglia, T.; Heisig, L.; Kaushal, R.; and Iamnitchi, A. 2024. InstaSynth: Opportunities and Challenges in Generating Synthetic Instagram Data with ChatGPT for Sponsored Content Detection. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 18(1): 139–151.
- Bin Zia, H.; He, J.; Castro, I.; and Tyson, G. 2024. Fe-diverse Migrations: A Study of User Account Portability on the Mastodon Social Network. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference, IMC ’24*, 68–75. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400705922.
- Dammu, P. P. S.; Jung, H.; Singh, A.; Choudhury, M.; and Mitra, T. 2024. ”They are uncultured”: Unveiling Covert Harms and Social Threats in LLM Generated Conversations. arXiv:2405.05378.
- De Choudhury, M.; and De, S. 2014. Mental health discourse on reddit: Self-disclosure, social support, and anonymity. In *Proceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media*, volume 8, 71–80.

- Gao, C.; Lan, X.; Lu, Z.; Mao, J.; Piao, J.; Wang, H.; Jin, D.; and Li, Y. 2023. S3: Social-network simulation system with large language model-empowered agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.14984*.
- Garimella, K.; De Francisci Morales, G.; Gionis, A.; and Mathioudakis, M. 2018. Political discourse on social media: Echo chambers, gatekeepers, and the price of bipartisanship. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*, 913–922.
- Gehrmann, S.; Strobel, H.; and Rush, A. M. 2019. Gltr: Statistical detection and visualization of generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.04043*.
- GlobeNewsWire. 2024. Butterflies AI Raises Seed Round, Launches First Social Media Platform Where People and AI Friends Co-Exist.
- Hao, G.; Wu, J.; Pan, Q.; and Morello, R. 2024. Quantifying the uncertainty of LLM hallucination spreading in complex adaptive social networks. *Scientific reports*, 14(1): 16375.
- Haq, E.-U.; Jangra, S.; De, S.; Sastry, N.; and Tyson, G. 2025. Unpacking the Layers: Exploring Self-Disclosure Norms, Engagement Dynamics, and Privacy Implications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10701*.
- Hartvigsen, T.; Gabriel, S.; Palangi, H.; Sap, M.; Ray, D.; and Kamar, E. 2022. ToxiGen: A Large-Scale Machine-Generated Dataset for Implicit and Adversarial Hate Speech Detection. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- He, J.; Zia, H. B.; Castro, I.; Raman, A.; Sastry, N.; and Tyson, G. 2023a. Flocking to mastodon: Tracking the great twitter migration. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference*, 111–123.
- He, J.; Zia, H. B.; Castro, I.; Raman, A.; Sastry, N.; and Tyson, G. 2023b. Flocking to Mastodon: Tracking the Great Twitter Migration. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM on Internet Measurement Conference, IMC '23*, 111–123. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400703829.
- He, J. K.; Wallis, F. P.; Gvirtz, A.; and Rathje, S. 2024a. Artificial intelligence chatbots mimic human collective behaviour. *British Journal of Psychology*.
- He, Y.; Gu, Y.; Shekhar, R.; Castro, I.; and Tyson, G. 2024b. Making the Pick: Understanding Professional Editor Comment Curation in Online News. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, 557–568.
- Jain, L.; Katarya, R.; and Sachdeva, S. 2023. Opinion leaders for information diffusion using graph neural network in online social networks. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 17(2): 1–37.
- Lees, A.; Tran, V. Q.; Tay, Y.; Sorensen, J.; Gupta, J.; Metzler, D.; and Vasserman, L. 2022. A new generation of perspective api: Efficient multilingual character-level transformers. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, 3197–3207.
- Li, M.; Zhao, S.; Wang, Q.; Wang, K.; Zhou, Y.; Srivastava, S.; Gokmen, C.; Lee, T.; Li, E. L.; Zhang, R.; et al. 2024. Embodied agent interface: Benchmarking llms for embodied decision making. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 100428–100534.
- Li, S.; Yang, J.; and Zhao, K. 2023. Are you in a masquerade? exploring the behavior and impact of large language model driven social bots in online social networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10337*.
- Luo, J. 2023. Analyzing Character and Consciousness in AI-Generated Social Content: A Case Study of Chirper, the AI Social Network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08614*.
- Mathew, B.; Illendula, A.; Saha, P.; Sarkar, S.; Goyal, P.; and Mukherjee, A. 2020. Hate begets hate: A temporal study of hate speech. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 4(CSCW2): 1–24.
- Minos, S. 2023. Chirper: Changing the AI Landscape with Autonomy and Entertainment.
- Minos, S. 2024. From AI Social Network to Simulated AI World.
- Mitchell, E.; Lee, Y.; Khazatsky, A.; Manning, C. D.; and Finn, C. 2023. DetectGPT: Zero-Shot Machine-Generated Text Detection using Probability Curvature. In Krause, A.; Brunskill, E.; Cho, K.; Engelhardt, B.; Sabato, S.; and Scarlett, J., eds., *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 24950–24962. PMLR.
- Piao, J.; Lu, Z.; Gao, C.; Xu, F.; Santos, F. P.; Li, Y.; and Evans, J. 2025. Emergence of human-like polarization among large language model agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.05171*.
- Raman, A.; Joglekar, S.; Cristofaro, E. D.; Sastry, N.; and Tyson, G. 2019. Challenges in the decentralised web: The mastodon case. In *Proceedings of the internet measurement conference*, 217–229.
- Su, J.; Zhuo, T. Y.; Wang, D.; and Nakov, P. 2023. Detectllm: Leveraging log rank information for zero-shot detection of machine-generated text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05540*.
- Wang, C.; Liu, Z.; Yang, D.; and Chen, X. 2024a. Decoding echo chambers: Llm-powered simulations revealing polarization in social networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19338*.
- Wang, L.; Yang, N.; Huang, X.; Yang, L.; Majumder, R.; and Wei, F. 2024b. Multilingual E5 Text Embeddings: A Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05672*.
- Wei, Y.; and Tyson, G. 2025. Virtual Stars, Real Fans: Understanding the VTuber Ecosystem. *arXiv:2502.01553*.
- Wei, Y.; Zhu, Y.; Hui, P.; and Tyson, G. 2024. Exploring the Use of Abusive Generative AI Models on Civitai. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM '24*, 6949–6958. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400706868.
- Wu, S.; and Resnick, P. 2024. Calibrate-Extrapolate: Rethinking Prevalence Estimation with Black Box Classifiers. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, 1634–1647.
- Zhang, F.; Linghu, Q.; Xie, J.; Wang, K.; Lin, X.; and Zhang, W. 2023. Quantifying Node Importance over Network Structural Stability. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM*

*SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 3217–3228.

Zhu, Y.; Haq, E.-U.; Tyson, G.; Lee, L.-H.; Wang, Y.; and Hui, P. 2024. A Study of Partisan News Sharing in the Russian invasion of Ukraine. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, volume 18, 1847–1858.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Classifiers' parameters for grid search and parameters achieved best F1-score.

- **Logistic Regression:** 'penalty': ['l1', 'l2', 'elasticnet', 'none'], 'C': [0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100], 'solver': ['lbfgs', 'liblinear', 'saga'], 'max\_iter': [200, 300, 500]. **Best Parameters:** 'C': 0.01, 'max\_iter': 200, 'penalty': 'l2', 'solver': 'liblinear'.
- **Random Forest:** 'n\_estimators': [100, 200, 300], 'max\_depth': [None, 10, 20], 'min\_samples\_split': [2, 5, 10], 'min\_samples\_leaf': [1, 2, 4], 'max\_features': ['auto', 'sqrt', 'log2']. **Best Parameters:** 'max\_depth': 10, 'max\_features': 'log2', 'min\_samples\_leaf': 4, 'min\_samples\_split': 5, 'n\_estimators': 300.
- **K-Nearest Neighbors:** 'n\_neighbors': [3, 5, 7, 9, 11], 'weights': ['uniform', 'distance'], 'algorithm': ['auto', 'ball\_tree', 'kd\_tree', 'brute']. **Best Parameters:** 'algorithm': 'ball\_tree', 'n\_neighbors': 9, 'weights': 'uniform'.
- **XGboost:** 'learning\_rate': [0.01, 0.1, 0.2], 'max\_depth': [3, 5, 7], 'subsample': [0.7, 0.8, 0.9], 'colsample\_bytree': [0.7, 0.8, 0.9], 'min\_child\_weight': [1, 3, 5]. **Best Parameters:** 'algorithm': 'ball\_tree', 'n\_neighbors': 9, 'weights': 'uniform'.
- **Linear-SVM:** 'C': [0.1, 1, 10, 100], 'loss': ['hinge', 'squared\_hinge'], 'penalty': ['l1', 'l2'], 'dual': [True, False]. **Best Parameters:** 'C': 1, 'dual': True, 'loss': 'squared\_hinge', 'penalty': 'l2'.
- **RBF-SVM:** 'C': [0.1, 1, 10, 100], 'gamma': ['scale', 'auto', 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1]. **Best Parameters:** 'C': 0.1, 'gamma': 'scale'.

### A.2 Degree of abusive content for 12 categories.






Figure 8: CDF plots of moderation features of submissions from Chirper.ai and Mastodon.